2002

Principal Leadership Style And Teacher Job Satisfaction

Karen M. Wetherell
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons, and the Other Psychology Commons

PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STYLE AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

BY

KAREN M. WETHERELL

Dissertation Committee

Daniel Gutmore, Ed.D., Mentor
John Collins, Ed.D.
Ralph Ferrie, Ed.D.
Nathan Parker, Ed.D.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctorate of Education
Seton Hall University

2002

ABSTRACT

Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction

This purpose of this study was to ascertain if there is a relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Hersey and Blanchard's (1976) model of situational leadership was used to determine principal leadership style. The research was conducted using a descriptive/correlational design. In this study, leadership style, as perceived by the teachers, was the independent variable and teacher job satisfaction was the dependent variable. Demographics of the principal were also independent variables. This study focused on elementary schools in Morris County, New Jersey, in District Factor Groupings of GH, I or J, in which the principal had been at the school at least one year. The decision to limit the principal sample to those who had been at the site for at least two years was to ensure they had time to affect teacher job satisfaction. Out of the twenty-four districts in DFG GH, J, or I twenty districts had elementary schools with principals in at least their second year. Nine superintendents agreed to allow their principals to be contacted to participate in this study. This accounted for thirty eligible elementary schools. Of this thirty, twenty-three principals agreed to participate after receiving the informed consent letter. After collecting the questionnaires, nineteen schools had usable data. Out of 396 teachers, 251 completed the questionnaires for a return rate of 63%.

This study found that the leadership style, telling, tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction in the areas of supervision, contingent rewards, operating conditions, communication, total job satisfaction, and style adaptability. Principals with 11-15 years of principal experiences tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of pay, promotion, communication, and higher style adaptability scores. Principals with over ten years of experience at the present school tended to have lower levels of teacher job satisfaction in the areas of operating conditions, communication and total job satisfaction. Differences in age, gender, and highest degree earned were not found to be statistically significant.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Background of the Problem

Education in the United States is under intense scrutiny by public and private interests who question the system's ability to fulfill its goals of teaching basic skills, instilling values, preventing dropouts, and producing a productive workforce. Such an incredible responsibility requires top caliber teachers committed to fulfilling the high expectations Americans have for their education system.

According to the US Census Bureau (Guigeon, 1998), the population of elementary age students (age 5-13) is expected to increase 15% from 1990-2005. This increase, combined with the rising number of teachers reaching retirement age, will result in the need of 2.2 million new teachers in the next decade, according to President Clinton. Education World (1999) cited statistics that 42 states issue emergency certificates to people who have not taken teaching courses. Also reported was some states offer signing bonuses, housing allowances, and higher salaries in order to meet the demand for more teachers during the teacher shortage. Research by Grissmer and Kirby (1987) state that the majority of states are experiencing a teacher shortage. They predicted that the shortage would continue. The need for teachers has historically depended on many factors. The mandates for lower class size, more attractive careers, tougher certification standards, and other careers offering more opportunities for advancement are amongst the reasons.

According to the National Education Association (2001), attrition, retirement, increased student enrollment, and an emphasis on smaller class size are the main reasons the nation's schools will need 2 million teachers in the next 11 years. Low unemployment rates and other careers offering higher salaries compound the problem. The NEA projects that there will be a 20% increase in the need for preschool and kindergarten teachers, a 10% increase in the need for

elementary teachers and a 9% increase in the need for special education teachers between now and 2006. The teaching shortage will have an effect on student achievement when schools lack qualified teachers.

Boe (1997) reported that teacher attrition is the largest single factor that determines the need for additional teachers. Thirty percent of traditionally trained teachers leave the profession by their third year. Higher satisfaction has been associated with a lower propensity to leave (Mayes & Ganster 1986).

This is a time in which there is an increasing demand for quality teachers, yet a decreasing supply of well-educated candidates (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986). The finding reported in A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century compounds the situation. This report stated that half of all teachers leave the profession within seven years. Additionally, there is evidence that some of the best-qualified teachers are those that leave the profession.

The study, Teaching to Teach (2000), as printed in the Newark Star Ledger, reported new teachers' feelings about their profession. Although 96% stated they loved teaching, 20% would not choose the profession again if they were given the chance to start over. Only 68% reported getting satisfaction out of teaching. Hall and DeLos (1987) conducted a similar study in Florida in which they reported 31% of teachers surveyed planned to quit teaching. This result did not include those teachers close to retirement age.

Schools must give more attention to teacher job satisfaction to determine why, at such a crucial time, teachers are experiencing increasing dissatisfaction. A study by Heller, Clay, and Perkins, (1993) attempted to find a relationship between principals' leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. They found that teachers are least satisfied with the financial aspect of teaching, and most satisfied with their co-workers, but did not find job satisfaction to be related to leadership style. They thought job satisfaction would be more closely related to principals'

friendliness, warmth, support, and rapport, and also dependent upon the individual follower. This would be in line with Hersey and Blanchard's (1988) theory that leadership should be situation-specific and based on follower characteristics. They suggested further research on job satisfaction to include situational leadership.

Madeline Hunter believed in the power of a principal. She felt a good principal could turn a school around in two years because, "every orchestra plays better with different directors; actors act better with different directors; teams become champions because of the ability of the coach to bring out the very best in somebody" (McCurdy, 1983, p.72).

Parker (1984) studied the work of principals in both public and private elementary schools and determined principals are a critical component of effective and successful implementation of school programs. As a school's instructional leader, the principal is not only responsible for knowing effective pedagogy, a principal must also provide a good working environment and meaningful staff development opportunities for teachers. Principals, as leaders, are held accountable for whatever occurs in the schools. If teachers are unhappy or unproductive, the principal is blamed for not developing a positive climate and not focusing on morale. If students are not learning, the principal is blamed for not ensuring an environment conducive to learning.

The United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement conducted a study in 1997, on teacher job satisfaction. Included in this study were elementary and secondary teachers, from both the public and private sector. The report focused on workplace conditions, school safety, and parent and administrator support.

