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The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The study also investigated differences in teachers’ perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, teaching experience). Additionally, an examination of the significant factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction as identified by the elementary teachers was explored.

This correlational study with a quantitative, non-experimental design utilized two surveys to measure elementary teacher perceptions of principal leadership style (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire [MLQ]) and teacher job satisfaction (Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire [MSQ]). Demographic information from each teacher was also collected. Participants included 179 certified elementary teachers (kindergarten through grade 5) from six different rural elementary schools in six different school districts across south central Kentucky.

Results from the Pearson Correlation indicated that all five transformational leadership style dimensions and one transactional leadership dimension derived from the MLQ were statistically significant at the .0001 level and showed positive, moderate correlations with teacher job satisfaction. Results from ANOVA testing indicated
significant differences existed between teacher age and education level groups with regard to teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style. Results revealed that younger teachers (ages 21-30) tended to rate their principal higher in the two transactional leadership components of contingent reward and management-by-exception (active). Older teachers (ages 31-40, ages 41 and above), however, rated their principal lower in these same dimensions. Furthermore, the study’s results reported significant differences between grade level taught groups (kindergarten-grade 5 and special area teachers) with respect to teacher job satisfaction. Results demonstrated that special area teachers (i.e., art, music, library, computers, special education, etc.) rated their intrinsic job satisfaction level significantly higher than kindergarten through grade 5 teachers. Stepwise multiple regression analyses also showed that teachers identified significant factors that contributed to teacher job satisfaction. Intrinsic motivators included areas related to creativity, social service, and independence, while extrinsic motivators included the areas of supervision and compensation. General job satisfaction factors identified included the areas of responsibility and recognition.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

School principal leadership changed significantly over the span of the 20th Century expanding to meet the increased pressures and demands of the job. The paradigm shift from school manager to school leader has forced next-generation school principals to create and maintain a delicate balance between managing effectively, leading instructionally, and developing all school stakeholders as collaborative partners and leaders in the learning process (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000).

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2001) has been a driving force in the world of public education since it was signed into law as part of the overhaul and reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. NCLB has required school principals and teachers alike to be confronted with the stark realization that the educational landscape has been dramatically altered with a concentration on increased levels of accountability including utilization of standardized testing, implementation of a standards-based curriculum, and the imposition of rigid penalties for schools not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Because of this heightened pressure to guarantee schools are making continuous progress and consistently improving, school principals must analyze every facet of their role as principal in hopes of meeting the high standards required by NCLB. Principal leadership style is one construct of the role of the principal that should be closely examined in order to help all teachers learn to adjust to the increased accountability levels with the objective of sustaining high teacher job satisfaction levels. It is anticipated that, through the preservation of adequate levels of job satisfaction, teachers will feel happier and more motivated with their profession, which will ultimately influence student academic
achievement in a positive way and decrease teacher attrition rates (Mathieu, 1991; Leithwood, Leonard, & Sharratt, 1998; Ostroff, 1992).

Significance of the Study

There is no doubt that the intensified demands now placed on school principals due to the NCLB Act of 2001 have made a strong impact with regard to principal leadership, job satisfaction, and teacher attrition. The requirements listed under the NCLB Act have indeed created many daunting challenges for teachers and principals alike. The increased accountability and anxiety associated with stringent student testing and federal sanctions for schools deemed failing has led to teachers feeling demoralized, unmotivated, and dissatisfied (Popham, 2004). Consequently, teachers within the profession have begun to leave, and job satisfaction in relation to principal leadership and support is identified as the reason more often than not (Ingersoll, 2003). With this heightened sense of stress, principals are being compelled to examine their own leadership style in order to help keep teachers satisfied with their profession. Therefore, this research study will inform principals about the perceptions of their leadership style from the perspective of their teachers so that principals can learn to adapt their leadership in ways that may provide additional assistance in helping keep teachers more motivated and satisfied.

This study is significant because there are minimal empirical research studies in the current review of literature that specifically link a particular principal leadership style to positively impacting teacher job satisfaction. Additionally, while there is evidence of research studies that have been conducted investigating the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, this
researcher could find few studies conducted at the elementary level of education within the rural context of the United States according to the current review of literature (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni, Sleegers, & Denessen, 2006). Therefore, this empirical research study will serve as a supplement to the existing body of literature and research in determining this relationship within the United States rural elementary school context.

Results from this study could assist in making school principals more cognizant of their own leadership ability and style and assist them in developing their own leadership capacity to support teachers in adequately managing the increased demands placed on them in this educational age of accountability. This heightened awareness and modification of principal leadership style may contribute to improved levels of teacher job satisfaction and possibly decrease attrition rates. In addition, this investigation will seek to determine if there are differences in teachers’ perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and job satisfaction based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and years of teaching experience). The results from this relationship could help guide principals in recognizing the key differences among teachers’ demographic data with regard to their perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Understanding these differences could provide principals with specific feedback needed to help change their own leadership behaviors with regard to different teacher populations to potentially keep teachers more satisfied. The study also will identify significant factors as perceived by elementary teachers that contribute to their job satisfaction level. Through identification of these elements, principals may learn which factors teachers perceive as critical in maintaining increased levels of job satisfaction, which could ultimately help them in
modifying their own style of leadership or behavior to more effectively build systems of support for their teachers. Through adaptation of leadership style, principals may learn to adjust their leadership behaviors to assist in keeping teachers more satisfied with their job.

**Theoretical Basis for the Study**

The theoretical basis for this study focuses on the transformational leadership model and theory. Initially, the theory of transformational leadership emerged in contrast to the top-down nature of instructional leadership and educational policies in schools as the “creation of valuable and positive change in the followers with the end goal of turning followers into leaders” (Bass & Avolio, 1994, p. 3). However, the theory gained the most traction when James MacGregor Burns first introduced the concept of transformational leadership in his seminal work *Leadership* in 1978. Burns (1978) argued that the unique capacity to lead charismatically while raising awareness of the followers regarding important issues and successfully directing them toward desired outcomes are defining characteristics highly associated with transformational leadership. In addition, Burns suggested that transformational leaders must focus on values, moral purpose, and higher-order intrinsic needs of followers.

Burns’ transformational leadership model was influenced by Maslow’s Theory of Human Needs because this theory recognizes that human beings have a range of needs, and the degree to which followers perform in the workplace will naturally be affected by the extent to which these needs are being satisfied (Burns, 1978). The transformational leadership model can be linked to the higher levels of human needs as it requires the transformational leader to develop the followers’ self-esteem and self-actualization.
In 1985, Bass revised the Burns model arguing that the qualities related to transformational and transactional leadership shape the effectiveness of the leader. Bass characterized his revised model of transformational leadership into four qualities: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Most recently it was from Bass’s conceptualization that Leithwood (1994) further revised the transformational leadership theory in relation to the school setting through identification of specific factors that comprised his own version of transformational leadership, which focused on vision, goal setting, individual support, behavior modeling, and high expectations.

Masood, Dani, Burns, and Blackhouse (2006) further argued that transformational leaders have influence to raise followers to an advanced echelon of moral purpose through establishing emotional bonds with followers. Their research examined the perspectives of teachers and found substantial evidence of a positive correlation with regard to principal influence and the job satisfaction of teachers, their willingness to follow the principal, and positive perceptions of their principal’s effectiveness (Hallinger, 2003).

Accordingly, research of teacher job satisfaction began in 1935 with Hoppock’s classic study, in which he discovered that the elements of working conditions, familial obligations, and social interactions with co-workers impacted satisfaction on the job (Brief & Weiss, 2002). Additionally, Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory (as cited in Dinham & Scott, 1998) aligned satisfying factors (motivators) with teachers’ higher order needs, while dissatisfying factors (hygiene factors) were aligned more closely with teachers’ lower order needs. The satisfiers can be applied to the intrinsic aspects of work
including employee appreciation, praise, and recognition; opportunities for promotion; and respect for the profession.

Later, Bogler (2001) examined transformational leadership and teacher job satisfaction in several school districts in Israel and discovered that a positive relationship existed between the transformational leadership style of the school principal and the job satisfaction of teachers. Furthermore, it was determined that job satisfaction of teachers was highly correlated with the transformational leadership qualities exhibited by the principal. Nguni et al. (2006) also examined the effects of transformational leadership style of the school principal and job satisfaction among teachers in the developing country of Tanzania and discovered that transformational leadership characteristics of the principal do indeed positively affect job satisfaction levels of teachers. Similarly, Korkmaz (2007) examined several school variables from a sample of high school teachers in Turkey. The results from this study indicated that teachers who perceived their principal as a transformational leader experienced higher levels of job satisfaction. In addition, Korkmaz noted that the organizational health of the school improved when teachers viewed their principal as less transactional with regard to leadership behaviors.

Teacher job satisfaction also has been linked to teacher attrition through effectiveness of principal leadership (Marlow, Inman, & Betancourt-Smith, 1997). Research has confirmed job satisfaction of teachers is highly correlated with retention when they experience quality student-teacher and collegial relationships, independence, intellectual stimulation, and appropriate access to materials and supplies (Shann, 1998). Nevertheless, because of the increased levels of school accountability, lack of administrative support, and poor working conditions, many teachers have voluntarily
chosen to leave the profession altogether with feelings of job dissatisfaction (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005). Therefore, it is critical for principals to realize that perhaps their own leadership behaviors can assist in keeping teachers more satisfied, which will consequently impact student achievement in a positive manner and assist in decreasing teacher attrition rates (Mathieu, 1991; Leithwood et al., 1998; Ostroff, 1992).

**Problem Statement**

The problem addressed in this study is that many teachers today feel dissatisfied with their job because of increased accountability and stress, heavy workloads, poor pay and working conditions, a negative school atmosphere, low morale, excessive bureaucracy, and, specifically, perceived inadequate principal support (Metlife Survey of the American Teacher, 2001; National Education Association, 2001; Popham, 2004; Spear, Gould, & Lee, 2000). The inception of NCLB also has created an educational atmosphere focused on increased accountability, which has, as a result, placed a substantial amount of stress and anxiety on teachers leading to feelings of job dissatisfaction and decreased morale (Popham, 2004). Consequently, teachers within the profession have begun to leave, and teacher job satisfaction in relation to principal leadership and support is identified as the reason more often than not (Ingersoll, 2003). In fact, researchers cite the constructs of teacher job satisfaction as well as unsupportive principals as crucial, contributing factors with regard to the current high rates of teacher attrition across America (Ingersoll, 2003).

While empirical evidence exists in the literature that confirms the association of increased levels of job satisfaction and transformational leadership within non-educational settings (Bono, Foldes, Vinson, & Muros, 2007; Judge & Piccolo, 2004),
there is minimal research that has been conducted within the context of the school setting. Additionally, although there have been some empirical research investigations conducted at the elementary, middle, and high school levels concerning the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, the fact remains that this author could locate minimal studies in the current review of literature that have been conducted at the elementary school level within the United States rural school context (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006). This poses a significant problem in relation to the current review of literature in the fact that it is lacking substantiated empirical research evidence to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of school principal leadership style and job satisfaction among teachers within the rural elementary school context of the United States. The results garnered from this study could have a lasting impact with regard to principal leadership and its effect on job satisfaction of teachers. The results could potentially help principals assist teachers in feeling more satisfied with their chosen profession, which may also aid in decreasing the teacher attrition rates in the United States.

**Purpose of the Study**

Research has indicated that job satisfaction of teachers is highly correlated with teacher retention (Shann, 1998), and teacher job satisfaction also has been linked to teacher attrition through the effectiveness of the principal leadership (Marlow et al., 1997). Therefore, the primary purpose of this research study is to examine the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Second, the study will examine the differences between teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years
of teaching experience) and their perceptions of the elementary school principal’s leadership style and job satisfaction. Finally, the study will investigate the factors that contribute to job satisfaction as identified by the elementary school teachers.

**Research Questions**

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction?

Research Question 2: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?

Research Question 3: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of job satisfaction based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?

Research Question 4: What are the significant factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction as identified by elementary school teachers?

This research study will examine the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Data will be collected through the utilization of two survey instruments designed to measure the perceptions of teachers regarding principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1995) will measure the elementary school principal leadership style as perceived by the teachers, and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) will measure job satisfaction levels of the elementary school teachers as perceived by the
teachers. Both surveys have validity and reliability and have been commonly utilized in the review of literature (Bogler, 2001; Nguni et al., 2006).

Definition of Terms

*Elementary School:* The term "elementary school" means an institution or residential school that provides elementary education, as determined by appropriate state law (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). For the purposes of this study, elementary school consists of surveying certified elementary teachers in grade levels kindergarten to fifth grade.

*Job Satisfaction:* Job satisfaction in general is simply “how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs…it is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs” (Spector, 1997, p. 2).

*Rural:* The National Center for Education Statistics (2010), in consultation with the U.S. Census Bureau, defined “rural” as a territory that is more than 5 miles from an urbanized area (population of 50,000 or more) and 2.5 miles or greater from an urban cluster (population of 25,000-50,000).

*Teacher Attrition:* According to Boe, Bobbit, and Cook (1993), teacher attrition is a component of teacher turnover (i.e., changes in teacher status from year to year) in which teachers exit the teaching profession altogether due to natural events such as retirements, deaths, and/or resignations, as opposed to reductions planned by management such as discharge, layoffs, retrenchments, or early retirements.

*Transformational Leadership:* A model of leadership that can be considered an ongoing process by which “leaders motivate followers to do more than they thought was originally possible…through the creation of valuable and positive change with the end
goal of turning followers into leaders” (Bass & Avolio, 1994, p. 3; Burns, 1978, p. 20).  

Kentucky Teacher Certification Rank System: The Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) of Kentucky issues teaching certificates at three ranks to persons who have completed an approved teacher preparation program (traditional or alternative) and earned at least a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited postsecondary institution (EPSB, 2012).

(a) Rank III — certification at the baccalaureate level
(b) Rank II — certification at the master’s (or its equivalent) level
(c) Rank I — certification at the “sixth-year,” specialist, or doctoral level

Certificates issued at the Rank II and Rank I levels are “advanced” certificates.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

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 (Metlife Survey, 2001; NEA, 2001; Popham, 2004; Spear et al., 2000). 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).

This study is significant because the current review of literature lacks a clear connection with conclusive research-based evidence concerning the relationship between specific principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. In addition, while empirical research exists in the literature that corroborates the correlation between transformational leadership and high levels of job satisfaction in settings outside the realm of education (Bono et al., 2007; Judge & Piccolo, 2004), there is an inconsiderable amount of research that has been conducted within the context of the school setting. Although there have been some empirical research investigations conducted concerning the relationship between teacher perceptions of school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, this author could find few studies in the current review of literature that have been conducted within the rural elementary school context of the United States (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006). Therefore, a substantial gap exists in the literature regarding the relationship between teacher perceptions of school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction within the rural elementary school setting of the United States. Results from this study could potentially help school principals keep teachers more satisfied with their job, which could
aid in decreasing the current trend of high rates of teacher attrition. This study will add to
the existing body of research in determining the relationship between teachers’
perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction
within the United States rural school context.

This quantitative, correlational design study will utilize two Likert-type
questionnaires. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1995) will be
employed to measure the perceptions of teachers with regard to elementary school
principal leadership style, and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al.,
1967) will be used to measure the level of job satisfaction among the certified elementary
school teachers. The following research questions will be explored to determine the
relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style
and teacher job satisfaction:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary
school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction?

Research Question 2: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school
principal leadership style based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught,
education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?

Research Question 3: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of job satisfaction
based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and
combined years of teaching experience)?

Research Question 4: What are the significant factors that contribute to teacher job
satisfaction as identified by elementary school teachers?
The following review of literature will trace the origins of transformational leadership, the key theorists of transformational leadership, the relationship between transformational leadership style and the school setting, and its relation to educational leadership in general. Additionally, the theory of transactional leadership will be explored offering insight into the transactional leadership components of contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire leadership. The influence of instructional leadership also will be examined with identification of vital instructional leadership qualities and its impact on school effectiveness. Responsibilities of the school principal in the 21st Century also will be surveyed with an analysis of the evolution and roles of the school principal along with the current paradigm shift from the managerial principal to the collaborative principal. This chapter will conclude with a focus on causes and factors related to teacher job satisfaction. Specifically, intrinsic and extrinsic factors related to teacher job satisfaction will be investigated as well as the relation to transformational principal leadership style and teacher attrition.

The purpose of this review of literature is to investigate and synthesize the existing research regarding transformational and transactional leadership styles, the roles and responsibilities of the school principal in the 21st Century, teacher job satisfaction, and teacher attrition in order to present the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

**Leadership Styles**

Leadership style can be defined as the perceived behavior patterns that a person exhibits when attempting to influence the activities of others (Hersey & Blanchard,
specifically, this chapter focuses on a review of the literature in relation to the transformational leadership style model as well as the transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles.