The findings of the report were that workplace conditions are strongly associated with teacher job satisfaction. Salary and benefits were found to be important to teachers, but was only weakly related to teacher job satisfaction. This was even less significant at private schools, where the salaries tended to be lower. At all schools and at each level, focusing on workplace

conditions such as a safe working environment, supportive administration, and involved parents, can increase teacher job satisfaction. The factors which were more strongly associated with teacher job satisfaction were parental support, student behavior, principal interaction, staff recognition, teacher participation in school decision-making, influence over school policy, and control in the classroom. Principal interaction and supportive administration was defined by teachers in the survey as "being recognized for a job well-done."

An example of the effect a principal can have on a school's success can be found in Gallagher's study (1984). A school had all the facilities and amenities needed, but revealed low teacher job satisfaction and morale. Teachers in his study preferred a principal who had concern for others, was an open communicator, and believed in shared decision making. Although the principals perceived themselves as possessing these qualities, the teachers perceived their behaviors differently.

Statement of the Problem

Educators have the unique opportunity to participate actively in the development and transformation of human lives. The art of educating is an artful and complex task that is carried out with a group of students who come from a variety of backgrounds, possess a variety of interests and skills, and maintain hopes and dreams of learning. The ultimate expected outcome for educators is to prepare individuals so that ongoing societal development can occur. For this to happen, effective instructors must retain employment in school districts. Teacher job satisfaction must remain at a level to ensure this.

This study will determine if there is a relationship between principals' leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. This is a topic that has been written about in informal reports, formal studies, and dissertations for several years (Benit, 1991; Bogler, 1999; Davis & Wilson, 2000; Perkins, 1991; Smith, 2000; Zigrang, 2000). Few definitive conclusions have been drawn,

and all concluded that there is a need for further study, specifically in the area of situational leadership. This study will add to the body of research in the area of job satisfaction and leadership style. It will focus specifically on suburban areas in New Jersey, making connections to the study by Smith, which was conducted in a different demographic location, and Benit, which was conducted in a similar demographic location.

This study will answer the following questions:

1. Will there be any significant differences in teacher job satisfaction based upon the principal's leadership style?

2. Will the following demographic characteristics of the principal account for some differences in teacher job satisfaction?

Age of the principal

Gender of the principal

Total years of experience as a principal

Principal experience at the present school

Highest degree completed by principal

Race/ethnicity of the principal

3. Is there a particular leadership style that has more of an impact on teacher job satisfaction than other leadership styles?

Significance of the Study

High turnover among teachers minimizes the opportunity for students to have access to experienced professionals. Haberman and Rickards (1990) contend that it takes about three years to become a competent classroom teacher. When 30% of traditionally trained teachers leave the classroom by their third year, it means that many teachers leave the professions about the same time they become effective professionals.

As the problem of teacher attrition escalates nationwide, one possible answer may be found with the principal. A more coherent understanding of teacher job satisfaction in relationship to principal leadership style may give districts the solution they are looking for. Programs that will strengthen the relationship between principals and their teachers, keep qualified teachers satisfied, retain teachers in the profession, will have positive influence over student outcomes, as proposed by Sagor (1992).

Leadership style research found that people respond differently to different leadership style. Schein (1970) and Fiedler (1967) both state that there is an interaction between the styles of leaders and their subordinates. This interaction can either be an advantage or a detriment. Fiedler promotes the idea that the effectiveness of the leader, and subsequently the organization, is a direct result of the interaction.

While there has been much research trying to connect principal leadership style to job satisfaction, as well as connecting working conditions to job satisfaction, there is little research connecting the principal behavior to teacher job satisfaction. Behavior is important as a principal interacts with staff.

In our rush to reform education, we have forgotten a simple truth: reform will never be achieved by renewing appropriations, restructuring schools, rewriting curricula, and revising texts if we continue to demean and dishearten the human resource called the teacher on who so much depends. Teachers must be better compensated, freed from bureaucratic harassment, given a role in academic governance, and provided with the best possible methods and materials. But none of that will transform education if we fail to cherish - and challenge - the human heart that is the source of good teaching. (Palmer, 1998 p.16)

Situational leadership focuses on the leader's behavior, as perceived by the followers. The bulk of research shows that there is not one particular leadership style more effective than others are, rather, the leader must vary his/her behavior based on the

maturity of the members in relation to a specific task. If this research shows that there is a relationship between a principal who effectively uses the theory of situational leadership and job satisfaction, training in the area of situational leadership could help reverse to problem of teacher attrition.

Situational leadership was chosen over other leadership theories. Trait leadership attempts to list characteristics of successful leaders. This leadership theory was rejected because it focuses only on the leader, not the followers. This study will focus on the followers, or the teachers. Leadership theories that depict two styles and conclude an either/or style of task or relationship were rejected for situational leadership, which state leaders use a combination of these behaviors, not one or the other.

Examining the relationship between principal leadership style and job satisfaction could help schools prepare leaders, employ leaders efficiently, and provide professional development to those principals looking for ways to be a more effective leader. According to Northouse (1997) situational leadership has been effective in corporations as they train individuals to be effective leaders.

Definitions of Terms

District Factor Group (DFG). A means of ranking school districts in New Jersey by their socioeconomic status.

Leadership. The process of influencing an individual or group in efforts to achieve a goal.

Leadership style. The behavior patterns that a leader uses to achieve a goal, as measured by Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD instrument.

LEAD. An instrument used to determine leadership styles of high task/low relationship, high task/high relationship, high relationship/low task or low relationship/low task.

Maturity. The ability and willingness of people to take responsibility for directing their own behavior.

Relationship behavior. The extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of the group by opening up channels of communication, providing socio-emotional support, "psychological strokes", and facilitating behaviors.

Task behavior. The extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of members of their group; explain what activities each is to do; and when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished.

Teacher attrition. Teachers leaving the teaching profession.

Teacher job satisfaction. The degree of satisfaction or gratification experienced by teachers.

Teacher retention. The process of keeping or retaining teachers in their chosen profession.

Style 1 (telling). This style of leader provides specific instruction, defines roles of followers, and closely supervises them.

Style 2 (selling). This style of leader explains decisions and attempt to get the followers to 'buy into' the decision made.

Style 3 (participating). This style of leader shares the decision making process with followers. These followers have the ability and knowledge to complete tasks.

Style 4 (delegating). This style of leader gives the responsibility of decision making to the followers. The followers are high in maturity and are willing to take responsibility for directing their own behavior.

Limitations of the Study

      This study will be limited to elementary schools in suburban areas of New Jersey, in Morris County. Districts used in the study will have a District Factor Grouping (DFG) of GH or higher in order to study similar districts and eliminate factors that may cloud research. It will include only principals who are in at least their second year at the same school. The study will make the assumption that a principal's first year is spent learning about the staff, students and community. The second year, this basis of knowledge can be utilized when determining the level of competence and commitment of the teachers, and then decide which leadership style to employ. It will also provide principals more time to have an impact on teacher job satisfaction. The study will used intact groups, no random selection.

Organization of the Study

      Chapter one includes the introduction, overview and purpose of the research, significance of the research, research questions, definitions of key terms, and limitations of the study. Chapter two includes a review of related research on teacher job satisfaction/teacher attrition, leadership theories and leadership styles, and the influence of principal leadership style. Chapter three contains the methodology, research design, the population and sampling process, the instrumentation, and the data collection procedures. Chapter four presents an analysis of the data, in terms of the research questions. Chapter five contains a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

This study will determine if there is a relationship between principals' leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. This chapter gives an overview of the literature on which the study was based.

Principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction has been researched as both separate and related topics. This literature review will look at existing research on these topics to determine if there are related themes to assist in answering the research questions. Teacher job satisfaction will be reviewed, particularly in the area of attrition. It will be determined if teachers are leaving the profession because of some degree of dissatisfaction related to the job. The literature review will examine the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction in an attempt to find out if that relationship can help keep teachers satisfied, limit attrition, and ultimately have a positive impact on school effectiveness. The literature review chapter is divided into three main sections: (a) overview of teacher job satisfaction/teacher attrition, (b) overview of leadership theories and leadership styles, and (c) the influence of principal leadership style. Principal leadership style will be further broken down into sub categories, teacher effectiveness, student achievement, change, school effectiveness, and specifically, teacher job satisfaction.

Teacher Satisfaction/Teacher Attrition

Research surrounding teacher job satisfaction is examined, particularly how it relates to teacher attrition. These serve as the grounds for this study. Job satisfaction is important in retaining teachers in the profession.

A successful education system is dependent upon a high-quality teaching staff. In order to develop this high quality teaching staff, one must look at factors associated with teacher quality and retention. One of these factors is teacher job satisfaction. Job satisfaction can be defined as an overall feeling about one's job or career in terms of specifics, i.e. compensation, autonomy, coworkers, administration. Typically, job satisfaction is examined against productivity. With teachers, it has implications on student learning. Choy et al. (1993) found that teachers who are not satisfied may be less motivated to do their work and those who are highly satisfied are less likely to change schools or to leave the teaching profession.

Job satisfaction has been studied for many years. Hoppock (1935) was one of the first researchers to study job satisfaction. He found that workers were more satisfied with a supervisor who was understanding and helpful (as cited in Bass, 1981). Frederick Herzberg (1959), psychologist and researcher studied job satisfaction because he believed higher satisfaction led to higher productivity, decreased absenteeism, and better working relations. He found that positive feelings about work, a sense of personal worth, and a sense of personal fulfillment were related to achievement and responsibility.

Lumsden (1998) reported on job satisfaction among teachers. Teachers identified administrative support, leadership, good student behavior, a positive school atmosphere, and teacher autonomy as factors associated with higher job satisfaction. Parental support and workplace conditions were also positively related to job satisfaction. Salaries and benefits were found to be weakly related to job satisfaction.

Factors affecting teacher job satisfaction are intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic factors come from daily interactions with students, feeling of successful learning outcomes, relationships with coworkers. Teachers enter the teaching profession for intrinsic factors. Very few teachers enter the profession for extrinsic factors such as salary, benefits, or prestige (Choy, et al. 1993).

Teacher satisfaction has been linked to attrition. A study by Bobbitt et al. (1994) found that twenty percent of teachers who left the profession in the 1990-91 school year cited salary, inadequate support from administration, and poor student motivation to learn, as primary reasons for leaving. Salary may seem a primary reason for teachers leaving the profession, but researchers have found limited impact of high salaries and merit pay in increasing satisfaction. In fact, low salaries can be associated with increased organizational commitment, because teachers find other reasons to justify remaining in their position.

A study in Florida (Hall, 1987) revealed that thirty-one percent of respondents planned to quit teaching. This percentage did not include those who were planning on retiring. The reason cited for lack of satisfaction with the career was the working conditions. These individuals were also found to be more negative about education and more involved in professional organizations than other teachers in the study.

The United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1997) conducted a study on teacher job satisfaction. Included in this study were elementary and secondary teachers, from both the public and private sector. The report focused on workplace conditions, school safety, and parent and administrator support.

The findings of the report were that workplace conditions are strongly associated with teacher job satisfaction. Salary and benefits were found to be important to teachers, but was only weakly related to teacher job satisfaction. This was even less significant at private schools, where the salaries tended to be lower. At all schools and at each level, focusing on workplace conditions such as a safe working environment, supportive administration, and involved parents, can increase teacher job satisfaction. The factors which were more strongly associated with teacher job satisfaction were parental support, student behavior, principal interaction, staff recognition, teacher participation in school decision-making, influence over school policy, and control in the

classroom. Principal interaction and supportive administration was defined by teachers in the survey as "being recognized for a job well-done."

As noted in chapter one, higher satisfaction leads to a higher likelihood of staying in the profession. Lower satisfaction is linked to a greater likelihood of leaving. A study in North Carolina (Simmons, 1996) revealed that one-third of all the state's teachers leave the teaching profession within five years. In the same state, Feuer (1995) noted that attrition is highest for new teachers. He cited a report by the Professional Practices Commission to the State Board of education that noted the two primary reasons for the high teacher attrition were low salaries and inadequate training.

Also in North Carolina, Konanc (1996) studied the problem of teacher attrition. He found that there is a loss of 15-18 percent of teachers after their first year of teaching. He also found that teachers with higher scores on the National Teacher Examination were more likely to leave. He concluded that the state had a problem retaining the better-qualified teachers.

Pisciotta (1997) examined the results of the 1996 Texas Performance Review. This review stated that in Texas, half of the teachers quit within their first five years of teaching. The three most commonly stated reasons were poor working conditions, lack of student discipline, and low salaries. The state officials implemented new policies based on these results. They included improving teacher compensation, improving the work environment, and a school choice plan that allowed parents to choose between public and private schools.