**Transformational Leadership**

Instructional leadership was effective in the 1980s and early 1990s because this particular leadership style met the expectations of the public and the principal. However, because of increased demands placed upon the school principal, instructional leadership theory alone was not enough to support and sustain high levels of school improvement. In fact, many felt that instructional leaders focused too much on authority and not enough on relationships; therefore, the evolution of the school principal began hinging less on power and more on influence.

During the mid-1990s, educational scholars and practitioners started using characteristics such as influence, passion, charisma, motivation, consideration, and change agent to describe effective leaders. Thus, the theory of transformational leadership emerged, in contrast to the top-down nature of instructional leadership in schools, through the creation of positive change in others with the ultimate goal of transforming followers into leaders (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

**Origin of transformational leadership theory.** As with many other forms of leadership, transformational leadership has been interpreted and conceptualized in many ways. Bennis (1959) first introduced the view that transformational leadership was a person’s capacity to raise another person’s consciousness, build meanings, and inspire human intent. Almost two decades later, however, Burns (1978) was the first individual to truly conceptualize the model of transformational leadership in his seminal work
Leadership. Burns declared that transformational leadership was the disregard of self-interest by the leader to cause a particular goal or outcome that will benefit all.

Burns also suggested that transformational leaders have an obligation to concentrate their efforts on moral purpose and values as well as the higher-order intrinsic needs of their followers. Burns’ transformational leadership model was derived from Maslow’s Theory of Human Needs because of its emphasis in recognizing that human beings require a broad range of needs and understanding that the performance of the follower in the work environment depends heavily on the extent to which their needs are being met. The transformational leadership model can be linked to human needs because it requires the transformational leader to develop the followers’ higher-level needs of self-esteem and self-actualization (Burns, 1978).

Burns (1978) introduced the idea of embracing leadership as shared values, moralities, and ethics. He argued that the unique capacity to charismatically lead while raising awareness of the followers regarding important issues and successfully directing them toward desired outcomes are defining characteristics highly associated with transformational leadership. He contended that effective leadership should be less about wielding power and gaining compliance, and more focused on the relationships between people and a greater understanding of the individual’s motives and purposes. Burns believed that power and authority should be used to enact a common purpose, not to advance personal agendas. He further stipulated that power in itself is not a negative component, but the manner through which power is used determines the type of leadership style. Burns believed effective and popular leaders are those who raise
themselves and their followers to higher levels in order to put the needs of the organization as a whole first.

Bass (1985), however, chose to modify Burns’ original definition into a two-factor theory that places the two theories of leadership at opposing ends of the leadership spectrum. Bass stressed that leaders could theoretically be transformational and transactional simultaneously with the two models complementing each other. Most recently, it was from Bass’s conceptualization that Leithwood (1994) further revised the transformational leadership theory to identify specific factors that comprised his model of transformational leadership. Leithwood’s model focused on developing a shared vision, fostering group goals, providing individual support, modeling desired behaviors, and communicating high expectations for optimal performance.

**Two-factor theory of transformational leadership.** Bass’s revision to Burns’ (1978) first transformational leadership model centers around what he calls the two-factor theory, which integrates transformational and transactional leadership practices. Bass (1985) argued that the qualities related to transformational and transactional leadership shape the effectiveness of the leader. Similarly, these leadership practices actually complement one another and work together to ensure that organizational needs are continually being met. The opposite end of the relational continuum would have transactional leadership, with the three dimensions of contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire or “hands off” leadership. Transactional practices foster the continuation of the daily routines, while transformational leadership is necessary for organizational change (Leithwood, Tomlinson, & Genge, 1996). Bass (1985) characterized his revised model of transformational leadership into four qualities:
idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Bass asserted that, through the concept of idealized influence, transformational leaders integrate charisma and inspiration as a means to communicate organizational vision and establish a strong school culture. In communicating their vision, leaders allow followers to become informed about the significance of their efforts in accomplishing organizational goals (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). Transformational leaders also possess the ability to develop a personal rapport with their subordinates by providing individual consideration in serving as a mentor or coach (Bass & Avolio, 1993). The establishment of relationships built on inspiration and personal attention foster an atmosphere of intellectual stimulation in which the leader is able to encourage followers to think creatively and recommend ideas (Bass, 1985). The leader’s willingness to challenge assumptions and take risks builds the foundation for employee motivation, commitment, and extra-effort, which are necessary to initiate change within the organization (Yukl, 1989).

**Transformational leadership and its relation to the school setting.** Leithwood (1994) was very influential in integrating the previous work of Burns and Bass into the field of education. Therefore, certain dimensions are associated with other conceptualizations of transformational leadership that are either absent or are given quite different significance when compared to Leithwood’s model (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Leithwood’s model established a framework of the transformational leadership continuum that can be connected to explicit transformational activities and methods within a school setting (Leithwood, 1994). Leithwood’s model supports the concept of distributed leadership because it can be assumed that the principal shares leadership with
the entire faculty and staff rather than focusing on controlling others through sheer domination and power. Furthermore, a focus on the principal providing individual support, intellectual stimulation, and a collective vision for learning is advocated by this particular model of transformational leadership (Stewart, 2006). Leithwood’s model also included dimensions of educational practice, including creating productive community relationships, not found in prior models of transformational leadership based on his own qualitative and quantitative research studies (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000).

**Transformational leadership and its relation to educational leadership.** With respect to transformational leadership style and educational leadership, transformational leaders ultimately affect change through a bottom-up approach; and several studies conclude that they have positive influence regarding teacher perceptions of the school-wide working environment, organizational change, and student learning (Hallinger, 2003). Transformational leaders also must provide accommodating leadership and offer guidance to followers in order to help them adapt to the ever-changing world of education (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). Marks and Printy (2003) proposed that scholars of education are proponents of transformational leadership because of its focus on identification and solution of the problem as well as increased collaboration among stakeholders with the goal of improvement of the organization. Transformational leaders hope to encourage stakeholders to maximize their fullest potential by building strong systems of support for the betterment of the entire organization. Furthermore, transformational leaders aim to influence stakeholders by encouraging teachers to take part in the collaborative process of making shared decisions.
Sergiovanni (1995) emphasized the development of a transformational leader who seeks advice from appropriate school-community stakeholders in order to establish successful learning opportunities. Developing innovative instructional strategies and maintaining a firm belief in the ability level and potential of students and teachers are also advocated. Transformational leadership focuses on building relationships with followers, with an intentional emphasis placed on “human capital, satisfying higher-order needs, and raising expectations of both leader and follower in a manner that motivates both to increased levels of commitment and performance…leadership by building responds to esteem, achievement, competence, autonomy, and self-actualizing needs” (p. 119). The ultimate goal of the transformational leader is to elicit characteristics that seek to actively engage all school stakeholders.

The implementation of transformational leadership seeks to transform feelings of teachers that, consequently, impact school culture. Specifically, Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) confirmed that transformational leadership impacts student achievement through creation of a school culture that emphasizes learning at all levels. The influence of school culture as a mediating variable is supported by Hallinger (2003), who noted transformational leaders are exceptional at culture building and developing an overarching school vision. Indeed, building a positive school culture is a necessary function that should be shared with teachers “because teachers themselves can be barriers to the development of teacher leadership; therefore, transformational principals are needed to invite teachers to share leadership functions” (Hallinger, 2003, p. 343).

Masood et al. (2006) further argued that transformational leaders have influence to raise followers to an advanced echelon of moral purpose. This is accomplished by
implementation of good managerial skills that influence the emotional bonds with followers. Their research examined the perspectives of teachers and found substantial evidence of a positive correlation with regard to principal influence and the job satisfaction of teachers, their willingness to follow the principal, and positive perceptions of their principal’s effectiveness.

Transformational leaders influence followers to change performance rather than promote special instructional practices (Hallinger, 2003). They also are considered to be risk takers and embrace change, which emphasizes the principle of empowerment (Bass, 1985). The characteristics associated with this type of principal include: building solid, emotional bonds focused on increasing enthusiasm; expressing extraordinary performance standards for all teachers; advocating value-oriented leadership; and encouraging the motivation of teachers to take action that promote the good of the entire school organization (Northouse, 2004).

Transformational leadership and school effectiveness. It can be argued that educational leaders who subscribe to the transformational leadership philosophy are effective leaders because of the close alignment of transformational leadership qualities with those of the effective school leader. Murphy (2011), for example, stated that good school leaders must come to the understanding that leadership should not be built around the concept of power and authority; rather, it is more about service to others with the hope of reaching the overall vision of the organization. Likewise, Murphy (2011) also argued that effective school leadership is not about the principal; instead, it is about the legacy that the principal leaves behind. Additionally, effective principals are noted for
using a combination of expertise and charisma in order to help teachers become better (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986).

The transformational leadership model is correlated with effective leadership attributes because the central themes of transformational leadership also emphasize distributed leadership rather than control and power; building a solid organization that can stand the test of time in which all members are considered valuable contributors to the overall organizational vision and mission; and leading with charm and personality with an intentional concentration on helping colleagues become leaders in their own right.

**Criticism of transformational leadership.** Critics of the transformational leadership theory, however, argue that there is little to no instructional focus (Marks & Printy, 2003), which does not give the principal the necessary tools to actively lead issues regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Therefore, it is indeed vitally necessary for next-generation principals to be able to articulate a vision for learning based on these areas. For that reason, many critics contend that instructional leadership is actually far superior when compared to transformational leadership (Robinson, Kannapel, Gujarati, Williams, & Oettinger, 2008). Additionally, relatively few research studies identify which specific behaviors of the school principal are associated with transformational leadership. Although certain leadership characteristics are defined by the transformational leadership model, identifiable behaviors are not specified in the literature regarding the role of the school principal.
**Transactional Leadership**

**Rewards and punishments.** Transactional leadership at one time was considered the predominant core component of effective leadership with regard to any organization. Burns (1978) identified transactional leadership as motivating followers by exchanging rewards with them for services rendered. He further described the transactional leader as approaching followers with an eye for exchanging one thing for another and having the ability to recognize an existing need for a potential follower. Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Zaleznik (1989) referred to persons exhibiting characteristics of transactional leadership as “managers.” Zaleznik stated that the role of the manager was to use a specific process that involved the integration of people and their ideas working interdependently to determine choices and decisions. Bass (1985) defined transactional leaders as those who saw what their followers wanted and tried to get it for them if their performance merited it, exchanged promises of rewards for certain levels of effort, and responded to the wants and needs of their subordinates as long as their efforts warranted that attention.

Transactional leaders can further be described as controlling followers by means of psychological manipulation through the utilization of rewards and punishments (Gronn, 1995) or leaders who focus on needs and rewards to motivate followers (Campbell, Gold, & Lunt, 2003). The transactional leader has the ability to raise levels of rewards and punishments, while maintaining a key awareness of what the follower needs in order to achieve the goal and provide necessary support and clarification. Bass et al. (2003) agreed that transactional leaders influence followers through the exchange of praise and rewards as well as punishment; however, they also argued that the
transactional leader must always offer followers recognition, praise, and rewards when the desired outcome has been achieved. The transactional leaders work efficiently with followers, contract defining work objectives, and reward responsibilities through a strong work ethic and knowledge of content and respect from those they lead. Specifically, transactional leadership consists of three core components: contingent reward, management-by-exception (active and passive), and laissez-faire leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

**Contingent reward.** Korkmaz (2007) defined contingent reward as “the extent to which leaders set goals, offer rewards for performance, obtain necessary resources, and provide rewards when performance goals are met” (p. 149). Contingent reward refers to the leader who states explicit expectations for the follower and promises rewards in exchange for completion (Bass & Avolio, 1994). This component of transactional leadership is the most active form, and it means that the leader and follower agree on job expectations and the level of performance necessary to achieve those standards. The follower is promised reward for completion of the task or assignment, while the leader monitors and advises the subordinate on an as-needed basis (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Moreover, previous research demonstrates a direct correlation between contingent reward leadership and the commitment, satisfaction, and performance of followers (Bass et al., 2003). Whaley (1994) concurs with the idea that teachers are satisfied with rewards as motivators because teachers, in particular, reported they were more satisfied with the leader when they received a reward for their quality work.

**Management-by-exception.** Management-by-exception is a term that refers to the leader who only takes action after monitoring closely for errors or mistakes from
followers (Bass & Avolio, 1994). When the leader actively monitors the performance of the subordinate for deviations from the norm, this is identified as active management-by-exception. More specifically, Korkmaz (2007) defines active management-by-exception as “the extent to which leaders closely monitor followers’ performance and keep track of mistakes” (p. 149). This type of leadership is most effective in cases where deviation from the norm can cause disastrous results (Avolio et al., 1999). Conversely, passive management-by-exception exists when no action is taken by the leader until mistakes, errors, or deviations occur. This behavior may be viewed as non-leadership, with the exception that the status quo is respected and deviation from it brings about a response.

**Effective transactional leadership practices.** Klimoski and Hayes (1980) identified six observable characteristics of effective transactional leadership that include the following: giving clear and complete instructions, communicating frequently about job-related issues, involving subordinates in setting performance goals, supporting subordinates in their attempt to be effective on the job, reviewing performance of subordinates frequently, and interacting with subordinates in a consistent manner. Bryant (2003) emphasized that transactional leaders possess three distinguishable characteristics: determining unequivocal goals and rewards, exchanging incentives for meeting required expectations, and being responsive to the needs of others. Essentially, transactional leadership is highly dependent on followers being motivated by various types of rewards and punishments including, but not limited to, praise, increased pay, or paid leave.

Burns (1978) contended that the foundation of transactional leadership relies heavily on the concept of the leader and the follower exchanging one thing for another and that followers receive a reward or outcome only when they perform as expected. The
transactional leader develops followers to meet performance expectations, while the transformational leader goes beyond satisfaction of the lower human needs by inspiring followers to transcend normal job responsibilities. Ultimately, however, transformational leadership can be viewed as following a shared organizational vision and going above and beyond the simplified concept of reward exchange for compliance as advocated by transactional leadership theory (Hater & Bass, 1988).

Comparing transactional and transformational leadership. Even though it may seem advantageous to contrast only transformational and transactional leadership, the two models do share some similarities. Burns (1978) argued that the two models of leadership were two separate concepts, while Bass (1985) viewed them on opposite ends of the spectrum. Bass’s perception implied that a leader can actually be transactional and transformational. Bass also stated that transformational leadership theory is merely an extension of transactional leadership theory, and that the two models differ mainly on the process utilized by the leader to motivate the followers (Hater & Bass, 1988). Although transactional and transformational leadership styles are considered separate and each uniquely different, they both require a sense of moral purpose on the part of the leader. In fact, Burns (1978) argued that a leader without a moral purpose is not a leader at all.

Laissez-Faire Leadership

Laissez-faire leadership is defined by Korkmaz (2007) as being 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. Laissez-faire leaders are non-existent and elude leadership duties and responsibilities at all costs. Bass et al. (2003) label 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. Laissez-faire leadership may occur due to the avoidance of leadership behavior altogether, which enables the followers to ignore assignments and expectations. The laissez-faire leader exudes an attitude of indifference as well as a non-leadership approach toward the followers and their performance. This kind of non-leader lacks responsiveness and refuses 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. Bass and Avolio (1995) also asserted that there is no transaction or transformation of any kind with the follower because laissez-faire leaders do nothing to affect either the followers or their behaviors.

**Summary of Leadership Styles**

For the purposes of this study, the transformational leadership model was chosen as the theoretical framework because few research studies exist in the review of literature that focus on the transformational leadership style with respect to the school setting. Exploring the transformational leadership model with respect to the leadership style of the school principal could add to the existing body of research in determining the relationship between transformational leadership and its effect on principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction. The transformational leadership model is also important to this study because it facilitates empowerment through the transformational process of molding teachers into active leaders.

**The School Principal in the 21st Century**

Effective principals are desperately needed as the world of education continues to change rapidly in order to meet the new demands of 21st Century learning. Fullan (2001)
argues, “For better or for worse, change arouses emotions, and when emotions intensify, leadership is key” (p. 1). Consequently, principals are discovering that their past duties and responsibilities are quite different from the complex role of the school principal today because the role of the school leader has indeed changed.

**Effective Schools Movement**

The landmark report *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) informed the public that students in the United States were performing academically below students from other countries due to inadequacies in the curriculum, low student expectations, insufficient time on school work, and inadequate teacher preparation programs. Consequently, the controversial yet seminal report set off a wave of reforms aimed at improving academic performance at all levels of the United States educational system. In fact, it was from this report that the “Effective Schools Movement” flourished during the mid-1980s based primarily on the correlates of effective schools research conducted by Brookover and Lezotte (1979) and Edmonds (1979). These correlates of effective schools, as defined by Edmonds (1979) and later revised by Lezotte (1991), included an orderly and safe climate conducive to teaching and learning, an atmosphere of high expectations for success, a clear and focused mission based on quality instruction, opportunities for learning and student time on work, close monitoring of student progress, valuable home-school relations, and strong instructional leadership from the principal. As a result of the “Effective Schools Movement,” the role of the principal really began to shift from manager to instructional leader.
**Evolution of the School Principal**

The role of the principal has been transformed from focusing primarily on managing various rudimentary aspects of the school (i.e., staff, students, buildings and grounds, safety, etc.) to concentrating more on leading issues related directly to curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Although the principal must definitely be able to “manage” effectively, the principal also must be able to properly lead from an instructional vantage point in order to lead schools to proficiency and beyond. Likewise, the role of the principal in the 21st Century must further expand on the instructional leadership component by continuing to integrate effective management skills and sound instructional leadership practices, while simultaneously articulating the development of the entire school community as collaborative partners in the learning process. “However leadership is designed, divided, or structured, principal leadership must be a matter of effectively leading a community of teachers, learners, and other school community members” (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000, p. 5).

The accountability level of the school principal is perhaps at its pinnacle, and it is not surprising that they are struggling with the pressure of increased accountability for student learning and continuous progress with an obvious obligation to functioning as an instructional leader (Hallinger, 2007). School principals are indeed an essential component to the effectiveness of any school, and their indirect effect on the success of the school cannot be underestimated. Essentially, the school principal in the 21st Century will face the extraordinary challenge of integrating the concepts of instructional, community, and visionary leadership. These areas of future principal leadership are important; however, leadership focused on creating a sustainable vision and mission,
establishing appropriate goals, reinforcing staff through systematic support systems, collaborating with community partnerships, and creating a positive school culture must continue to be the focus (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000).

Elmore, City, Fiarman, and Teitel (2009) affirmed that principals should strive to enhance the knowledge of all stakeholders in order to create a collaborative, cohesive learning atmosphere that emphasizes personal responsibility and accountability. Fullan (2003) expanded this notion, arguing that the “principal of the future must lead a complex learning organization by helping to establish new cultures in schools that have deep capacities to engage in continuous problem solving and improvement.” Fullan (2001) further asserted that there are four key roles of school leadership including extending teacher content knowledge; creating a culture focused on collaboration and professional learning communities; maintaining coherence, continuity, and consistency of school-wide initiatives; and assuring appropriate access to space, time, and materials that encompass the technical resources of the school.

**Roles of the School Principal**

The principalship has evolved significantly over the past two decades, becoming a balancing act integrating managerial and instructional leadership rather than relying solely on management skills (Educational Research Service, 2000). Nonetheless, the school principal in the 21st Century must continue to focus on maintaining effective management skills and leadership involving instructional improvement while, at the same time, further developing the potential of all stakeholders in order to maximize success for all. This capacity development requires the school principal to possess a variety of 21st Century skills that, not surprisingly, have a direct correlation with the transformational
leadership theory including building instructional support systems and professional relationships and shaping a positive school culture in order to promote a sense of collaboration with the entire learning community (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

The school principal is the chief executive officer and authority in any school. The principal is the individual who ultimately bears the burden and responsibility for supervising all school-related activities, and the principal determines the level of morale and culture within the school setting. The performance of the principal also may be a strong indicator of the overall culture of the school; therefore, if the school culture is one that exemplifies a positive tone and a “kids-first” mentality, then one could easily point to the school principal leadership as a crucial factor in determining its success (Marzano et al., 2005). Effective principals are desperately needed as the world of education continues to change rapidly in order to meet the new demands of 21st Century learning. Principals are discovering that their past duties and responsibilities are quite different from the complex role of the school principal today.

The Shift to Collaboration and Collegiality

The effective principal is one who promotes collegiality among teachers (Hoerr, 1996). The association between instructional leadership and collegiality can be promoted by the school principal through the implementation of a schedule that allows for increased time for collaboration and collegiality, which is the hallmark of professional learning communities. Principals, according to Hoerr, can indirectly impact student achievement by providing teachers with the necessary time to share instructional strategies, activities, and lesson plans. Likewise, giving teachers time to analyze student work and pertinent assessment data is also important as well as protecting professional
collaboration. By advocating and nurturing a collaborative and collegial culture, school principals as instructional leaders are indirectly impacting student achievement in a positive way.

Principals must continue to learn that the key to school improvement involves initiating and maintaining the culture of collaboration in which the principal works with teams of teachers in order to develop the leadership capacity of all teachers. Through the initiation of the collaborative process, principals are able to foster the leadership ability of teachers by helping them function as a contributing member of the professional learning community (DuFour & Marzano, 2009). The principal must develop a culture focused on learning for students as well as learning for teachers. Ultimately, the principal in the 21st Century must look beyond “management” and focus on “leading” through the establishment and development of a positive, collaborative school culture focused on high-quality instruction and learning for all students and staff members.

Instructional Leadership

“One lasting legacy of the ‘Effective Schools Movement’ was the institutionalization of the term ‘instructional leadership’ into the vocabulary of educational administration” (Hallinger, 2005, p. 1); and over 20 years later, the term is still alive throughout every domain of education. During the 1980s and throughout the early 1990s, the most prevalent theme in educational leadership focused on the idea of instructional leadership because it was the dominant style of leadership cited in the realm of educational leadership research (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999). In addition, instructional leadership has been the most frequently studied model of school leadership
over the past 25 years (Hallinger, 2005). Although the concept is widely discussed and popular, its definition is certainly difficult to pinpoint.

**Effective instructional leadership qualities.** Four attributes of instructional leadership are most often recognized: provider of management resources, provider of instructional resources, effective communicator, and visible leader (Smith & Andrews, 1989). The resourceful principal has the responsibility to ensure teachers and staff members have adequate materials, facilities, and an appropriate budget to meet performance expectations. The instructional principal must provide support concerning the daily operations of the school; direct activities related to curriculum and instruction; model appropriate behavior; provide high quality professional development; and routinely give priority to concerns pertaining to curriculum, instruction, and assessment (Smith & Andrews, 1989). As an effective communicator, the principal sets well-defined expectations for the school and conveys those expectations openly and precisely. Finally, the visible principal consistently conducts walkthroughs of classrooms and touts an “open door” policy for the entire staff (Marzano et al., 2005).

Blasé and Blasé (1999), however, proposed another set of instructional leadership qualities including: fostering the analysis of teaching pedagogy, promoting collaboration among teachers, establishing mentoring programs among teachers, utilizing research-based instructional strategies to assist in making informed decisions, and advocating the use of interpersonal skills when interacting with teachers. Blasé and Blasé (2001) further argued that instructional leadership from the school principal must invoke a feeling of collaboration among all stakeholders, particularly among teachers at the building level. This collaborative culture must focus on creating mentoring or coaching systems, where
principals and teachers work cooperatively to improve instructional pedagogy and, eventually, academic performance. The ultimate goal of the collaborative process within the school setting is the creation of a learning-centered school in which principals create a shared vision of the future by helping teachers stay focused on putting students first.

Other researchers, likewise, also differ marginally by identifying the following as effective characteristics of instructional leadership: helping teachers in their daily activities; initiating professional learning communities; designing and implementing effective professional and curriculum development; and using research to assist in teaching and learning (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1995). Last, evidence has been presented that links instructional leadership and transformational leadership theory. Transformational leadership can be seen as an extension of instructional leadership because it seeks to increase the collective effort among followers and their accountability for the entire organization, which, consequently, helps members cultivate improved instructional practices (Leithwood et al., 1999). Likewise, Murphy and Meyers (2008) cite strong instructional leaders as optimistic, achievement-oriented, courageous, and persistent, which are all defining qualities indicative of a transformational leader.

**Impact of instructional leadership on school effectiveness.** The research is extensive and clear regarding the influence and power of strong, school-level instructional leadership. DuFour (1999) supported the importance of the school principal when he stated, “Where principals are effective instructional leaders, student achievement escalates” (p. 15). McEwan (2003) confirmed the significance of instructional leadership in relation to student achievement by stating that, “while each researcher has generated a slightly different set of descriptors that characterize effective or excellent schools, one
variable always emerges as critically important: the leadership abilities of the building principal, particularly in the instructional arena” (p. 1).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction in general is simply “how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs…it is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs” (Spector, 1997, p. 2).

**Overview of Teacher Job Satisfaction**

Hongying (2007) referred specifically to teacher job satisfaction as the attitude and views of teachers concerning working conditions and the teaching profession in general. Accordingly, research of teacher job satisfaction began in 1935 with Hoppock’s classic study in which he utilized surveys and interviews of workers in one community with regard to the teaching profession. He discovered that the elements of working conditions, familial obligations, and social interactions with co-workers impacted satisfaction on the job (Brief & Weiss, 2002). In addition, Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory (as cited in Dinham & Scott, 1998) argued that certain factors in the work environment cause job satisfaction, while another group of factors contribute to job dissatisfaction. Herzberg’s theory, therefore, can be construed to align satisfying factors with higher order needs of teachers, whereas dissatisfying factors can be associated with teachers’ lower order needs. The satisfiers can be applied to the intrinsic facets of work including employee appreciation, praise, and recognition; opportunities for promotion; and respect for the profession. Conversely, the dissatisfiers correlate to extrinsic factors such as working climate and conditions, administrative supervision, salary, policy-making, and collegial relationships. Overall, teachers report more motivation and job
satisfaction if they feel that the principal communicates effectively, seeks advice and input from others, and practices collaborative decision-making skills (Bogler, 2001).

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors Related to Teacher Job Satisfaction

The Metlife Survey of the American Teacher (2001) further examined teacher job satisfaction as it relates to extrinsic and intrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors associated with increased levels of teacher job satisfaction included working with students, viewing the profession as rewarding, and feeling good about student progress. On the contrary, extrinsic factors leading to teacher job dissatisfaction included low wages, poor principal support, issues of student misconduct, minimal teaching resources, and a negative school atmosphere (Metlife Survey, 2001). Studies also support the notion that intrinsic rewards are correlated with an elevated degree of motivation and satisfaction. Therefore, teachers who feel that teaching is a “calling” and yearn to watch students grow and make progress academically experience more job satisfaction than their counterparts who do not feel that way (Latham, 1998). Goodlad (1984) discovered that teachers feel more satisfied with their work if they view teaching as a profession based on professional values compared to teachers who choose to teach based purely on the monetary value. Ultimately, the research confirms that higher autonomy levels at work and professional areas of teaching in general, such as principal leadership, have contributed to increased teacher job satisfaction levels (Bogler, 2001).

Teacher Job Satisfaction and Transformational Principal Leadership Style

The empirical studies included in the following section are considered primary research investigations focused on transformational principal leadership style and the outcome variable of teacher job satisfaction. Specifically, the studies include the
transformational leadership theoretical framework with respect to principal leadership and, consequently, its relationship with the perceptions of teachers concerning job satisfaction. All three studies were conducted in the foreign countries of Israel (Bogler, 2001); Tanzania (Nguni et al., 2006); and Turkey (Korkmaz, 2007).

**The Bogler study.** Bogler (2001) examined the effects of job satisfaction of teachers with regard to teacher perceptions of their principal’s transformational and transactional leadership style, teacher perceptions of their principal’s decision-making strategy (autocratic or participative), and teacher occupation perceptions. The purpose of this study was designed to examine the teacher perceptions of their principal’s behavior rather than the actual behavior of the principal.

Participants included 930 teachers, and the response rate for this study was 80%. Bogler surveyed elementary, middle, and high school teachers in 98 schools located in the northern part of Israel. There was a representative sample of urban, suburban, and rural schools with a diverse population that represented the composition of teachers in Israel with regard to gender and religion. The sample included 66% female teachers, and the method included the use of a quantitative questionnaire with Likert-type scales. The first section of the questionnaire was a modified version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and measured the leadership style of the school principal. The second section was taken from Friedman’s decision-making style questionnaire and measured autocratic-participative strategies used by principals. The third section of the questionnaire dealt with teacher occupation perceptions and was developed from Yaniv’s Occupation Perception Questionnaire. Respondents were asked to refer to their current principal and answered questions about their principal's leadership style and decision-
making strategies, perceptions about their profession, and their satisfaction from issues related to teaching as an occupation. Principal component analysis with a varimax rotation was performed on the dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership, teacher occupation perceptions, and teacher job satisfaction.

Results indicated that teacher satisfaction was significantly correlated with teacher occupation perceptions, school principal transformational leadership, participative decision-making style, and transactional leadership. Additionally, the more that teachers perceived their occupation in terms of a profession, the more they perceived their principal to be a transformational leader. It also was found that the more the principals were perceived as participative, the greater their levels of job satisfaction. The most important finding, according to Bogler, was that teacher occupation perceptions strongly affected teacher job satisfaction. Limitations of the study include generalizability of the sample because it only consisted of teachers in the northern part of Israel. Therefore, any attempt to generalize the study’s findings should be approached with caution. Researchers also suggested that transactional leadership entails some negative connotations in its scale items that could potentially pose a problem with face validity potentially leading to interference with the reliability of this particular construct (Bogler, 2001).

**The Nguni, Sleegers, and Denessen study.** Nguni et al. (2006) studied the relationship between the transformational leadership style of the school principal and teacher job satisfaction. The researchers added the effects of these leadership practices on teachers’ organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and the
indirect effects of transformational and transactional leadership on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior through the lens of job satisfaction.

The study was conducted in public primary schools in Tanzania and included 700 primary school teachers selected from 70 schools located in five districts in the eastern education zone of Tanzania. A total of 545 teachers appropriately responded, with a return rate of 78%. The sample teacher population consisted of 83% female and 17% male. Instrumentation consisted of a 95-item Likert-type questionnaire that sought to examine school leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. School leadership was surveyed through questions gleaned from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ); organizational commitment was surveyed through the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ); organizational citizenship behavior was measured through the Smith Questionnaire; and job satisfaction was measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Questionnaires were administered to teachers at selected schools during a faculty meeting, and separate envelopes were provided in which teachers could place their questionnaire in for anonymity purposes. Multiple regression analyses were performed to assess the effect of transformational and transactional leadership factors on the job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior.

Results indicated that both transformational and transactional leadership factors influence the outcome variables of organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and teacher job satisfaction; however, varying degrees of influence were evident on the outcome variables. The study findings also confirmed that the group of transformational leadership behaviors had strong to moderate positive effects on value
commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction. Transactional leadership behaviors had no significant effects on value commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and had only a positive effect on commitment to stay. The results demonstrated that individual leadership factors with regard to transformational and transactional leadership have varying degrees of influence on outcome variables. Particularly, the transformational leadership dimension of charismatic leadership had the greatest influence and accounted for a large proportion of variation in value commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and teacher job satisfaction. With regard to the transactional leadership dimensions, the contingent reward component had a positive influence on job satisfaction; however, it was noted to have a negative influence on commitment to stay. The two leadership dimensions of passive management-by-exception and laissez-faire leadership exhibited strong negative effects on commitment to stay. The results of the study illustrated that the individual dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership have varying degrees of influence on teacher work attitudes and behavior including organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction. These results suggest that effective school leaders should use a combination of transformational and transactional leadership styles or behaviors.

Limitations for the study included the possibility of diminished generalizability of the results. Because the study was conducted entirely in the developing country of Tanzania and exclusively sampled primary teachers, generalizability of the results could be skewed. Therefore, a replication of this study could be conducted in the United States to compare, contrast, and validate the results of this particular study.
The Korkmaz study. Korkmaz (2007) examined the effects of the transformational and transactional leadership style of the school principal along with teacher job satisfaction on the schools’ organizational health. Specifically, his study investigated to what extent the variations in school health can be related to the principal’s leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

Participants of the study were teachers working in high schools in Ankara, Turkey. The sample included 630 teachers who responded to the questionnaires, with a response rate of 75%. Female teachers comprised 55% of the respondents, and males comprised 55%. The instrument utilized Likert-type questionnaires, in which teachers were asked to answer questions concerning principal leadership styles, their school’s organizational health, and job satisfaction within their current school context. The leadership style of the school principal was measured by a modified version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ); school organizational health was measured by an adapted version of the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI); and job satisfaction was measured by the Job Satisfaction of Education Administrators. Path analysis was used to explain the direct and indirect relationships between leadership style of the school principal and teacher job satisfaction in relation to the overall organizational health of the school.