Similar studies occurred nationally. Surveys conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (1994) and from the National Education Association (NEA) (2001) cited inadequate administrative support, and incompetent and uncooperative administrators as the main reasons for the high rate of teacher attrition in the United States. Karge (1993) studied other national statistics. He focused on the working conditions as they related to teacher attrition.

These conditions included administrative support, enforcement of rules, resources, student achievement, and workload. The variables most associated with a teacher's decision to leave the profession were lack of administrative support and inadequate resources.

According to the National Education Association (2001), attrition, retirement, increased student enrollment, and an emphasis on smaller class size are the main reasons the nation's schools will need two million teachers in the next 11 years. Low unemployment rates and other careers offering higher salaries compound the problem. The NEA projects that there will be a 20% increase in the need for preschool and kindergarten teachers, a 10% increase in the need for elementary teachers and a 9% increase in the need for special education teachers between now and 2006. The teaching shortage will have an effect on student achievement when schools lack qualified teachers.

Derlin and Schneider (1994) studied job satisfaction of both principals and teachers. In their research, they found that, in urban areas, job satisfaction was most affected by teacher school climate and working conditions. In suburban areas, the most important factor was teacher involvement and empowerment. Winter and Sweeney (1994) also found that climate affects satisfaction. They identified areas in which administrators could focus on in order to improve climate. These were recognizing achievement, supporting teachers, encouragement, caring, and fairly enforcing school rules.

Anderman et al. (1991) studied both school culture and principal leadership and its effect on job satisfaction. Data was collected, for three studies, from 758 teachers in three states. The analysis of the first study showed that accomplishment, recognition, and affiliations were related to satisfaction. The second study showed that different behaviors of the principal created different cultures in the school. The last study showed that principals' leadership behavior

fostered different perceptions of teachers on school culture, and also in teacher satisfaction and commitment.

Several studies were conducted on the relationship between the principal's communication skills and their effect on job satisfaction. Meyers (1985, as cited by Smith, 2000), concluded that it is important for principals to communicate effectively, as well as handle conflict. Teachers were most satisfied with principals who could handle conflicting demands of two or more individuals, through effective communication. A similar study by Holder (1984, as cited by Smith, 2000), found that teaching staffs with a high level of satisfaction, perceived their principal to have a "low level of aloofness, an average level of production emphasis, a high level of trust, and a high level of consideration" (p.28). Whaley (1994, as cited by Smith, 2000), reported results of a study that showed a strong relationship between principal communication and job satisfaction. This was especially true in areas of feedback, rewards, and support.

Leadership Theories And Leadership Styles

Situational leadership

This section focuses on the aspects of situational leadership. Other leadership styles are discussed in the literature review, along with an explanation of why those styles are not a part of this study. Hersey and Blanchard (1976) first developed the model of situational leadership in 1976. They defined leadership style as "a constant pattern of behavior which the leader exhibits, as perceived by others, when she/he is attempting to influence the activities of the group" (p.34). Hersey and Blanchard believed that there is not a particular leadership style that is more effective than another is, rather the effective style of leadership is contingent upon the situation. The situational leadership model consisted of four quadrants characterizing basic leadership styles, namely (1) high task/low relationship, or "telling", (2) high task/high relationship, or "selling",

(3) high relationship/low task, or "participating", and (4) low relationship/low task, or "delegating".

The leadership model integrates the leadership model with the situation. The focus of the model is the combination of the amount of direction (task behavior) provided by the leader and the amount of emotional support (relationship behavior) provided by the leader and the task-specific maturity displayed by the followers.

To determine a principal's leadership style, a LEAD-Other instrument (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) is used. Subordinates answer questions based upon the leader's actions in different scenarios. The quadrant in which most of the responses fall identifies the leadership style. The more the respondent's choices reflect an equal distribution among the four styles, the more effective is the leader.

Hersey and Blanchard (1976) introduce the concept of adaptability. This requires the leader to assess the maturity level of the followers for a specific situation. The maturity is the ability and willingness of the followers to take responsibility for completing a task. The leader then uses the appropriate style based upon the level of maturity. As the level of the maturity of the followers increases in relation to a specific task, the leaders should reduce task behavior and increase relationship behavior. As a high level of maturity is reached, the level of relationship behavior is not needed to be as high. Mature followers see this increase in delegation as an indication of trust and confidence in their abilities.

For example, a new teacher, with little experience, would be unfamiliar with the evaluation process or how a school system requires a teacher to improve teaching skills. The principal would initially use the directing style, informing the teacher of expectations and procedures. Frequent visits to the classroom with feedback of the observations would occur.

When the teacher demonstrates a moderate level of understanding, the principal would give the teacher increased responsibility. Discussions may center on a self-identified area of weakness. The teacher and the principal would determine a course of action, with the final decision of what is to be done made by the principal.

If the increased responsibility were handled well, the principal would reduce directions given and increase support until the teacher takes on more responsibility in the process of improving instruction. The level of direction would not decrease; it would now stem from the teacher's self-perceptions of strengths and weaknesses. The principal would continue leaving the teacher more and more alone. It is not that the principal is not concerned about the teacher, but that less observable behavior of the principal is needed with a mature, self-directed teacher.

Walter, Caldwell, and Marshall (1980) looked for evidence for validity of situational leadership in schools. They found LEAD to be an effective tool to measure leadership style. Also in their findings was evidence that flexible and balanced use of task and relationship behaviors is beneficial for productivity and satisfaction.

Bulach and Lunenberg (1995) studied principal leadership style and its influence on school climate and student achievement. They utilized the Leadership Behavioral Matrix to measure principal leadership style, the Tennessee School Climate Inventory to measure school climate, and the California Test of Basic Skills to measure student achievement. They stated a null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference between leadership style and school climate, or student achievement. The null hypothesis was supported by the research, one particular leadership style was not found to be more effective than another. This supports the theory that leadership is situational and the best leadership style depends on the maturity of the staff.

<u>Task and relationship-motivated leadership styles</u>

Leadership styles, as described below, are similar to Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership model. These styles were rejected as part of this study because each lacked a clear, concise, measurement tool to address one's leadership style.