The results indicated that the more the teachers perceive their principal as a transformational leader, the more their level of job satisfaction increases; and the less their principal exhibits transactional leadership, the better the school’s organizational health becomes. As a result of the analysis, it can be assumed that the more the teachers perceive their principal as a transformational leader and the less they perceive him or her
as a transactional leader, the more their level of job satisfaction increases and the school’s organizational health improves. The findings of the study demonstrated that transactional leadership style and teacher job satisfaction may both be factors affecting the school’s organizational health. The most interesting finding of the study is that transformational leadership has a profound impact on teacher job satisfaction. Another finding from this study was that transformational leadership had a positive effect on organizational health, which could be seen as an expected result since transformational leadership usually involves the utilization of personal development strategies in combination with helping others realize their own leadership capacity. The findings of the study further illustrated that teachers prefer a school principal who exhibits transformational leadership style more so than a transactional leadership style, which actually contradicts earlier findings (Nguni et al., 2006) that argued the best leadership approach is that of combining transformational and transactional leadership styles.

Limitations of the study included restricted generalizability of the results because the research was exclusively conducted in Ankara, Turkey. Additionally, the study researched only the perceptions of high school teachers, which also could contribute to diminished generalizability of the results. Future research could be conducted to include further investigation into transformational leadership and the specific factors impacting job satisfaction of teachers.

Teacher Job Satisfaction, School Effectiveness, and Academic Achievement

Not surprisingly, perceptions of teachers regarding principal leadership are very important since schools are primarily interpersonal settings. In fact, teachers asserted that lack of principal support and enforcement of rules, as well as little to no recognition or
rewards, are contributing factors to job dissatisfaction (Pearson, 1998). Therefore, teacher job satisfaction with their principal may affect their assessment of school effectiveness. For instance, teachers with higher levels of satisfaction with the teaching profession may perceive their organization as more valuable and successful than those who feel more dissatisfied and demoralized with teaching. Thus, principals must take it upon themselves to closely examine their own leadership style in order to help keep teachers more satisfied so they are sufficiently motivated to maximize the use of professional resources and their own creativity (Schultz & Teddlie, 1989).

Satisfaction and attitudes of employees are predictors of organizational effectiveness. Indeed, organizations with more satisfied employees tend to be more effective than organizations with less satisfied employees (Ostroff, 1992). Zigarelli (1996) argued that teacher job satisfaction, in particular, is a single measure that is a statistically significant predictor of effective schools, which includes an emphasis on student progress and opportunities for learning (Lezotte, 1997). In addition to teacher retention and quality, teacher job satisfaction also can be linked to increased levels of student academic achievement as well as improved student behavior, teacher retention, and administrative effectiveness (Ostroff, 1992; Mathieu, 1991). Therefore, research evidence exists that confirms a correlation between higher levels of teacher job satisfaction and, specifically, increased student academic achievement and school effectiveness.

**Factors Influencing Teacher Job Satisfaction**

Teacher job satisfaction affects teaching, effectiveness of administration, and overall quality of the school. Demographic factors also have a tendency to affect teacher
job satisfaction including gender, age, education, length of service, and even marital status (Bolin, 2007). According to Spear et al. (2000), the main contributing factors that correlated with feelings of strong, positive satisfaction included working with students, being challenged to think creatively, and being given autonomy in their classrooms. Likewise, Perie and Backer (1997) cited student relationships, teacher autonomy, adequate principal assistance, and a positive school culture as factors associated with higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. Nevertheless, the most important variable concerning teacher job satisfaction is teacher attitude (Saari & Judge, 2004).

Interestingly, the National Education Association (2001) conducted a study that argued that poor administrative support and ineffectual building-level administrators were the main reasons for low levels of teacher job satisfaction.

Many teachers feel dissatisfied with their job because of the inordinate amount of accountability placed on them to ensure all students are reaching proficiency (Popham, 2004). As teachers become gradually dissatisfied with their working conditions and experience a decrease in commitment to their schools, this attitude of dissatisfaction slowly begins to negatively affect students as well (Wu & Short, 1996). Consequently, teachers who recently left teaching noted that increased stress, excessive bureaucracy, heavy workloads, poor pay, and low morale were the combination of factors that led to their decision to leave teaching altogether (Spear et al., 2000). Furthermore, in an effort to meet the requirements of NCLB, many teachers feel as if they have minimal time to focus on their teaching pedagogy; rather, they argue that their time is spent struggling to keep up with the daily stress associated with increased accountability (Popham, 2004).
Connolly (2000) noted that teacher job dissatisfaction increased when teachers realized they had limited input in the decision-making process coupled with restricted autonomy within their classrooms. Teachers begin to feel isolated, angry, and disrespectful toward administration when their independence as a classroom teacher is diminished. When this occurs, teachers then begin to feel frustrated and depleted of energy and enthusiasm for teaching. As teachers become isolated within their classrooms, their levels of satisfaction and commitment to the school becomes endangered (Danielson, 2002). Therefore, when teachers begin viewing teaching as a mere job instead of a profession that has meaning, and when issues arise that leave teachers feeling demoralized and unhappy, the consequence is teacher job dissatisfaction.

Teacher job satisfaction is greatly impacted through working conditions, the support they receive from their administration, the control they have over their work environment, the mentoring or coaching they receive, the extent to which they view themselves as successful in the classroom, and the perception of a safe and secure working environment (Stockard & Lehman, 2004). These are areas in which building level principals can have some control and can be promoted through district level policies and practices as well. Being able to identify the degree to which each of these environmental factors are present at the school level would give principals vital information concerning how to best adapt their own leadership style to improve the overall job satisfaction of their teachers.

**Teacher Job Satisfaction and Teacher Attrition**

Teacher job satisfaction has been linked to teacher attrition via effectiveness of the principal leadership (Marlow et al., 1997). Research has confirmed job satisfaction of
teachers is highly correlated with retention, and evidence proves that teachers are most satisfied when they experience quality student-teacher and collegial relationships, independence, intellectual stimulation, and appropriate access to materials and supplies (Shann, 1998). Ladson-Billings (1994) corroborates this finding through research that revealed the most effective teachers place a powerful emphasis on establishing and maintaining appropriate student-teacher and collegial relationships. Nevertheless, because of the increased levels of school accountability, lack of administrative support, and poor working conditions, many teachers have voluntarily chosen to leave the profession altogether with feelings of job dissatisfaction (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005). It is critical for principals to realize that perhaps their own leadership behaviors may assist in keeping teachers more satisfied which will, in turn, help decrease attrition rates (Leithwood et al., 1998).

**Teacher Attrition**

There is an alarming trend with regard to teaching in the United States — over 50% of all new teachers exit the profession within the first five years (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005). It is also disturbing that more teachers are leaving teaching than entering the profession, which has resulted in creating a sense of panic in the educational system throughout the country. Despite recent efforts to focus on teacher recruitment as a solution to the attrition problem, researchers now conclude that retention of teachers is the most suitable alternative in reducing attrition rates (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Ingersoll (2005) stated that solving the retention problem was of paramount importance because, by 2013, almost 5 million teachers will be needed.
The Economic Impact of Teacher Attrition

Teacher turnover also can be viewed as an economic problem because it costs America billions of dollars every year (Darling-Hammond, 2003), with current estimates nearing the $7 billion mark (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future [NCTAF], 2003). It is an economic disaster for the educational system in the United States because, as teachers leave the profession, school districts are forced to spend additional money on the recruitment, preparation, and employment of new teachers (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). These extra expenditures could more wisely be utilized to assist in raising the academic achievement of students rather than being spent on recruiting and preparing new teachers (NCTAF, 2003). Studies estimate that each school in the United States pays thousands of dollars per year for every teacher leaving the profession (NCTAF, 2007).

Factors Contributing to Teacher Attrition

Many would mistakenly assume that retirement is the primary reason for teacher attrition; but after close examination of the facts, it becomes clear that this assumption is not accurate (NCTAF, 2003). In fact, Ingersoll (2003) has conducted countless analyses with regard to teacher turnover, and it was determined that retirement is not cited as often as teacher job dissatisfaction as a cause for teacher attrition. This has resulted in many novice teachers leaving the classroom looking for new jobs in other fields, which has left classrooms in America vacant with more and more hiring to be done. Ingersoll further reported that dismal principal assistance, student discipline problems, and minimal democratic participation are contributing issues concerning teacher attrition. Billingsley (2004) found research that suggested teachers are more likely to leave the profession or
indicate an intent to leave in the “absence of adequate support from administrators…” (p. 45). This research supports the notion that certain factors are easily identifiable in explaining why teachers are dissatisfied with their jobs as educators.

Obviously, some teacher attrition is inevitable. Some teachers do retire, others leave for personal reasons, and an even smaller amount are dismissed for poor performance altogether. Even more astonishing is the fact that “teacher attrition is the largest single factor determining demand for additional teachers in the United States” (McCreight, 2000, p. 3). Many of these new teachers cited minimal help provided from administration and inadequate working conditions as primary factors in deciding whether to continue teaching. Indeed, teachers old and new cited poor principal support and ineffective, obstinate principals as the primary causes of teacher attrition across the United States (Natale, 1993). Karge (1993) substantiated this finding when he discovered that insufficient principal support, inconsistent rule enforcement, minimal availability of resources, low student achievement, and heavy teacher workloads were contributing factors with regard to teacher attrition. Most importantly, Karge noted that poor principal support and minimal availability of resources were the primary factors associated with teacher attrition. Because of this substantiated research, identifying these dissatisfiers gives solid rationale for attempting to discover the relationship between principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction.

Ingersoll (2001) explained that teacher attrition rates were higher in school districts that offered insufficient help from administrators, difficulty with discipline, and minimal participation from teachers on decisions that ultimately affected them. On the other hand, Ingersoll found attrition rates at a lower level when teachers were given more
administrative support, experienced fewer discipline problems, and allowed more input in the decision-making process. Billingsley and Cross (1992) discovered that educators who cited increased levels of principal support experienced less stress and were more likely to be committed to and satisfied with their teaching jobs than teachers receiving less support. Furthermore, recent empirical research conducted in North Carolina and South Carolina school districts concurred that adequate working conditions, access to appropriate resources, and administrative support were among the most critical elements associated with lower rates of teacher attrition (Guarino, Santibanez, & Daley, 2006). Results of extensive research concerning teacher attrition consistently implicate school level leadership as a major predictor in the retention and attrition rates of teachers (Leithwood et al., 1998).

Summary

The existing review of research is clear with respect to teacher job satisfaction — some teachers today feel dissatisfied with their job due to contributing factors such as increased accountability and stress, heavy workloads, poor pay and working conditions, a negative school atmosphere, low morale, excessive bureaucracy, and, specifically, inadequate principal support (Metlife Survey, 2001; NEA, 2001; Popham, 2004; Spear et al., 2000). As a result of these feelings of job dissatisfaction, teachers within the profession have begun to leave, and teacher job satisfaction in relation to principal leadership is identified as the reason more often than not (Ingersoll, 2003). Therefore, it is crucial for principals to understand that their own leadership style and behaviors might have some influence among their teacher population in helping curtail this current trend.
The existing review of literature regarding school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction confirms a significant relationship between transformational leadership style of the school principal and teacher job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006). Specifically, Bogler (2001) discovered job satisfaction of teachers was significantly correlated with principal transformational and transactional leadership and teacher occupation perceptions. Nguni et al. (2006) indicated that both transformational and transactional leadership factors influenced teacher job satisfaction in addition to the constructs of organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. Korkmaz (2007) found that transformational leadership had an intense impact on teacher job satisfaction and organizational health.

While empirical evidence is present in the literature that corroborates the association of increased levels of job satisfaction and transformational leadership style within non-educational settings (Bono et al., 2007; Judge & Piccolo, 2004), minimal research has been conducted within the context of the school setting. Although some empirical research investigations have been conducted regarding the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, the fact remains that this author could find few studies conducted within the rural elementary school context of the United States according to the current review of literature (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006). Therefore, a major gap exists since there appears to be a lack of substantiated empirical evidence to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of school principal leadership style and job satisfaction among teachers within the rural elementary school context of the United States.
This research study will add to the existing body of research in determining the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction within the United States rural elementary school setting. The results garnered from this study could have a lasting impact with regard to principal leadership and its effect on job satisfaction of teachers. The next chapter will outline the research methodology utilized in this study. Specifically, the chapter will include a detailed description of the participants, measures used to survey the respondents, research design and overall nature of the study, procedures detailing the general administration of the questionnaires, and an overview of the data analysis plan with respect to the research questions.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

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 (Metlife Survey, 2001; NEA, 2001; Popham, 2004; Spear et al., 2000). 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 study is significant because there are few empirical research studies in the current review of literature that associate a certain principal leadership style to impacting teacher job satisfaction in a positive way. While there is proof of research studies conducted at all levels of education (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school) investigating the relationship between teacher perceptions of school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, this author could locate only a nominal amount of studies conducted within the rural elementary school context of the United States (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006). Therefore, this empirical research study will serve as a supplement to the existing body of literature in determining this relationship within the rural elementary school context of the United States. Results from this study could assist in making school principals more conscious of their own leadership ability and style, while simultaneously facilitating the development of their own leadership capacity to support teachers in dealing with the increased demands placed on them in this educational age of accountability. This deepened awareness and
modification of principal leadership style may contribute to strengthened levels of teacher job satisfaction and possibly decrease attrition rates.

This chapter provides detailed information with respect to the methodology employed in this research study. Specifically, the chapter outlines a description of the participants including detailed information about the sample population and selection criteria. Also included within this chapter are the measures used to determine the relationship being examined and evidence of reliability and validity regarding the two questionnaires used to survey the respondents. Additionally, the research design is included which details the general description and nature of the study design including identification of the variables in question. Procedures for the research study also are discussed at length, including the method of data collection, the rate of return, and a delineated description of the procedures utilized by the researcher in organizing the research study with the respondents. The chapter concludes with the data analysis in which the researcher restates the research questions and includes a brief description of the assumptions regarding the statistical analyses performed to determine statistical significance with respect to the research questions.

The following research questions will be explored to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction?
Research Question 2: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?

Research Question 3: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of job satisfaction based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?

Research Question 4: What are the significant factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction as identified by elementary school teachers?

Participants

The sample population for this study included certified school teachers (kindergarten through grade 5) from six different elementary schools. The population of certified elementary school teachers spanned across six different public school districts in the rural, south central region of Kentucky. Each elementary school selected met the following selection criteria: a) the school must be identified as an “elementary” school by the state’s highest educational governing body; b) the elementary school’s current principal must have been in place for at least five consecutive years in that particular elementary school; and c) the elementary school must be considered a “rural” elementary school, as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Table 1 illustrates the demographic information associated with each of the schools surveyed that includes the number of teachers who participated in the study, the years of consecutive principal experience and gender of each principal, the student population, the percentage of students at each school qualifying for free or reduced lunch, and the locale of each school.
Table 1

*Demographic Information of Schools Surveyed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School ID</th>
<th>No. Teachers Surveyed (K-5)</th>
<th>Principal Yrs. Experience (current school)</th>
<th>Gender of Principal</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>% Free-Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>Locale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9 M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6 F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.5 F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6 M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16 F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5 M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Student population and locale reported from NCES, 2009-10; Free and reduced lunch percentage reported from Kentucky Department of Education, 2011; Number of teachers surveyed, principal experience, and gender of principal data reported from administration of surveys.

Additional data collected included information about each teacher’s age, grade level taught, education level, experience level, and combined years of teaching experience. Descriptive statistics related to this demographic information will be presented in Chapter 4.

The study employed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1995) to measure the perceptions of teachers with regard to elementary school principal leadership style. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967) was used to measure the level of job satisfaction among the certified elementary school teachers. Both instruments will be discussed in the next section.

**Measures**

Two valid and reliable survey instruments were utilized to collect data in this study, and the researcher purchased licenses to use these instruments. The short-form Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (Bass & Avolio, 1995) was designed and used to measure the teacher perceptions of the elementary school principal leadership
style (see Appendix A). The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967) was administered to measure the job satisfaction levels of certified elementary school teachers (see Appendix B).

**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5X.** The first instrument used to collect data in this study was the short-form version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (Bass & Avolio, 1995), which is designed to “identify and measure key leadership and effectiveness behaviors shown in prior research to be strongly linked with both individual and organizational success” (Bass & Avolio, 1995, p. 11). The MLQ is the most widely used instrument to assess transformational leadership style (Kirkbride, 2006) and “is considered the best validated measure of transformational and transactional leadership” (Ozaralli, 2003, p. 338). Specifically, the MLQ was utilized in this study to measure the perceptions of teachers with regard to their principal’s leadership style. The MLQ consists of 45 Likert-type items that contain nine leadership components including five transformational leadership style dimensions, three transactional leadership style dimensions, and one laissez-faire leadership style dimension. In addition to the leadership styles, it also contains three outcome scales that included extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction of leadership behavior. Items are on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always). Each of the leadership style components consists of four items, and scores for each of the nine scales are considered to be the average scores for the items in each scale. Transformational leadership style scores were computed by averaging all of the scores from the items contained in the following scales: idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and
individualized consideration. Transactional leadership style scores were computed by averaging all scores from items contained in the following scales: contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive). Laissez-faire leadership is the only scale that measured non-leadership behaviors, so the non-leadership style score will give the scale score for the laissez-faire leadership dimension.

**Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ).** The second instrument utilized in this study to collect data was the short-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, which is designed to measure an employee’s satisfaction with his or her job (Weiss et al., 1967). For this particular study, the MSQ was used to measure the level of job satisfaction among the elementary school teachers sampled. The short-form version of the MSQ utilized in this study consists of 20 Likert-type items (developed from the long-form MSQ that best represented each of the 20 scales) that measured the feelings of the employee with respect to different aspects of job satisfaction. Factor analysis of the 20 items revealed that the MSQ consists of three scales: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction (Weiss et al., 1967). Each item contained within the MSQ is presented on a five-point scale ranging from *very dissatisfied* to *very satisfied* and scored based on weighted response choices ranging from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 5 (*very satisfied*). Responses were scored 1 through 5, and scale scores were determined by summing the weights for the responses chosen for the items in the intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction scales. MSQ scores are interpreted based on percentile scores for each scale obtained from the most appropriate norm group for the individual in the normative data tables provided within the manual for the MSQ. A percentile score of 75
or higher would typically represent a high level of job satisfaction while a percentile score of 25 would indicate a lower degree of satisfaction (Weiss et al., 1967).

**Validity and reliability of the MLQ and MSQ.** The Multifactor Leader Questionnaire (MLQ) is a well-established instrument that 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 MLQ 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 MLQ were the best reflection of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). Reliability of the MLQ survey instrument was established by the authors as a means to determine the extent to which the MLQ 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 MLQ has been proven to be successful in measuring the factor constructs of transformational leadership theory. Therefore, this provides researchers with confidence in using the MLQ to measure the leadership components representing transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008).

Validity for the short-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) may be inferred from validity from the long-form version. Other evidence of validity of the short-form MSQ is available from studies of occupational group differences and studies
of job satisfaction, as specified by the Theory of Work Adjustment (Weiss et al., 1967). Occupational group differences in mean satisfaction scores were statistically significant at the .0001 level for each of the three scales. Group differences in variability were not statistically significant for any scale. These results reflect those typically found in studies of job satisfaction and those obtained from the long-form MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967). The intrinsic satisfaction scale reliability coefficients from the MSQ ranged from 0.84 to 0.91, while the reliability coefficients for the extrinsic satisfaction scales ranged from 0.77 to 0.82. Concerning the general satisfaction scales, the reliability coefficients varied from 0.87 to 0.92. Therefore, it was determined that median reliability coefficients for the MSQ were .86 for intrinsic satisfaction, 0.80 for extrinsic satisfaction, and 0.90 for general satisfaction, which indicated strong internal consistency and statistical testing levels (Weiss et al., 1967).

Demographic data from all participants were collected through the completion of a demographic information sheet adapted from the MSQ (see Appendix C). This demographic data included gender, age, grade level taught, education level, combined years of teaching experience, and years of teaching experience at their current school. Demographic information regarding age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience was used to investigate differences in teacher perceptions of principal leadership style and job satisfaction.

**Research Design**

The primary purpose of this research study is to investigate the relationship between teacher perceptions of the elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Second, the study will examine the differences in teacher
perceptions of elementary principal leadership style and job satisfaction based on teachers’ demographics including age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience. The study also will explore the significant factors that contribute to job satisfaction as identified by the certified elementary school teachers.

This particular study is considered a quantitative investigation because the researcher measured two variables of interest — perceived elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction — by utilizing two questionnaires designed to measure those specified variables using 5-point Likert scales. This study also can be classified as 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 (elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction) to determine if they were related (Slavin, 2007).

The purpose of quantitative research is to seek explanations and predictions that will generalize to other persons and places (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). This study meets 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. This increased awareness and adaptation of principal leadership style also may contribute to higher job satisfaction levels among teachers and possibly even help in decreasing attrition rates. The results from this study also could help guide principals in realizing the important differences among teachers’ demographic data with regard to their perceptions of the leadership style of the school principal and their level of
job satisfaction. 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.

**Procedures**

Before beginning the data collection process, the researcher first obtained approval and notification from the Institutional Research Board (IRB) since the study involves human subjects (see Appendix D). After IRB approval, the researcher then acquired written permission from superintendents in six school districts located in rural, south central Kentucky to conduct the research study (see Appendix E). From the six school districts, the study included six different elementary schools that were surveyed. Participation in the research study was voluntary for all participants, and information collected was kept strictly confidential. There were no known negative risks or consequences from participation in the study.

Questionnaires administered to participants were kept confidential and anonymous. The researcher gave each participant an envelope in which to place their questionnaire, and all data collected excluded any identifying information such as names of teachers and/or principals. Hard copy data from questionnaires was kept secure in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s office.

The study utilized the short-form Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1995) to measure the perceptions of teachers with regard to elementary school principal leadership style. The short-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967) was used to measure the level of job satisfaction among the certified
teachers. The MLQ consists of 45 Likert-type items that identified and measured key transformational/transactional leadership and effectiveness behaviors highly correlated with individual and organizational success (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The MSQ (short-form version) consists of 20 Likert-type items that were designed to measure the employee’s satisfaction with his or her job. The researcher administered, collected, and analyzed results from the specified sample teacher population in each school.

The MLQ and MSQ were administered only to kindergarten through 5th-grade certified teachers at each participating elementary school on a specified date that was confirmed by each school principal. Subsequently, certified elementary teachers at each school site completed the short-form MLQ to measure their perceptions of the elementary principal’s leadership style. They also completed the short-form MSQ to measure their own level of job satisfaction. Demographic data from all participants was collected through the completion of a demographic information sheet adapted from the MSQ. This data was used to investigate the differences in teacher perceptions of elementary principal leadership style and job satisfaction.

The researcher visited a faculty meeting at each participating school. Before administration of the questionnaires, the school principal was asked to leave the room. All kindergarten through 5th-grade elementary teachers at each school were given an overview of the study including its purpose, procedures to be used, risks, benefits, confidentiality, and right to refuse or withdraw from the study. Teachers who chose to participate were then given the informed consent letter, and continued cooperation in the research study implied each teacher’s consent. General instructions were explained with respect to the questionnaires to be administered, and teachers who chose to participate
were administered the two questionnaires to complete regarding their perceptions of the principal’s leadership style and their own level of teacher job satisfaction. The questionnaires took approximately 20 minutes to complete for each school surveyed. After completion of the questionnaires, the researcher entered each teacher who participated into a drawing for a complimentary gift card as a gesture of appreciation for their cooperation.

Data Analysis

After completion of questionnaires at all elementary schools, the researcher compiled all data and reported significant findings using a statistical analysis software program to disseminate data with regard to determining the relationship between perceived leadership style of the school principal and teacher job satisfaction. Correlational statistical analyses were conducted with respect to the following empirical research questions:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction?

With respect to Research Question 1, a Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis was performed because the researcher sought to determine the strength and direction (positive, negative, none) of the relationship between elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by the certified elementary school teachers surveyed.

Research Question 2: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?
Research Question 3: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of job satisfaction based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?

With regard to Research Questions 2 and 3, the researcher employed a comparison of means utilizing an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine what differences (if any) were evident between teacher perceptions of principal leadership style and job satisfaction based on their demographic information (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, combined years of teaching experience).

Research Question 4: What are the significant factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction as identified by elementary school teachers?

The researcher conducted a stepwise multiple regression analysis on Research Question 4 to identify significant factors that help predict teacher job satisfaction. The researcher was interested in determining the most highly correlated items from the job satisfaction questionnaire (MSQ) with respect to teacher job satisfaction.

**Summary**

This chapter described in detail the research methodology associated with this study. The chapter included a discussion of the participants and criteria for the sample selection. Also included were the measures utilized with a description of the questionnaires used to survey the respondents and an explanation of their validity and reliability. The research design was addressed to describe the general nature of the investigation as well as the procedures employed, which detailed how the questionnaires were administered. The chapter concluded with an overview of the data analysis, which
outlined the statistical analyses performed with regard to the research questions in order to determine the level of statistical significance.

There is no doubt that the problem of teacher job dissatisfaction in relation to principal leadership and support has resulted in increased levels of teacher attrition across the United States (Ingersoll, 2003). For that reason, it is vitally important for principals to understand that their own leadership style and behaviors might have some influence among their teacher population in helping curtail this prevailing trend. Although there is some evidence of research studies that have been conducted investigating the relationship between teacher perceptions of school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, this author found few studies conducted within the rural elementary school setting of the United States according to the current review of literature (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006). Consequently, this empirical research study will serve as a supplement to the existing body of literature and research in determining this relationship within the rural elementary school context of the United States.

Results from this study could assist in helping principals become more aware of their own leadership style. This increased awareness could help principals learn to modify their own leadership style and behaviors in order to more effectively support teachers in managing increased levels of stress and accountability associated with their jobs. As a result, this modification of leadership style may aid in producing higher levels of teacher job satisfaction and possibly decrease rates of teacher attrition.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The problem addressed in this study revolves around the fact that many teachers feel dissatisfied with their job due to increased levels of accountability, substantial workloads, poor compensation and working conditions, a negative school culture, demoralization, excessive bureaucracy, and, particularly, perceived insufficient support from principals (Metlife Survey, 2001; NEA, 2001; Popham, 2004; Spear et al., 2000). Furthermore, the imposition of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2001) has created a learning environment that emphasizes increased accountability resulting in a substantial amount of anxiety on teachers leading to feelings of job dissatisfaction and decreased morale (Popham, 2004). Accordingly, teacher attrition rates have risen, and teacher job satisfaction in relation to principal leadership has been identified more often than not as the reason (Ingersoll, 2003).

Research has indicated that there is a high association between job satisfaction of teachers and teacher retention (Shann, 1998), and teacher job satisfaction also has been linked to teacher attrition through the effectiveness of the principal as the leader of the school (Marlow et al., 1997). Therefore, the purpose of this research study is to examine the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The study also examines the differences between teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience) and their perceptions of the elementary school principal’s leadership style and job satisfaction. Finally, the study investigates the factors that significantly contribute to job satisfaction as identified by the elementary school teachers.
This chapter presents the results of the study and data analysis findings regarding the following research questions concerning elementary principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction?

Research Question 2: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?

Research Question 3: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of job satisfaction based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?

Research Question 4: What are the significant factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction as identified by elementary school teachers?

**Descriptive Statistics**

There were 179 certified elementary school teachers who participated in this research study across the south central region of Kentucky. All schools surveyed were considered rural elementary schools as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The researcher visited each school site to conduct the research through the distribution of questionnaires regarding principal leadership style (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) and teacher job satisfaction (Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire). The teachers also provided demographic information related to their gender, age, grade level taught, education level, years of teaching experience, and years of teaching experience at their current school. For purposes of this study, only
demographic information related to age, grade level taught, education level, and years of teaching experience was used in the data analysis. The response rate was 100% for the teachers surveyed in this study. If participants chose not to respond to a survey item, the non-response was not factored into the final analysis.

Demographic information with respect to gender is presented in Table 2 for the elementary teachers surveyed. Not surprisingly, the number of female teachers surveyed was larger than the number of males surveyed, 88.83% to 6.70%.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>88.83</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>93.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic information regarding grade level taught is presented in Table 3 for the elementary teachers surveyed. Primary teachers (kindergarten-grade 3) made up 44.7%, and intermediate teachers (grades 4 and 5) made up 10.62%. Altogether, kindergarten through grade 5 (K-5) teachers represented 55.32% of sample teacher population, while special area teachers (i.e., art, music, P.E., library, special education, etc.) comprised 28.49% of the sample teacher population in this study.
Demographic information concerning age and years of experience is presented in Table 5 for the elementary teachers surveyed. The average age was $M = 37.46$ years. Average years of combined teaching experience for the sample teacher population was $M = 11.70$, and average years of teaching experience at their current school was reported at $M = 9.72$. 
Table 5

Demographic Information of Participants (Age and Teaching Experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>37.46</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs. of Teaching Experience (combined)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs. of Teaching Experience (at their current school)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Data Analyses of Research Questions

Results Related to Research Question 1

Research Question 1 seeks to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

Since 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), a 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 descriptive statistics for the relationship between elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction are provided in Table 5. The general satisfaction component is derived from the MSQ survey instrument and is included as an indicator of the overall satisfaction of the elementary school teachers surveyed. The total possible MSQ general satisfaction score is set at 100, and the mean score for the teachers’ general satisfaction based on the surveys distributed was $M = 50.00$, $SD = 28.30$.

Nine leadership style components that are developed from the MLQ survey instrument which includes the following five transformational leadership style scales:
idealized attributes (M = 2.91, SD = 0.82); idealized behaviors (M = 3.00, SD = 0.78); inspirational motivation (M = 3.13, SD = 0.82); intellectual stimulation (M = 2.59, SD = 0.86); and individual consideration (M = 2.44, SD = 0.97). Scores from the MLQ were computed on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0-4 (not at all to frequently, if not always). Table 6 illustrates that teachers overall scored their principal lowest in the individual consideration component of the transformational leadership style scale (M = 2.44). The transformational leadership scale score with the highest mean was in the inspirational motivation component (M = 3.13).

Three transactional leadership style scales are presented in Table 6 which includes the following leadership components: contingent reward (M = 2.94, SD = 0.87); management-by-exception-active (M = 1.94, SD = 0.89); and management-by-exception-passive (M = 1.47, SD = 0.89). Within the transactional leadership scale, teachers scored their principal lowest in the management-by-exception-passive component (M = 1.47) and highest in the contingent reward component (M = 2.94).

One non-leadership style scale is illustrated by the laissez-faire leadership component (M = 1.10, SD = 0.96), which had the lowest rating by the teachers based on all the leadership style scales.
Table 6

**Descriptive Statistics: Principal Leadership Styles and Teacher Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Satisfaction</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>28.30</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>98.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Attributes (TF)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Behaviors (TF)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (TF)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (TF)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration (TF)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward (TA)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Exception-A (TA)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Exception-P (TA)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TF=Transformational Leadership; TA=Transactional Leadership

Table 7 shows that the Pearson correlation statistical analysis was conducted to answer Research Question 1: What is the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction? The results revealed a relationship between elementary principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by the teachers surveyed (eight of nine leadership dimensions statistically significant at the .0001 level). Specifically, the transformational leadership style dimensions (i.e., idealized attributes, $r = 0.59$; idealized behaviors, $r = 0.53$; inspirational motivation, $r = 0.59$; intellectual stimulation, $r = 0.54$; and individual consideration, $r = 0.59$) were all statistically significant at the 0.0001 level and showed a positive, moderate correlation with teacher job satisfaction. The transactional leadership component contingent reward ($r = 0.65, p < .0001$) also showed a positive, moderate correlation with teacher job satisfaction. Conversely, the transactional leadership dimension management-by-exception-passive ($r = -0.32, p < .0001$) and the non-leadership dimension laissez-faire ($r = -0.43, p < .0001$) showed a negative, weak correlation with teacher job satisfaction. The transactional leadership component
management-by-exception-active ($r = 0.03, p = 0.62$) was not statistically significant and illustrated no correlation with teacher job satisfaction.

Table 7

_Pearson Correlation: Principal Leadership Styles and Teacher Job Satisfaction_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Attributes (TF)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Behaviors (TF)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (TF)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (TF)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration (TF)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward (TA)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Exception-Active (TA)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Exception-Passive (TA)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-0.43**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation significant at the .0001 level.

Note: TF=Transformational Leadership; TA=Transactional Leadership

Results Related to Research Question 2

Research Question 2 focuses on determining whether or not there are differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style based on demographic information (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and years of teaching experience). Since the researcher wanted to compare demographic information to see if statistically significant differences existed between the means, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed (Slavin, 2007). In this study, principal leadership style was compared to teacher age, grade level taught, teacher education level, and years of teaching experience in order to determine if significant differences were present.