Research from Ohio State University in the 1950's (as cited in Schein, 1970) led to the development of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). This instrument has been used in studies of effective leadership in education. LBDQ contains fifteen items pertaining to the leader's consideration and fifteen pertaining to the leader's initiating behavior. Respondents choose how often the leader engages in a specified behavior. The behaviors are centered around consideration and initiating structure. Consideration refers to behaviors indicative of friendship, trust, respect and warmth. Initiating structure refers to behavior in delineating the relationship between the leader and the followers in order to establish patterns of organization, channels of communication, and procedures. These definitions are given by Halpin and Winer (as cited in Hanson, 1996). These two behaviors can be compared to task behavior and relationship behavior, as discussed by Hersey and Blanchard (1976).

Studies conducted at the University of Michigan in 1945 (as cited in Schein, 1970) identified two concepts of leadership, employee oriented and production oriented. Likert (1961) used this as a base to study the styles of high producing managers, compared to the styles used by low producing managers. The high-producing managers focused on the human side of management. They worked on building effective teams, or work groups. Managers who focused on productivity did not have good performance records. Likert studies show, again, that the general pattern of leadership includes task behavior and relationship behavior.

Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Theory of Leadership builds on Halpin and Winer's work. He also stated that a leader either possesses a relationship motivated or a task-motivated

leadership style. The effectiveness depends on the relationship between the style and the degree to which the groups enables the leader to lead. Relationship-motivated style is one in which the leader gains power through the development of interpersonal relationships. This is similar to Halpin's consideration factor. The task-motivated leader focuses on the task and gains satisfaction from performing the task. This is similar to Halpin's initiating structure factor.

These themes continued as Furtwengler and Hurst (1992) studied leadership and quality schools. They concluded that effective leadership must include both factors. The leader must have the necessary administrative skills to provide structure for the group, as well as human relation skills of consideration and acceptance.

Evans and Teddlie (1993) studied leadership style and school effectiveness in different socio-economic status (SES) settings. The leadership style focused on was the Change Facilitator Style of Principal (CFSP). This included behaviors such as goal setting, vision, managing change, decision making, and structuring the leadership role. Results showed that principals with a manager style were more effective in middle SES schools than those with an initiating style. One conclusion was that the Change Facilitator Style could be useful when assigning a principal to a school that needed a certain style.

The Influence of Principal Leadership Style

Principal leadership style and teacher effectiveness

Clark (1998) attempted to answer the question of what kind of leadership style does a leader employ in the field of education? He defined three common leadership styles. These were authoritarian, participative, and delegative. Using the authoritarian style, a leader specifically

tells teachers what to do and how to do it. A participative style leader involves teacher in making decisions on what needs to be done, and how to do it. A delegative style leader allows the teachers to make the decisions. Clark found that a good leader uses all three styles, depending on the situation and the teachers involved. This finding is important because it supports Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership theories in that an effective leader must analyze each situation and the players involved when determining the style of leadership to employ.

A similar investigation by Greenblatt, Cooper, and Muth (1984) asked teachers to complete a 'Profile of the School' questionnaire to assess the principal's leadership style. The result put the schools studied into four groups, Authoritarian, Consultative-Centralized, Consultative-Decentralized, and Participative. Schools in the Consultative-Centralized were found to have the most effective teaching, and the Authoritarian group was found to be least effective. The Consultation approach was most directly associated with effective teaching. Greenblatt, et. al. and Clark both concluded that a principal should consult teachers, yet make the final decision alone. Hersey and Blanchard also utilized input from subordinates to determine the leadership style. This can be found in the LEAD-other questionnaire.

Principal leadership style and student achievement

Heck and Marcoulides (1993) studied instructional leadership and estimated its effect on school achievement. Using questionnaires, completed by teachers, they measured 22 strategic behavioral interactions between principals and teachers. These behaviors were based on the principal's instructional leadership role in governing the school, developing school climate and organizing and monitoring the instructional program. Their study found that the way principals govern the school, build strong climate, and monitor school instruction are important predictors of academic achievement. The teachers' perceptions on the way that the principal governs the

school are strongly related to the principal's role in building a school climate. Climate was then found to have a small positive relationship in explaining school achievement. This is important to the current study because it focuses on teacher perception, as does the determining of leadership style, using the LEAD-Other. It is also important because job satisfaction is connected to school climate. A higher level of job satisfaction leads to a more positive school climate.

Sagor (1992) studied the relationship between leadership style, school culture and student achievement. This was done through a case study of three principals. The first principal used a nurturing, supportive approach and was known for developing teachers into leadership roles. The teachers received support, encouragement, and assistance from the principal. They expressed satisfaction with their jobs and the principal's leadership. Student achievement was high, as were faculty morale and parent support. The second principal was energetic, charismatic, and supportive. This principal believed in shared-decision making, and setting high expectations for teachers and students. Teachers were willing to put in extra hours on projects to benefit the students. Student test scores improved and morale was high. The third principal was self-assured, direct and personable. He worked in the summer with custodians to prepare the school for the new school year; he coached a basketball team of students who did not have the athletic ability to make the school team. The new teachers hired, as well as the veteran teachers were involved in decision making. When a decision on tracking proposed two different opinions, he asked thought-provoking questions and offered research on the effectiveness of tracking and heterogeneously grouped classes. At the end of his first year, the principal was well liked and respected. Decisions were based on sound research, made in the students' best interests. These examples illustrate a connections between leadership style, teacher morale and student achievement. This connection is important in justifying the purpose of the study. It is necessary for principals to be aware of leadership style, as it may effect student achievement.

Andrews and Soder (1987), in Seattle Washington, studied principal leadership and student achievement over a two year period. They used a questionnaire to assess the level of interactions between principals and teachers, in terms of the principal as a resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence. This was compared to academic gains by all students, gains based on ethnicity, and according to free lunch status. The leaders who were strong instructional leaders, as perceived by teachers, had greater gains in reading and math score than those perceived to have a weak or average principal. The results were the same for Black students, and students eligible for free lunch. Hersey and Blanchard (1976) based the determination of leadership style on the perception of subordinates. Principals can use the results of the study and of the surveys to find if they are perceived as strong instructional leaders, thus leading to greater gains in scores.

A study on student achievement and leadership style in small rural schools in New Mexico (Edington, 1988) arrived at similar results. Student achievement, as measured by the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), was studied in relationship to the principal's rating on participation, role clarification, supervision, and charismatic leadership. The results showed a positive relationship between the perception of charismatic leadership and CTBS scores. There was a negative relationship between perception of principal role clarification and CTBS scores. This is important because again, it is the teachers' perception that was connected to test scores. This study will also use the teachers' perception of the principals' style.

Schmitt (1990) also compared CTBS scores to principal leadership style. He identified two styles: initiators and managers. Initiators developed long-term goals, set high expectations, provided support, and implemented staff development. Managers supported faculty efforts to change the school, helped analyze test results, analyzed teaching techniques, and demonstrated responsive behavior. Schmitt concluded that leadership style affected student achievement in

reading and math. Principals who were managers tended to have students with higher scores in reading and math, than principals who were initiators. This study will help principals identify their style and will be able to determine if they are managers or initiators. For those who need to improve test scores, managerial behaviors will be beneficial.

Principal leadership style and change

Davidson and Dell (1996) studied the relationship of principal leadership style on school restructuring. The restructuring was created to improve student achievement. The project, in its second year, was implemented by one principal the first year, and another the second year. The first principal worked from the central office on the project and was therefore absent from the school often. There was not a sense of unity or empowerment at the school. There was little communication with the teachers and many teachers reported distention. In the second year, the principal applied the project's philosophy at the school level. She was supportive, treated the teachers as professionals, and gave opportunities for redesigning the curriculum. Davidson and Dell concluded that the principal's relationship was the key element in the success of the project. This study will also focus on the principals' relationships with teachers. Identifying the relationship will be important in initiating change.

Delaney (1995) studied factors that effected school improvement. Through case studies, he found that in order for school-based management and school improvement to be successful, the principal must be a strong, dedicated leader. Delaney stated that the leadership style of the principal is the primary factor contributing to a successful relationship between school-based management and school leadership. These findings are important to the current study as they add significance to the study of leadership styles.

Principal leadership style and school effectiveness

Due to national, state and local emphasis on accountability, school principals often must make decision on what to do about student achievement. With the introduction of statewide tests, there is a benchmark against which all schools in New Jersey can be compared. Students in New Jersey are tested with the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) at the fourth grade, the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment (GEPA) at the eighth grade and the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) before graduating high school. The problem escalates as the media advertises results, and prints the percentage of students who scored in each of the three areas, advanced proficient, proficient, and partially proficient. This publicity puts pressure on principals, particularly if their students are not performing well. Although this study will not look at leadership style and students performance, it is important to examine the literature since the goal of schools is student success.

Evans (1996) studied the relationship between elementary use of transformational leadership strategies and social organizational factors associated with effective schools. Eighteen elementary principals and their teachers' perceptions utilizing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and a School Organizational factors Questionnaire. All schools were within the district in southwest Michigan. Evans concluded that achieving school improvements that improve a school's effectiveness is related to the principal's leadership style. Principals with high transformational leadership behaviors had higher social organization than those principals with low transformational behaviors. Again, this finding is relevant to the current study, to determine if a participating leadership style is the style to choose to increase teacher job satisfaction, and school effectiveness.

Dow and Oakley (1992) studied the effect of leadership style on school effectiveness. They utilized Fiedler's Contingency Theory which maintains that different situations require

different leadership styles. A combination of the principal leadership style and the favorableness of the situation determine group effectiveness. Favorableness is determined by the interpersonal relationship between the leader and the members, the structure of the task, and the leader's position power.

Effective schools were defined as those that had strong leadership, high expectations for student achievement, a system for monitoring student progress, a positive climate, well defined goals, and strong community relations. Principals completed surveys on staff and staff completed surveys on school effectiveness. The results of the study did not support Fiedler's theory that group performance is contingent on the appropriate matching of leadership style.

The findings of this study are significant to the current study. This study utilized Fiedler's Contingency Theory, which is similar to Hersey and Blanchard's (1976) theory of situational leadership. The instrument used to measure teacher job satisfaction was the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale (LPC), as it applies to schools. Dow and Oakley scrutinized this instrument. They suggested utilizing an alternative model to determine the relationship between leadership style and school effectiveness. This study will use a different, but similar theory. Hersey and Blanchard's theory states that leadership style must constantly change to the situation, Fiedler's theory promotes a match between the members and the leaders, instead of style to specific situations.

Patrick (1995) studied the relationship between administrative style and school climate. He surveyed teachers in a graduate program in the Chicago area. He found statistically significant correlation between school climate and principal administrative style, principal gender, teachers' years of experience and teaching position. The study was unable to compare survey answers within a school because it surveyed graduate students, working in different areas. The current study will focus on specific schools and will determine consistency of answers.

<u>Principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction</u>

Previous dissertations and formal studies have used the LEAD-Other (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979), as this study will. Perkins (1991) conducted a study in North Carolina on teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership style and its effect on job satisfaction. The LEAD-Other instrument was used to measure the principals' leadership style and Mendenhall's Job Satisfaction survey was used to measure teacher job satisfaction. Analysis of variance, correlation, and multiple regression procedures were used to analyze the responses from 339 teachers. He found that although leadership style did not significantly contribute to overall satisfaction, teachers were more satisfied with principals who were perceived as "selling", or high task/high relationship. Teachers were least satisfied with principals who were perceived as "delegating," or low task/low relationship. He also reported that teachers' overall job satisfaction were not affected by other variables tested, including teacher gender, principal gender, years of experience, and level of the school. It was recommended for districts to find ways to improve salaries, increase community involvement, and develop principal skills in the area of task and relationship behaviors. The current study will follow similar methodology, but utilize teachers in a different setting, suburban schools in New Jersey. It will focus on areas in which salaries and community involvement are not pressing issues, so that these variables might be eliminated, leaving a more effective study of principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

Smith (2000) studied the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, also in North Carolina. Smith used the LEAD-Other instrument (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) to measure the principal leadership style and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System's Teacher Survey to determine the level of teacher job satisfaction.

Results were similar to Perkins (1991). Teachers, who perceived their principals as "selling", or high task/high relationship, were most satisfied with their jobs. Smith suggested a similar study to be conducted using a larger sample size in order to support or negate the findings, as well as to utilize principal gender in the study. Similar studies could also help districts determine if leadership style could help with the selection and training of principals. The current research will utilize suburban areas in New Jersey, again eliminating many of the factors that influence large, urban districts such as salaries, facilities and community support. Principal gender will also be addressed.