In order to examine differences by teacher age, three groups were established based on the distribution of the age variables. Teachers were divided into three groups: Group 1 (ages 21-30); Group 2 (ages 31-40); Group 3 (ages 41 and above) as noted in Table 8.
Table 8

*Teacher Age Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows the analysis of variance (ANOVA) that was conducted with regard to determining significant differences between principal leadership style and teacher age. ANOVA testing revealed significant differences between teacher age groups,

\[ F(2, 149) = 3.30, \ p = 0.0397 \] and \[ F(2, 148) = 6.13, \ p = 0.0028 \] and teacher perceptions of elementary principal leadership style.
Table 9

*Analysis of Variance: Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>99.70</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.0557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>92.52</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96.17</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.0662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>96.41</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.99</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>105.28</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107.91</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>139.34</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141.84</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>105.80</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110.48</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Exception-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>0.0028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>105.24</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113.97</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Exception-P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>116.99</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117.08</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>137.94</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139.50</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comparisons significant at the .05 level.

In order to determine where significant differences existed between principal leadership style and teacher age, Tukey post hoc tests were conducted as seen in Tables 10 and 11. Tukey post hoc analysis revealed significant differences between Group 1 (ages 21-30; M = 3.25, SD = 0.71) and Group 2 (ages 31-40; M = 2.85, SD = 0.87) in the contingent reward component of the transactional leadership scale (Table 10). There
were also significant differences between Group 1 (ages 21-30; M = 2.29, SD = 0.89) and
Group 3 (ages 41 and above; M = 1.79, SD = 0.75), as well as Group 1 (ages 21-30) and
Group 2 (ages 31-40; M = 1.74, SD = 0.88) in the management-by-exception (active)
component of the transactional leadership scale (Table 11).

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>Group 1-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 1 (ages 21-30); Group 2 (ages 31-40); Group 3 (ages 41 and above)
* Comparisons significant at the .05 level.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Except.-A</td>
<td>Group 1-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 1 (ages 21-30); Group 2 (ages 31-40); Group 3 (ages 41 and above)
* Comparisons significant at the .05 level.

Concerning the demographic information on grade level taught, the researcher
was interested in examining differences between regular education teachers (kindergarten
through grade 5 teachers) and special area teachers (i.e., art, music, P.E., library,
computers, special education, etc.). Therefore, two groupings were composed of
kindergarten through grade 5 teachers and special area teachers as seen in Table 12.
Table 12

*Grade Level Taught Groups (K-5 Teachers and Special Area Teachers)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Taught Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Area</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 displays the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing with respect to principal leadership style and grade level taught (kindergarten through grade 5 and special area teachers). ANOVA testing revealed no statistically significant differences between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and regular education teachers versus special area teachers.
Table 13

*Analysis of Variance: Principal Leadership Style and Grade Level Taught (K-5 Teachers vs. Special Area Teachers)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Attributes Between Groups</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.3209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>101.01</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101.69</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Behaviors Between Groups</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.6974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>94.71</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94.81</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation Between Groups</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>96.64</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97.93</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation Between Groups</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>112.20</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112.21</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration Between Groups</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>143.10</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143.11</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward Between Groups</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>107.61</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107.62</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Exception-A Between Groups</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>115.63</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116.93</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Exception-P Between Groups</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.5462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>118.14</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118.44</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire Between Groups</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.8121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>140.21</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140.26</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows the analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing that was conducted concerning principal leadership style and education level of teachers. Levels included the categories of bachelor’s degree, master’s degree, and Rank I. ANOVA testing revealed significant differences between teacher education level groups, $F(2, 160) = 3.48$, $p = 0.0332$ and teacher perceptions of elementary principal leadership style.
Table 14

*Analysis of Variance: Principal Leadership Style and Education Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Attributes Between</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.0153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>104.77</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>110.35</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110.35</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Behaviors Between</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.4482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>103.55</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>104.59</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104.59</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.3977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.3977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106.91</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.0744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.0744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>117.82</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121.69</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.1439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.1439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>148.76</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152.39</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>118.38</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121.33</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Exception-A</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.0332*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.0332*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>123.58</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128.95</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Exception-P</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.6504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.6504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>132.67</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133.38</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.3154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.3154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>148.43</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150.57</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comparisons significant at the .05 level.

In order to determine where significant differences existed between principal leadership style and teacher education level, Tukey post hoc tests were performed. These results are reported in Table 15. Tukey post hoc analysis revealed significant differences existed between teachers with a bachelor’s degree (M = 2.22, SD = 0.97) and teachers
with a Rank I (M = 1.76, SD = 0.82) in their ratings of the management-by-exception (active) component of the transactional leadership scale.

Table 15

Tukey Post Hoc Results for Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. by Except.-A</td>
<td>Bachelors-</td>
<td>Rank I</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comparisons significant at the .05 level.

In order to examine differences by combined years of teaching experience, four groups were established based on tenure laws and recommendations of the researcher. Teachers were divided into the following four groups based on years of experience:

Group 1 (0-4 years); Group 2 (5-11 years); Group 3 (12-19); Group 4 (20 years and above) as noted in Table 16.

Table 16

Years of Teaching Experience Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing with respect to principal leadership style and teaching experience. ANOVA testing revealed no statistically significant differences between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and combined years of teaching experience.
Table 17

Analysis of Variance: Principal Leadership Style and Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Attributes</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>100.04</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104.73</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Behaviors</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>94.52</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97.66</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Motivation</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>95.17</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98.94</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Stimulation</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>110.28</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112.93</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Consideration</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>142.78</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148.36</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingent Reward</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>106.15</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111.55</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mgt. by Exception-A</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>117.34</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120.60</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mgt. by Exception-P</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>122.79</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123.11</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laissez-Faire</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>139.74</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145.09</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results Related to Research Question 3

Research Question 3 focuses on determining whether or not there are differences in teacher perceptions of teacher job satisfaction based on demographic information (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and years of teaching experience). Since the researcher wanted to compare four different group means to see if there were statistically significant differences between the means, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was
employed (Slavin, 2007). In this study, teacher job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) was compared to teacher age, grade level taught, teacher education level, and years of teaching experience in order to determine if significant differences were evident.

Table 18 illustrates the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing with respect to teacher job satisfaction and teacher age. The same age groupings were used in this section as were used in results related to Research Question 2. ANOVA testing revealed no statistically significant differences between teacher perceptions of job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, or general) and teacher age.

Table 18

Analysis of Variance: Teacher Job Satisfaction and Teacher Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Sat.</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5119.97</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>34.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5145.87</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Sat.</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>88.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.36</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3297.60</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3386.32</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Sat.</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>258.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>129.46</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>16989.82</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>114.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17248.74</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 displays the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing with respect to teacher job satisfaction and grade level taught. The same grade level taught groupings (K-5 teachers and special area/special education teachers) were used in this section as were used in the results related to Research Question 2. ANOVA testing revealed significant differences between grade level taught groups, $F(1, 148) = 8.43, p = 0.0043$ and teacher perceptions of intrinsic teacher job satisfaction.
Table 19

Analysis of Variance: Teacher Job Satisfaction and Grade Level Taught (K-5 Teachers vs. Special Area Teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Sat. Between Groups</td>
<td>270.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270.84</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>0.0043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4754.60</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5025.44</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Sat. Between Groups</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3316.79</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3317.04</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Sat. Between Groups</td>
<td>207.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>207.24</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>16605.54</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>112.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1612.77</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comparisons significant at the .05 level.

Tukey post hoc tests were utilized to examine where differences existed between principal leadership style and grade level taught groups as seen in Table 20. Tukey post hoc analysis revealed significant differences between kindergarten through grade 5 teachers (M = 49.56, SD = 5.90) and special area teachers (M = 52.39, SD = 5.18) in terms of their intrinsic satisfaction component ratings of the Minnesota Job Satisfaction scale (MSQ items 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 19).

Table 20

Tukey Post Hoc Results for Teacher Job Satisfaction and Grade Level Taught Groups (K-5 Teachers vs. Special Area Teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Grade Level Taught</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>K5-</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ar.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comparisons significant at the .05 level.

Table 21 shows the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing with respect to teacher job satisfaction and teacher education level (bachelor’s degree,
master’s degree, and Rank I). ANOVA testing revealed no statistically significant
differences between teacher perceptions of teacher job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, or
general) and teacher education level as presented in Table 21.

Table 21

*Analysis of Variance: Teacher Job Satisfaction and Education Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Sat.</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.6277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5395.52</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>33.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5427.02</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Sat.</td>
<td>107.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53.96</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.0912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3551.12</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3659.04</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Sat.</td>
<td>267.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>133.52</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.3106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>18140.37</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>113.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18407.41</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 shows the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing with
respect to teacher job satisfaction and years of teaching experience. The same teaching
experience groupings were used in this section as were used in results related to Research
Question 2. ANOVA testing revealed no statistically significant differences between
teacher perceptions of teacher job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, or general) and
combined years of teaching experience.
Table 22

Analysis of Variance: Teacher Job Satisfaction and Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>36.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.7768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5000.85</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>153.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51.10</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.0809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3350.96</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3504.26</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>237.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79.31</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.5492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>16824.32</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>112.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17062.27</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results Related to Research Question 4

Research Question 4 seeks to identify the significant factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction as identified by the teachers surveyed through the MSQ instrument. The researcher performed a stepwise multiple regression analysis in order to examine how effectively the highest rated intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction items from the MSQ helped predict the value of teacher job satisfaction (Slavin, 2007). Items from the MSQ were regressed in order to identify which factors significantly helped predict the intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction scores from the MSQ.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis revealed that, for the intrinsic satisfaction group, the following items best predicted teachers’ intrinsic job satisfaction score and explained 84% of the variance as noted in Table 23:

Step 1: Creativity — MSQ_16 — The chance to try my own methods of doing the job, \( R^2 = 0.62, F(1, 159) = 262.28, p < .0001 \), which explains 62% of the variance.
Step 2: Social Service — MSQ_9 — The chance to do things for other people,

\( R^2 = 0.77, F(2, 158) = 102.72, p < .0001 \), which, when included in the stepwise regression, explains 77% of the variance.

Step 3: Independence — MSQ_2 — The chance to work alone on the job,

\( R^2 = 0.84, F(3, 157) = 76.66, p = < .0001 \), which, when included in the stepwise regression, explains 84% of the variance.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Partial R^2</th>
<th>Model R^2</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>262.28</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>102.72</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>73.66</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>47.15</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>43.87</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>50.07</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>72.34</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>66.23</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>110.22</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>263.57</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Infinity</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stepwise multiple regression analysis revealed that, for the extrinsic satisfaction group, the following items best predicted teachers’ extrinsic job satisfaction score and explained 85% of the variance as noted in Table 24.

Step 1: Supervision (human relations) — MSQ_5 — The way my boss handles his or her workers, \( R^2 = 0.65, F(1, 159) = 289.94, p < .0001 \), which explains 65% of the variance.

Step 2: Compensation — MSQ_13 — My pay and the amount of work I do,

\( R^2 = 0.85, F(2, 158) = 219.76, p < .0001 \), which, when included in the stepwise regression, explains 85% of the variance.

Table 24
Stepwise multiple regression analysis revealed that for the general satisfaction group, the following items best predicted teachers’ general job satisfaction score and explained 78% of the variance as noted in Table 25.

Step 1: Responsibility — MSQ_15 — The freedom to use my own judgment,

\[(R^2 = 0.59, F(1, 159) = 228.68, p < .0001),\] which explains 59% of the variance.

Step 2: Recognition — MSQ_19 — The praise I get for doing a good job,

\[(R^2 = 0.78, F(2, 158) = 133.35, p < .0001),\] which, when included in the stepwise regression, explains 78% of the variance.
### Table 25

**Stepwise Regression Analysis: Teacher Job Satisfaction (General)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Partial $R^2$</th>
<th>Model $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ Value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Responsibility</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>228.68</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Recognition</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>133.35</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Social Status</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>57.84</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Moral Values</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>48.41</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Compensation</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>57.35</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Variety</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>41.84</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Working Conditions</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>36.92</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Advancement</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Authority</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Achievement</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Supervision-Technical</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Independence</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>26.51</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Ability Utilization</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Company Policies</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Security</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>49.27</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Activity</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>63.78</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Co-Workers</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>125.52</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Supervision Relations.</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>110.29</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Creativity</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>119.52</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Social Service</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Infinity</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

This chapter presented quantitative results and findings based on the four research questions regarding teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Descriptive statistics were presented to illustrate the distribution of demographic information with respect to the teacher respondents. Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis also was presented to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between elementary principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by the teachers surveyed. ANOVA tests were employed to determine differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction with respect to teacher demographic information such as age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience.
Stepwise multiple regression analyses revealed the significant factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction as identified by the elementary school teachers through their scores on the job satisfaction questionnaire (Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire).

The findings from this study may be used to help principals become more aware of their own leadership style, which could result in principals learning to modify their own leadership style and behaviors in order to more effectively support teachers in managing increased levels of stress and accountability associated with their jobs. As a result, this adaptation of leadership style may help in creating higher levels of teacher job satisfaction and possibly decrease rates of teacher attrition. Chapter 5 will discuss results, findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

There is a positive relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Specifically, Bogler (2001) and Nguni et al. (2006) noted a positive correlation between transformational and transactional leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. The results of the Korkmaz (2007) study, on the other hand, revealed that transformational leadership played a more important role than transactional leadership in positively affecting teacher job satisfaction. Therefore, it can be concluded that the leadership style of the school principal does indeed seem to affect teacher job satisfaction.

Teacher job satisfaction levels are low today due to a plethora of reasons including high levels of accountability and stress, considerable workloads, poor pay and working conditions, an undesirable school culture and atmosphere, low morale, excessive paperwork, and, specifically, perceived inadequate support from principals (Metlife Survey, 2001; NEA, 2001; Popham, 2004; Spear et al., 2000). These feelings of job dissatisfaction have inevitably become a significant problem within the education context of the United States. Additionally, the imposition of NCLB has created a school environment that accentuates increased accountability, which has caused a rise in the levels of anxiety among teachers and has resulted in feelings of job dissatisfaction and decreased morale (Popham, 2004). Consequently, teachers have begun to leave the profession, and teacher job satisfaction in relation to principal leadership has been identified as a contributing factor (Ingersoll, 2003).

The primary purpose of this research study is to examine the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job
satisfaction. This study also investigates the relationship between teachers’
demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of
teaching experience) and teachers’ perceptions of the elementary school principal’s
leadership style and their own level of teacher job satisfaction. Additionally, the study
explores the factors that significantly contribute to job satisfaction as identified by the
elementary school teachers.

This chapter will present a discussion of the results and findings from the research
study with respect to the following research questions concerning elementary principal
leadership style and teacher job satisfaction:
Research Question 1: What is the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary
school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction?
Research Question 2: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school
principal leadership style based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught,
education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?
Research Question 3: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of job satisfaction
based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and
combined years of teaching experience)?
Research Question 4: What are the significant factors that contribute to teacher job
satisfaction as identified by elementary school teachers?

Discussion and Conclusions of Results and Findings

Discussion of Results and Findings Related to Research Question 1

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between teacher perceptions of
elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction?
Based on the results and findings from this research study, all five transformational leadership style components (idealized attributes, idealized behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration) and one transactional leadership component (contingent reward) derived from the MLQ are statistically significant at the .0001 level and show positive, moderate correlations with teacher job satisfaction. This means that, as the level of teacher job satisfaction increases, the higher teachers rate their principal as a transformational or contingent reward transactional leader. These results corroborate the previous findings concerning the relationship between transformational and transactional (contingent reward) principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

The Bogler (2001) and Nguni et al. (2006) studies reported a positive relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. Likewise, the results from this study also reveal moderate, positive correlations between all five transformational leadership style dimensions as well as the transactional leadership style dimension contingent reward. In fact, according to this research study, the contingent reward component of the transactional leadership scale shows the highest correlation of all the leadership style scale dimensions, \( r = 0.65 \). This finding confirms the Bogler (2001) and Nguni et al. (2006) studies, in which transactional leadership (contingent reward) and transformational leadership positively affected the job satisfaction levels of teachers.

Conversely, the transactional leadership dimensions management-by-exception (passive) and the non-leadership dimension laissez-faire illustrate weak, negative correlations with teacher job satisfaction. The results from this study regarding the
management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire dimensions substantiate prior research stating that these non-leadership styles actually decrease levels of teacher job satisfaction and teacher commitment (Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006). The transactional leadership dimension management-by-exception (active) did not show any statistical significance or correlation with teacher job satisfaction.

The results from this study concur with Bass’s conceptual understanding implying that a leader may be perceived as being both transformational and transactional (Bass, 1985). This study’s results also validate the research completed by Nguni et al. (2006), who revealed that both transformational and transactional leadership styles do impact teacher job satisfaction. Concerning the dimensions of transformational leadership, this study confirms the research of Bogler (2001) and Korkmaz (2007), who found that transformational leadership is significantly correlated with teacher job satisfaction.