Davis and Wilson (2000) conducted a study to determine the relationship between teacher empowerment and teacher job satisfaction and motivation. Their study is significant to the current study because the participating style of leadership, as discussed by Hersey and Blanchard (1976), is an empowering style of leadership. If empowering has a significant, positive effect on teacher job satisfaction, it could also mean that the participating style of leadership would be more connected to job satisfaction than the other styles.

Davis and Wilson (2000) tried to determine if there is a significant relationship between principal empowering behavior and teacher motivation, job satisfaction, and stress. Teachers at thirty-one schools in Washington were surveyed and relationships were computed using the Pearson correlation analysis. Their results showed a significant relationship between principal empowering behavior and teacher motivation. Principal empowering behaviors were not found related to job satisfaction or job stress. These results are important to the current study as they may show that the delegating leadership style is not the most significantly related style to teacher job satisfaction.

Bogler (1999) studied leadership style of principals, principal decision-making strategy, and teachers' perceptions of their occupation, and the effect on teacher job satisfaction. He

utilized the theory of transformational and transactional leadership. Studying teacher job satisfaction is based on the research by Heller, Clay and Perkins (1993). They suggested that schools must give more attention to increasing job satisfaction. Maeroff (as cited by Bogler, 1999) claimed that job satisfaction is positively related to participative decision-making and transformational leadership. . He surveyed 930 teachers in schools in northern Israel, using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to determine the principal's leadership style and a job satisfaction questionnaire utilized in Israel to determine the level of job satisfaction. Bogler found that teachers felt highly satisfied when their work gave them a sense of self-esteem provided them with opportunities for self-development, gave them a feeling of success, and allowed them to participate in determining school activities.

The findings of Bogler's (1999) study are important to the current study. Bogler looked at several factors that might impact job satisfaction and found all of them to be positively related to job satisfaction. All three factors are also part of situational leadership. If his findings in Israel hold true in the current study, a participating leadership style will be found to be most related to teacher job satisfaction.

Benit (1991) also studied the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The LEAD-Other instrument (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) was used to measure principal leadership style and the Purdue Teacher Questionnaire was used to measure teacher job satisfaction. This study consisted of 484 public school teachers and 27 building principals in the Detroit, Michigan area. Principals were classified according to Hersey and Blanchard's (1976) four leadership styles. The study found that principal leadership style does affect teacher job satisfaction. Job satisfaction had a high positive correlation with "selling" or high task/high relationship, as well as "participating," or low task/high relationship. The leadership style of delegating was perceived to be the least beneficial to teacher job satisfaction.

Age, gender, educational level, years of experience, size of school, or number of in-service days did not significantly affect teacher job satisfaction over the past five years. The current study will follow a very similar research path, limiting several factors that may interfere with the research, such as type of school and socioeconomic grouping. A recommendation was made to study student outcomes at schools with a high level of teacher job satisfaction. Again, the current study will follow similar procedures, in a different setting, thus eliminating issues in urban areas that might effect teacher job satisfaction.

Zigrang's (2000) study explored the relationship between teacher personality and teachers' perception of their principal's leadership style and how that relationship affects teacher job satisfaction. Teachers, who were graduate students, completed a Leader Behavior Questionnaire, the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator, and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The study found there to be a statistically significant positive relationship between a consideration style of leadership and teacher job satisfaction

Several studies were conducted using the LEAD-Other (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) study to examine the relationship between principal leadership style and student achievement. Lewis (1983, as cited by Smith, 2000), found that principals' leadership style were significantly related to low-income students' test scores. Hardie (1992, as cited by Smith, 2000) found that there was little relationship between principal leadership style and student reading achievement, but there was a relationship between the leadership style and mathematics achievement.

Gallimer (1992) studied the effectiveness of principal leadership style on teacher motivation. The study utilized the Teacher Morale Survey, developed by the American Federation of Teachers. He found that there was not a difference in motivational level between teachers who work under a transactional administrator and those who work under laissez-faire or

dictatorial administrators. His study concluded that there is not one best leadership style in terms of motivating teachers. However, he suggested that research be continued utilizing a different instrument and sampling different levels of education, such as elementary, middle, or high school. This study will utilize a different instrument, the LEAD-Other survey (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979).

Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature on the influence of leadership style. Teachers are more effective when the principal includes them in the decision making process. Students have higher levels of achievement when the principal uses leadership abilities in organizing the school, building a positive climate, and monitoring the school instruction. The principal's relationship with teachers is important in restructuring the school and initiating change. School-based management is effective when there is a positive relationship between the principal and the teachers. Principals with transformational leadership style are associated with effective schools. Principals with the leadership style of 'participating' or 'selling' were found to have teachers with a higher level of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was found to be more influenced by principal leadership style than other factors such as age of the principal, gender of the principal, years of experience of the teacher or the type of school. Empowering teachers was found to be related to teacher job satisfaction, teacher motivation, and self-esteem.

This study will determine if there is a relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. It will focus on schools that are similar in order to minimize outside factors that may confuse the findings. If one style of leadership is found more related to job satisfaction, it would be beneficial for principals in similar settings to use that particular style. Chapter III will discuss the methodology used to determine this relationship.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

This study was designed to determine if there is a relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Smith (2000) and Benit (1991) also studied principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Smith's study included an instrument on teacher job satisfaction that consisted of three questions. This current study will utilize a more thorough instrument for teacher job satisfaction. Benit's study utilized a job satisfaction instrument that consisted of one hundred questions. He stated that there was limited response from teachers, perhaps because the survey took a considerable amount of time to complete. This current study will utilize a job satisfaction instrument that will be more 'user friendly' to teachers. Data on principal leadership style came from administering the LEAD-Other to participating teachers. This questionnaire was developed by Hersey and Blanchard based on their situational leadership model. This chapter discusses the population, the instrumentation, the sampling procedures and data collection, and the analysis procedures.

Population

This study focused on elementary schools in Morris County, New Jersey, in District Factor Groupings of GH, I or J, in which the principal had been at the school at least one complete year. The decision to limit the principal sample to those who had been at the site for at least one complete year was to ensure they had time to affect teacher job satisfaction. Out of the twenty-four districts in DFG GH, I or J, twenty districts had elementary schools with principals in at least their second year. Nine superintendents agreed to allow their principals to be contacted to participate in this study. This accounted for thirty eligible elementary schools. Of this thirty, twenty-three principals agreed to participate after receiving the informed consent

letter. After collecting the questionnaires, nineteen schools had usable data. Out of 396 teachers, 251 completed the questionnaires for a return rate of 63%.