The transactional leadership style component management-by-exception (passive) and the non-leadership component laissez-faire exhibit negative correlations with teacher job satisfaction, which, not surprisingly, validates the research of Korkmaz (2007) and Nguni et al. (2006) indicating the negative effects of management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire leadership styles on job satisfaction and commitment to stay.

**Conclusions Related to Research Question 1**

The results of this study suggest that elementary teachers are more satisfied with their job when their school principal exhibits the transformational leadership style dimensions including idealized attributes and behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. In addition, teachers are most satisfied with their job when their principal demonstrates the contingent reward
dimension of the transactional leadership style. It can be concluded that teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction do indeed have a positive relationship with a moderate correlation.

**Discussion of Results and Findings for Research Question 2**

Research Question 2: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?

The results of this study indicate significant differences evident between the teacher age and education level groups with respect to teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style. Results illustrate that younger teachers (ages 21-30) tend to rate their principal higher in the following two transactional leadership style dimensions: contingent reward and management-by-exception (active). Older teachers, however, (ages 31-40 and ages 41 and above) rate their principal lower in these same transactional leadership style dimensions.

The teacher age group (ages 21-30) scored their principal at an average of 3.25 (70th percentile) in the contingent reward component of the transactional leadership scale, while the teacher age group (ages 31-40) scored their principal at an average of 2.85 (45th percentile) in the same area. This demonstrates that younger teachers (ages 21-30) are more inclined to view their principal as a transactional leader versus the older teachers (ages 31-40), who view their principal as less transactional with respect to the contingent reward component. Bass et al. (2003) also reported a direct correlation between contingent reward leadership and the satisfaction levels of their followers.
The teacher age group (ages 21-30) rated their principal at an average of 2.29 (70th percentile) in the management-by-exception (active) dimension component of the transactional leadership style scale, whereas the teacher age groups (ages 31-40 and ages 41 and above) rated their principal at an average of 1.74 and 1.79 (both at the 55th percentile), respectively, in the same leadership dimension. This indicates that younger teachers (ages 21-30) view their principal as more transactional with regard to the management-by-exception (active) dimension than their older counterparts (ages 31-40 and 41 and above).

Significant differences between teachers with a bachelor’s degree and those with a Rank I also are evident in the management-by-exception (active) component of the transactional leadership style scale. Teachers with a bachelor’s degree rated their principal at an average of 2.22 (70th percentile) in this transactional leadership dimension; however, teachers with a Rank I rated their principal at an average of 1.76 (55th percentile) in this same transactional leadership style component. This reveals that teachers with a bachelor’s degree regard their principal as more transactional concerning the management-by-exception (active) leadership component than those with a Rank I. This finding contradicts an earlier research study by Korkmaz (2007) that argued the importance of transformational leadership style over transactional leadership style in relation to job satisfaction levels of teachers. Nevertheless, the contingent reward component of transactional leadership also was seen in previous research (Nguni et al., 2006) to have a positive influence on job satisfaction.

The significant differences observed between teacher perceptions of elementary principal leadership style and the demographic information with respect to teacher age
and education level are noteworthy since there is a general association between teacher age and level of education completed (i.e., teachers with a bachelor’s degree tend to be younger teachers).

This study did not find any significant differences between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and the demographic information related to grade level taught or combined years of teaching experience.

**Conclusions Related to Research Question 2**

This study reveals significant differences in teacher perceptions of elementary principal leadership style based on age and education level. Younger teachers (ages 21-30) rated their principal significantly higher in the transactional leadership style dimension of contingent reward versus their older colleagues (ages 31-40). Younger teachers (ages 21-30) also rated their principal significantly higher in the management-by-exception (active) area of transactional leadership than the older teachers (ages 31-40 and ages 41 and above). Additionally, teachers with a bachelor’s degree rated their principal higher than those with a Rank I in the transactional leadership style dimension management-by-exception (active). These findings suggest that younger teachers who view their principal as more transactional had a more positive perception of their principal’s leadership style versus older teachers and teachers with a Rank I.

It can be concluded that there are differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style. The findings illustrate that younger teachers and teachers with a bachelor’s degree viewed their principal differently than older teachers and teachers with a Rank I with regard to the transactional leadership style components contingent reward and management-by-exception (active).
Discussion of Results and Findings for Research Question 3

Research Question 3: Are there differences in teacher perceptions of teacher job satisfaction based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience)?

The results of this study indicate significant differences are evident between groups of teachers according to grade level taught (kindergarten through grade 5 teachers versus special area teachers) with respect to teacher perceptions of teacher job satisfaction. This finding validates the research of Bolin (2007), who found that demographic factors tended to affect teacher job satisfaction. Results from this study also demonstrate that special area teachers (i.e., art, music, library, computers, special education, etc.) rated their level of intrinsic job satisfaction ($M = 52.39$) significantly higher than kindergarten through grade 5 teachers ($M = 49.56$) as measured by the MSQ. The mean for both grade level taught groups would be considered above average since the total perfect score for intrinsic job satisfaction is 60 (MSQ items 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 19). This finding indicates that special area teachers are more intrinsically satisfied with their job than regular education teachers (kindergarten through grade 5).

The fact that special area teachers show significant differences in their level of intrinsic job satisfaction versus kindergarten through grade 5 teachers coincided with the importance of intrinsic job satisfaction factors cited in the review of literature. Particularly, this study validated the link between ability utilization (the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities), achievement (the feeling of accomplishment I get from the job), creativity (the chance to try my own methods of doing the job), and responsibility (the freedom to use my own judgment) in relation to several previous
research studies that emphasized the importance of teacher autonomy as a factor positively influencing teacher job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001; Connolly, 2000; Metlife Survey, 2001; Perie & Baker, 1997; Spear et al., 2000; Stockard & Lehman, 2004).

This study did not uncover any significant differences between teacher perceptions of teacher job satisfaction and the demographic information related to teacher age, education level, or combined years of teaching experience.

**Conclusions Related to Research Question 3**

Special area teachers rated themselves differently than regular education teachers (kindergarten through grade 5) in the intrinsic job satisfaction category. It can be concluded that special area teachers have a higher level of intrinsic teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the MSQ) than regular education teachers (kindergarten through grade 5). Special area teachers scored themselves higher in the following intrinsic job satisfaction areas: ability utilization (the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities), achievement (the feeling of accomplishment I get from the job), activity (being able to keep busy all the time), authority (the chance to tell other people what to do), creativity (the chance to try my own methods of doing the job), independence (the chance to work alone on the job), moral values (being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience), responsibility (the freedom to use my own judgment), security (the way my job provides for steady employment), social service (the chance to do things for other people), social status (the chance to be “somebody” in the community), and variety (the chance to do different things from time to time). This indicates that intrinsic factors do play a significant role in influencing teacher job
satisfaction. In this study, it is evident that special area teachers are more intrinsically motivated than regular education teachers.

Discussion of Results and Findings for Research Question 4

Research Question 4: What are the significant factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction as identified by elementary school teachers?

The results of this research study identify significant factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction as identified by the elementary school teachers surveyed. Factors identified were delineated into intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction categories.

According to the stepwise regression analysis, the following three items explain 84% of the variance with respect to intrinsic teacher job satisfaction:

1. Creativity — the chance to try my own methods of doing the job ($R^2 = .62$)
2. Social service — the chance to do things for other people ($R^2 = 0.77$)
3. Independence — the chance to work alone on the job ($R^2 = 0.84$)

The items teachers identify as significant contributors to their intrinsic job satisfaction level (creativity and independence) also are evident in the review of literature as causal factors related to intrinsic teacher job satisfaction including being challenged to think creatively (Schultz & Teddlie, 2001; Spear et al., 2000) and autonomy and independence as a teacher (Bogler, 2001; Connolly, 2000; Metlife Survey, 2001; Perie & Baker, 1997).

The extrinsic job satisfaction factors that teachers identify as significantly contributing to their job satisfaction levels include the following two items regressed from the MSQ that explain 85% of the variance:
1. Supervision (human relations) — the way my boss handles his or her workers
\((R^2 = 0.65)\)

2. Compensation — the pay and amount of work I do \((R^2 = 0.85)\)

The areas of supervision and compensation identified as extrinsic factors affecting job satisfaction by teachers in this study match findings in earlier research studies that also cited principal support and assistance as well as teacher pay as influencing factors with respect to teacher job satisfaction (Metlife Survey, 2001; NEA, 2001; Perie & Baker, 1997; Spear et al., 2000).

Concerning general job satisfaction, teachers recognize the following two items regressed from the MSQ as predictors of their overall general teacher job satisfaction that account for 78% of the variance:

1. Responsibility — the freedom to use my own judgment \((R^2 = 0.59)\)

2. Recognition — the praise I get for doing a good job \((R^2 = 0.78)\)

Of the two items teachers identify as strong predictors of overall general job satisfaction, it is important to note that one item is considered an intrinsic motivator (responsibility), while the other item is an extrinsic motivator (recognition).

Again, a connection can be made between general satisfaction factors related to teacher job satisfaction in this study and satisfaction factors cited in the review of literature. Specifically, the literature points to the areas of responsibility (the freedom to use my own judgment) and compensation as contributing factors related to teacher job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001; Connolly, 2000; Danielson, 2002; Metlife Survey, 2001; Perie & Baker, 1997).
Conclusions Related to Research Question 4

Teachers identify creativity (the chance to try my own methods of doing the job), social service (the chance to do things for other people), and independence (the chance to work alone on the job) as the most significant contributing factors related to their intrinsic job satisfaction. Teachers also identify supervision (the way my boss handles his or her workers) and compensation (the pay and amount of work I do) as important contributing factors related to their extrinsic job satisfaction. Finally, teachers identify responsibility (the freedom to use my own judgment) and recognition (the praise I get for doing a good job) as significant contributing factors related to their overall general job satisfaction.

This study demonstrates that teacher job satisfaction is significantly impacted through a combination of factors that include intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. Furthermore, it is through this combination of factors that determines teachers’ overall general satisfaction.

Limitations

Several limiting factors may affect the generalizability of this research study. This study was conducted with elementary schools only, which excluded the middle school and high school populations. In addition, only rural elementary schools in Kentucky were selected for inclusion in the study; therefore, suburban and urban schools and schools in other states were excluded. Thus, the results of this study would be difficult to generalize to the entire population of teachers and principals since it was limited to rural elementary schools located in south central Kentucky.

This particular study also focused on measuring the perceptions of kindergarten through grade 5 elementary teachers with respect to principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Consequently, perceptions of other grade level teachers as well other
school stakeholders were not included in this study. The study also was limited in the fact that the survey used to measure principal leadership style (MLQ) measured only principal leadership style in terms of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. Although other survey instruments are readily available that measure other forms of leadership styles, this research study’s primary focus and theoretical framework centers on the transformational leadership style in particular.

This research study examined differences between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction limited to the following demographic information: age, grade level taught, education level, and years of teaching experience. Other demographic information was excluded from this study such as gender and race/ethnicity simply because elementary teachers surveyed were overwhelmingly female and white. Therefore, the populations of males and other races/ethnicities were too small for inclusion in this study without the threat of diminishing and skewing the generalizability of the results.

A final limitation to this study lies is its own research design. This study was non-experimental and correlational in nature. Although a correlational study may suggest a relationship between two variables, it does not prove causation because other variables and/or factors may play a part in determining a true causal relationship.

**Implications for Practice**

The importance of understanding the impact of teacher job satisfaction should not be underestimated. Satisfied teachers have been proven to stay on the job longer than teachers who are not satisfied, and principal leadership also has been cited as an integral contributing factor (Marlow et al., 1997). Indeed, principals and school districts alike
should come to the realization that teacher job satisfaction in relation to school principal leadership has been cited as a main contributing factor in explaining why half of all new teachers leave the profession in their first five years of teaching (Ingersoll, 2003; Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005).

The results from this study indicate that there is a relationship between teachers’ perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Therefore, implications for practice include the idea that school principals should be aware of their own leadership style and behaviors since there is a correlation between the way that leadership style is perceived by teachers and their level of job satisfaction. Furthermore, principals should use a combination of transformational and transactional approaches with respect to their own leadership style. For instance, this study identifies positive, moderate correlations between all five transformational leadership dimensions as well as the contingent reward dimension of transactional leadership. For that reason, principals should strive to maintain an awareness of and utilize behaviors and characteristics associated with transformational leadership and the contingent reward component of transactional leadership.

It might be helpful for school principals also to recognize that younger teachers (ages 21-30) view their principal’s leadership style differently than older teachers (ages 31-40) in the contingent reward component of the transactional leadership scale. Through a proper understanding of these differences, principals may benefit from utilizing alternative leadership approaches when dealing with different age groups of teachers. It would be advisable for school principals to approach younger teachers using the transactional leadership style with an emphasis on the contingent reward dimension.
As noted in the results of this study, there also is a difference in the way special area teachers rated their level of intrinsic job satisfaction because their score is significantly higher than regular education teachers (kindergarten through grade 5) in this area. School principals could possibly improve the intrinsic job satisfaction levels of regular education teachers by providing leadership that stresses the importance of supporting teachers through intrinsic motivators such as ability utilization (using one’s ability effectively), achievement (the feeling of accomplishment one gets from their job), activity (keeping busy on the job), authority (being able to tell others what to do), creativity (being able to use one’s own methods at work), independence (being able to work alone), moral values (doing things that do not go against one’s conscience), responsibility (the freedom to use one’s own judgment; autonomy), security (steady employment), social service and status (doing things for others and feeling proud of one’s job), and variety (being able to do different things on the job; Weiss et al., 1967).

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This research study focused on determining the relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction within the rural elementary school context. The sample teacher population included 179 elementary teachers scattered across six public school districts in south central Kentucky who were certified to teach kindergarten through grade 5. Recommendations for future research could involve a replication of this study to include a larger, more diversified sample population. It would be helpful to understand whether the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction existed at the middle and high school levels. Additionally, it would be interesting to survey a larger group of teachers...
from suburban and urban schools in other areas of the United States. The diversification of the study would contribute to a broader generalizability of the research results.

This research study used the transformational leadership model as a theoretical basis for determining the relationship between teacher perceptions of principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. A future research study could use a different leadership model as its theoretical basis, which could then be used to compare the results of the two studies. In addition, this research study utilized the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to measure teacher perceptions of principal leadership style (which is based on measuring transformational and transactional leadership style dimensions), while the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to measure teacher job satisfaction. It might be useful to replicate this study for future research using different survey instruments in order to compare the results of two studies that measured the same variables.

This same study could be replicated using a different research design. For example, the study could be conducted measuring teacher perceptions of school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction via a qualitative approach in which teachers could be interviewed and asked open-ended questions regarding their perceptions of principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction levels.

This study examined differences in teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction with respect to demographic information such as age, grade level taught, education level, and combined years of teaching experience. Future research studies could investigate these same differences
concerning additional demographic information such as gender, race/ethnicity, or years of teaching experience in their current school.

It would be interesting to discover whether there is a relationship between school principal leadership style and job satisfaction of school support staff. The results of each study could then be compared to see if there are differences in the way certified personnel view the principal as opposed to classified staff in relation to job satisfaction.
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APPENDIX A (continued): Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-Rater Form

Note: Only five questions may be reproduced per publisher.

For use by KIRK BIGGERSTAFF only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on March 21, 2011

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Rater Form

Name of Leader: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Organization ID #: ______________________ Leader ID #: _______________________

This questionnaire is used to describe the leadership style of the above-mentioned individual as you perceive it. Answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank. Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

Important (necessary for processing): Which best describes you?

I am at a higher organizational level than the person I am rating.
I am at the same organizational level.
I am at a lower organizational level than the person I am rating.
Other than the above.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing. Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Person I Am Rating...

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts .................................................. 0 1 2 3 4
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate ..................... 0 1 2 3 4
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious .............................................................. 0 1 2 3 4
4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards ....... 0 1 2 3 4
5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise .......................................................... 0 1 2 3 4

121
APPENDIX A (continued): Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Permission

For use by Kirk Biggerstaff only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on October 18, 2011

To whom it may concern,

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

Instrument: *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*

Authors: *Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

Copyright: *1995 by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

for his/her thesis research.

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 other published material.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

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

© 1995 Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass. All Rights Reserved.
Published by Mind Garden, Inc., www.mindgarden.com
APPENDIX B: Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

(short-form)

Vocational Psychology Research
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Copyright 1977
APPENDIX B (continued): Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Ask yourself, How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

Very Sat. means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.
Sat. means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.
N means I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.
Dissat. means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.
Very Dissat. means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On my present job, this is how I feel about</th>
<th>Very Dissat.</th>
<th>Dissat.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sat.</th>
<th>Very Sat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being able to keep busy all the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The chance to work alone on the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The chance to do different things from time to time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The way my boss handles his/her workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The chance to do things for other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My pay and the amount of work I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The chances for advancement on this job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The freedom to use my own judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The praise I get for doing a good job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B (continued): Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Permission Letter

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

October 21, 2011

Kirk Biggerstaff
Tompkinsville Elem School/Wky
420 Elem School Rd
Tompkinsville, KY 42167

Dear Kirk Biggerstaff:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 1977 short form version in your research project.

Vocational Psychology Research is currently in the process of revising the MSQ manual and it is very important that we receive copies of your research study results in order to construct new norm tables. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your results including 1) demographic data of respondents, including age, education level, occupation and job tenure; and 2) response statistics including scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and standard errors of measurement. If your tests are scored by us, we will already have the information detailed in item #2.

Your providing this information will be an important and valuable contribution to the new MSQ manual. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to call us at 612-625-1367.

Sincerely,

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research

Driven to Discover™
APPENDIX C: Demographic Information Sheet

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
Demographic Information Sheet

*Please circle the appropriate choice for each.*

1. *Gender:*
   - Male
   - Female

2. *Your Age:____________*

3. *Grade Level Taught:*

   *(Select one category that best describes the grade you currently teach).*
   - Kindergarten
   - 1st grade
   - 2nd grade
   - 3rd grade
   - 4th grade
   - 5th grade
   - Special Area (i.e., art, music, P.E., library, computers, special education, etc.)

4. *Education Level:*

   *(Select your highest degree earned).*
   - Bachelor’s
   - Master’s
   - Rank I
   - Doctorate

5. *Years of Experience in the Education Profession:____________*

6. *How many years have you taught at this particular school?____________*
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In future correspondence, please refer to HS12-046, September 9, 2011

Kirk Biggerstaff
C/o Dr. Maxwell
Educational Leadership
WKU

Kirk Biggerstaff:

Your research project, The Relationship between Teachers’ Perceptions of Elementary School Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction, was reviewed by the IRB and it has been determined that risks to subjects are: (1) minimized and reasonable; and that (2) research procedures are consistent with a sound research design and do not expose the subjects to unnecessary risk. Reviewers determined that: (1) benefits to subjects are considered along with the importance of the topic and that outcomes are reasonable; (2) selection of subjects is equitable; and (3) the purposes of the research and the research setting is amenable to subjects’ welfare and producing desired outcomes; that indications of coercion or prejudice are absent, and that participation is clearly voluntary.

1. In addition, the IRB found that you need to orient participants as follows: (1) signed informed consent is not required; (2) Provision is made for collecting, using and storing data in a manner that protects the safety and privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data. (3) Appropriate safeguards are included to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects.

This project is therefore approved at the Exempt from Full Board Review Level.

2. Please note that the institution is not responsible for any actions regarding this protocol before approval. If you expand the project at a later date to use other instruments please re-apply. Copies of your request for human subjects review, your application, and this approval, are maintained in the Office of Compliance at the above address. Please report any changes to this approved protocol to this office. A Continuing Review protocol will be sent to you in the future to determine the status of the project. Also, please use the stamped approval forms to assure participants of compliance with The Office of Human Research Protections regulations.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Mooney
Compliance Manager
Office of Compliance
Western Kentucky University

cc: HS file number Biggerstaff HS12-046
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TEACHER INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Project Title: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STYLE AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

Investigator: Kirk Biggerstaff, School Principal, 270-487-6472
WKU Educational Leadership Doctoral Program, 270-745-3061

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to participate in this project.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask him/her any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have.

If you then decide to participate in the project, please sign on the last page of this form in the presence of the person who explained the project to you. You should be given a copy of this form to keep.

1. **Nature and Purpose of the Project:**
   The primary purpose of this research study is to investigate the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Secondly, the study will also examine the differences in teachers’ perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and job satisfaction based on teachers’ demographics (i.e., age, gender, experience level, educational level). Finally, the study will explore the significant factors that contribute to job satisfaction as identified by the certified elementary school teachers.

2. **Explanation of Procedures:**
   The study will utilize two research-based questionnaires designed to measure the leadership style of the school principal and teacher job satisfaction levels. The questionnaires will be administered to kindergarten-fifth grade certified teachers at each participating elementary school on a specified date confirmed by each school principal. Subsequently, these certified elementary teachers at each school site will complete the two questionnaires. In addition, participants will also complete a demographic data sheet. This demographic data (i.e., age, gender, experience level, educational level) will be used to investigate the differences in teachers’ perceptions of principal leadership style and job satisfaction. The questionnaires will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. The researcher will administer, collect, and analyze results from the specified sample teacher population in each school.
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3. **Discomfort and Risks:**
   Participation in the research study will be on a voluntary basis for all participants, and information collected will be kept strictly confidential by the researcher. There will be no known negative risks or consequences from participation in the study.

4. **Benefits:**
   Results from this study could assist in making school principals more cognizant of their own leadership ability and style and assist them in developing their own leadership capacity to support teachers in adequately managing the increased demands placed on them in this educational age of accountability. This increased awareness and modification of principal leadership style may contribute to increased levels of teacher job satisfaction and possibly decrease attrition rates.

5. **Confidentiality:**
   The questionnaires administered to participants will be confidential and anonymous. The researcher will ensure anonymity by giving each teacher a separate envelope in which to place their questionnaires. Additionally, data for each participant will not include any identifying information such as names of teachers and/or principals; instead, data will be coded to ensure confidentiality of all information collected. Hard copy data from questionnaires will be kept secure in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s school office. Any electronic data collected and/or transposed from questionnaires will be maintained in a secure database in the researcher’s school office. The password needed to access this information is only available to the researcher.

6. **Refusal/Withdrawal:**
   Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

**Your continued cooperation with the following research implies your consent.**

THE DATED APPROVAL ON THIS CONSENT FORM INDICATES THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Paul Mooney, Human Protections Administrator

TELEPHONE: (270) 745-4652
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WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
Institutional Review Board
Continuing Review Report

If this is your third year for your Continuing Review Request, please complete a new application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number:</th>
<th>HS12-046</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Original IRB Approval:</td>
<td>September 9, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Approval (Previous Level):</td>
<td>☑ Exempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the project minimal risk or above?</td>
<td>☑ Minimum Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(If &quot;Above&quot; IRB Chair and one other IRB reviewer may determine whether the PI needs to appear before the IRB).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Project:</td>
<td>The Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Elementary School Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Researcher:</td>
<td>Kirk Biggerstaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Educational Leadership Doctoral Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIProgram.org Training - Yes/No</td>
<td>CITIProgram.org Training - Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>8/12/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many total subjects have participated in the study since its inception? # 0

How many subjects have participated in the project since the last review? # 0

Is your data collection with human subjects complete? ☑ Yes | ☐ No

(If "Yes", please sign below and return to the Office of Research Compliance, Room 301, Potter Hall. If "No", please respond to the questions below, sign and return).

1. Has there been any change in the level of risks to human subjects? (If "Yes", please explain changes on a separate sheet). ☑ Yes | ☐ No

2. Have informed consent procedures changed so as to put subjects above minimal risk? (If "Yes", please describe on a separate sheet). ☑ Yes | ☐ No

3. Have any subjects withdrawn from the research due to adverse events or any unanticipated risks/problems? (If "Yes", please describe on a separate sheet). ☑ Yes | ☐ No

4. Have there been any changes to the source(s) of subjects and the Selection criteria? (If "Yes", please describe on a separate sheet). ☑ Yes | ☐ No

5. Have there been any changes to your research design that were not specified in your application, including the frequency, duration and location of each procedure. (If "Yes", please describe on a separate sheet). ☑ Yes | ☐ No

6. Has there been any change to the way in which confidentiality of the Data is maintained? (If "Yes", please describe on a separate sheet). ☑ Yes | ☐ No

7. Is there desire to extend the time line of the project? ☑ Yes | ☐ No

On what date do you anticipate data collection with human subjects to be completed?

Kirk Biggerstaff (Print) Signature of Principal Investigator 10/3/11

IRB Approvals:

Reviewer Signature Date 10/4/11

Reviewer Signature Date 10/4/11
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October 5, 2011

Dear Superintendent,

I am a principal at Tompkinsville Elementary School in Monroe County, Kentucky, and currently an Ed.D. candidate in the educational leadership doctoral program at Western Kentucky University. I am presently in the process of completing my dissertation focused on principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The primary purpose of this research study is to investigate the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Results from this study could assist in making school principals more cognizant of their own leadership ability and assist them in developing their own leadership capacity to support teachers in adequately managing the increased demands placed on them in this educational age of accountability. This increased awareness and modification of principal leadership style may contribute to increased levels of teacher job satisfaction, which, in turn, could assist in possibly decreasing attrition rates and potentially improving student academic achievement and school effectiveness.

The study will utilize two research-based questionnaires designed to measure the leadership style of the school principal and teacher job satisfaction levels. The questionnaires will be administered to kindergarten-fifth grade certified teachers at the participating elementary school on a specified date confirmed by each school principal. The questionnaires will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. The researcher will administer, collect, and analyze results from the specified sample teacher population in each school.

Participation in the research study will be on a voluntary basis for all participants, and information collected will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous by the researcher. Additionally, data for each participant will not include any identifying information such as names of teachers and/or principals. There will be no known negative risks or consequences from participation in the study.

I am requesting permission to conduct this research study with (insert name) Elementary School. If granted permission, I will contact the appropriate principal and arrange a meeting to conduct the survey research. In addition, I will share results of the study after its completion. You may email me at kirk.biggerstaff@monroe.kyschools.us to grant permission to conduct the study in your district. If you have any questions, you may contact me via email or phone (270) 487-6472 (office). I am completing this dissertation under the direction of Dr. Marge Maxwell, WKU School of Teacher Education, and you may also contact her if needed at (270) 745-2435 (office).

Sincerely,

Kirk Biggerstaff
Principal
WKU Ed.D. Candidate
APPENDIX F: Curriculum Vitae

JOSEPH KIRK BIGGERSTAFF

CURRICULUM VITAE

Work
Tompkinsville Elementary
420 Elementary School Road
Tompkinsville, KY 42167
Phone: 270-487-6472; Fax: 270-487-9203
Email: kirk.biggerstaff@monroe.kyschools.us

Home
154 D. Pitcock Road
Tompkinsville, KY 42167
Phone: 270-487-1235

EDUCATION

2012  Ed.D. in Educational Leadership
(May) Western Kentucky University (4.0 GPA)
Concentration in P-12 Administrative Leadership
2010 Certification for School District Superintendent
Western Kentucky University (4.0 GPA)
Kentucky Superintendent Certification, All Grades
2005 Rank I in Instructional Leadership (School Principal)
Western Kentucky University (4.0 GPA)
Level I and Level II Kentucky Principal Certification, All Grades
2004 Master of Science in Library Media Education
Western Kentucky University (4.0 GPA)
Kentucky Teacher Certification, All Grades
2002 Bachelor of Arts in Social Studies,
Western Kentucky University (Cum Laude)
Kentucky Teacher Certification, Grades 8-12

PRESENTATIONS

Biggerstaff, K. (June, 2009). We’re better together: How PLCs impact student achievement in Monroe County. General session seminar presented at GRREC Summer Leadership Conference, Lexington, Kentucky.
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HONORS AND RECOGNITIONS

Tompkinsville Elementary School State Test Trend Data 2008-11
Based on Percentage Proficient and Distinguished

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reading % Proficient/Distinguished</th>
<th>Math % Proficient/Distinguished</th>
<th>Combined Reading/Math % Proficient/Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>86*</td>
<td>86*</td>
<td>86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>83**</td>
<td>96**</td>
<td>90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td>93**</td>
<td>90.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td>92**</td>
<td>90.48**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOP 5% of all public schools in KY. *TOP 10% of all public schools in KY.

2012 National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence Award Nominee-
Tompkinsville Elementary School-U.S. Department of Education
2011-present Kentucky Association of School Administrators (KASA) Leadership Awards Committee
2009-11 Kentucky Association of School Administrators (KASA) Summer Institute Planning Committee, Reviewer of Conference Proposals
2009-11 Kentucky Junior Beta Club State Executive Council
2008 Tompkinsville Elementary School-Kentucky Department of Education Pacesetter School Recognition-Top 5% of all Kentucky schools
2007 Tompkinsville Elementary School-Ranked #10 in Kentucky for Academic Achievement
2007-09 Kentucky Junior Beta Club State Sponsor
2005 Kentucky Junior Beta Club State Sponsor-Elect

GRANTS

2011 Kleenex Brand Back to School Field Trip Grant-$5,000
2011 Wal-Mart Foundation Community Outreach Grant-$500
2010 Federal Fruits/Vegetables Grant-Tompkinsville Elementary-$28,533
2009 PRIDE Club Grant-Tompkinsville Elementary-$4,000
2008 21st Century Community Learning Center Grant-Tompkinsville Elementary-$150,000
2007 National Endowment for the Humanities-“We the People” Bookshelf Grant-$500
2006 Scholastic School-wide Bookstore Grant-$2,000
2006 Improving Literacy through School Libraries Federal Grant (NCLB)-$127,731
2005 3M Salute to Schools Grant-$15,000
2005 National Endowment for the Humanities-“We the People” Bookshelf Grant-$500
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PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Kentucky Association of School Administrators, <em>Summer Leadership Institute</em>, Louisville, Kentucky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Kentucky Association of School Councils, <em>Councils and Student Achievement: Understanding the Future of Senate Bill 1</em>, Tompkinsville, Kentucky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td><em>Kentucky Leadership Academy</em>, Heartland Cadre, Elizabethtown, Kentucky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Kentucky CEO Superintendents Network Retreat, Lexington, Kentucky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Center for Improving School Culture, <em>School Culture Audit: Glasgow High School</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Center for Improving School Culture, <em>Certified School Culture Facilitator Training</em>, Bowling Green, Kentucky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Western Kentucky University, <em>Essential 55/Excellent 11 Lecture Series</em>, Ron Clark, Bowling Green, Kentucky.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MEMBERSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-present</td>
<td>Kentucky Association of Elementary School Principals (KAESP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-present</td>
<td>Kentucky Association of School Administrators (KASA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-present</td>
<td>Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2008</td>
<td>National Education Association-Kentucky Education Association (NEA/KEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2005</td>
<td>National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2005</td>
<td>American Association of School Librarians (AASL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Tompkinsville Elementary School, Tompkinsville, Kentucky
2008-present
Principal

Roles and Responsibilities
- Instructional Leader/Specialist
- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) Coordinator
- Professional Development Coordinator
- School-Based Decision Making Council (SBDM), Principal Chair
- Kentucky Teacher Internship Committee, Principal Chair
- Admissions and Release Committee (ARC) Chair
- Textbooks and Instructional Resources Coordinator
- Public Relations Liaison
- Academic Team Coach
- Junior Beta Sponsor

Tompkinsville Elementary School, Tompkinsville, Kentucky
2006-2008
Assistant Principal

Roles and Responsibilities
- School-Based Decision Making Council (SBDM), Vice-Chair and Secretary
- Kentucky Teacher Internship Committee, Principal Chair
- Admissions and Release Committee (ARC) Chair
- Professional Development Coordinator
- Public Relations Liaison
- Textbooks and Instructional Resources Coordinator
- Maintenance and Custodial Supervisor
- School Webmaster
- Academic Team Coach
- Junior Beta Sponsor

Monroe County High School, Tompkinsville, Kentucky
2004-2006
Library Media Specialist

Roles and Responsibilities
- School Technology Coordinator
- Student Technology Leadership Program Advisor
- KCCT Testing Coordinator
- Junior and Senior Beta Club Sponsor
- Certified School Culture Facilitator
# JOSEPH KIRK BIGGERSTAFF

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metcalfe County Middle School</th>
<th>North Metcalfe Elementary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roles and Responsibilities
- Social Studies and Library Skills Teacher
- Extended School Services (ESS) Teacher
- 21st Century Community Learning Center Teacher
- Junior Beta Club Sponsor
- Metcalfe County Education Association Secretary

## DISTRICT LEADERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-present</td>
<td>Monroe County Administrators’ Principal Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-present</td>
<td>Local District Facilities Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2010</td>
<td>District Calendar Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2008</td>
<td>Monroe County Education Association Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>Improving Literacy through School Libraries Grant Director (5 schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-present</td>
<td>Comprehensive District Improvement Plan Working Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>District Salary and Benefits Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>District Public Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>District Gifted and Talented Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>Monroe County Education Association Building Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2007</td>
<td>District Local Cable Access Channel Video Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Metcalfe County Education Association Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2004</td>
<td>Metcalfe County 21st CCLC Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>