Instruments

This purpose of this study was to ascertain if there is a relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The research was conducted using a descriptive/correlational design. In this study, leadership style, as perceived by the teachers, was the independent variable and teacher job satisfaction was the dependent variable. Demographics of the principal were also independent variables. Since this study was correlational, the findings should not be used to determine cause-effect relationships.

The methodology of this study will utilize the following instruments to collect data:

Hersey and Blanchard's (1976) Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description - Other (LEAD-Other).

Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1994)

Principal Demographic Questions

Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description – Other (LEAD-Other).

The Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD-Other) is an instrument developed by Hersey and Blanchard in the 1970's to determine leadership effectiveness, as perceived by subordinates, peers, or superiors. It was developed as a method for leaders to receive feedback of effectiveness. The LEAD-Other was chosen because it is the instrument Hersey and Blanchard developed to determine leadership style, based on their situational leadership model. This study will examine principal leadership style using the situational leadership model.

Hersey and Blanchard (1976) defined leadership style as the pattern of behavior a leader exhibits, as perceived by others. In this study, teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership style will be ascertained using the LEAD-Other. Since this study focused only on the perceptions of the teacher, no attempt was made to analyze the maturity, or the ability and readiness to take responsibility, of the followers.

The LEAD-Other instrument (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) describes twelve situations and four possible behaviors of a leader in each situation. The teacher is asked to select the behavior he/she thinks the principal would choose if faced with the given situation. Each possible alternative reflects the following combinations of task-relationship behavior:

1. High task/low relationship, or style 1 (quadrant 1), also known as "telling".

2. High task/high relationship, or style 2 (quadrant 2), also known as "selling"

3. High relationship/low task, or style 3 (quadrant 3), also known as "participating"

4. Low relationship/low task, or style 4 (quadrant 4), also known as "delegating"

The four leadership styles are described as follows:

1. Telling - This style of leader provides specific instruction, defines roles of followers, and closely supervises them.

2. Selling - This style of leader explains decisions and attempts to get the followers to 'buy into' the decision made.

3. Participating - This style of leader shares the decision making process with followers. These followers have the ability and knowledge to complete tasks.

4. Delegating - This style of leader gives the responsibility of decision making to the followers. The followers are high in maturity and are willing to take responsibility for directing their own behavior.

Selection of an action in each of the twelve situations yields one of four scores. Each score corresponds to one of four leadership style quadrants and describe the leader's style. The dominant leadership style was defined as that quadrant where the majority of responses fell.

(High)	High Relationship/ Low Task	High Task/ High Relationship
Relationship Behavior		
(Low)	Low Relationship Low Task	High Task Low Relationship

(Low) ----------------------Task Behavior----------------------(High)

Figure 1. Leadership Styles (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p.96)

Validity of the LEAD, which includes the LEAD-Other and the LEAD-Self (a questionnaire the leader completes based on opinion of his/her own behavior), is based on responses from a sample of 264 managers, in North America.   The contingency coefficient was .71 and was significant ($p=.01$). The LEAD scores remained stable over time, suggesting that the user may rely on the result as a consistent measure. Benit (1991) and Perkins (1991) used the LEAD-Other in their research on principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. They stated that the reliability of the LEAD—Other showed an internal consistency of 0.81. Validity studies have been conducted at the Center for Leadership Studies.

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

Paul E. Spector (1994) created the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) to assess employee attitudes about the job and aspects of the job. It consists of 36 questions about nine areas of

satisfaction. These areas are Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication. Each area is assessed with four questions and a total score is computed using all thirty-six questions.

Respondents are asked to rate each item, with six choices per item ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The items are written in two directions, some positive, and some negative. The survey is scored by assigning a number to each answer, one representing strongest disagreement, to six representing strongest agreement. The negatively worded items are reversed scored, one representing the strongest agreement to six representing the strongest disagreement. Scores in each area can range from one to twenty-four. The total scores on the JSS range from 36 to 216. High scores on the scale represent high job satisfaction.

The Job Satisfaction Survey was chosen for this study for its ease of use by respondents. Benit (2000) stated that he did not receive a large number of responses, probably due to the length of the survey used. Benit's survey, the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire consisted of 100 questions and took over thirty minutes to complete. He surmised, from the lack of response, that teachers were too busy to complete a lengthy survey. The JSS is also a more current instrument.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1994) was also chosen because of the norms available and the internal consistency. Spector used a sample size of 25,321. Means for each area, as well as total score were available. Norms wee also available for the public sector, where sample size was 15,666. The internal consistency (coefficient alpha) for the total score was .91. Individual consistency were also considered when selecting this instrument. The supervision facet had a reliability of .82. This is particularly important because it is the area most related to this study.

Demographic Questions

The following demographic characteristics of the principal were asked using survey type questions:

1. Age

2. Gender

3. Race/ethnicity

4. Total principal experience

5. Principal experience in the present school

6. Highest degree completed

The demographic questions were limited to these because they have been identified as predominant themes based on the literature. The research used elementary schools in District Factor groupings of GH, I, or J, in Morris County, New Jersey. A more homogeneous sample was sought because results from other studies, (e.g. Benit, Smith, and Perkins) were difficult to interpret when they included variable such as level of the school and socio-economic status of the district. Socio-economic status of the district seemed to be connected to dissatisfaction with school facilities, perhaps because of lack of funds.

Data Collection Procedures

Twenty-four school districts were identified in District Factor grouping GH, I or J in Morris County, New Jersey. Twenty districts had elementary schools with principals in at least their second year. Nine superintendents agreed to allow their principals to be contacted to participate in this study. This accounted for thirty eligible elementary schools.

A letter of solicitation was sent to the principals of the schools eligible for this study. A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix A. The letter asked for permission for the school to be used in the study. Twenty-three principals who were willing to participate provided answers to the demographic data questions (Appendix A). Questionnaires and informed consent letters

were distributed to teachers in each school (Appendix B). A box was placed in a central location in the school for surveys to be returned. The box was collected after sufficient time was given to complete the questionnaires.

Data Analysis Procedures

The Lead-Other surveys (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) were scored and a frequency distribution table was created to determine the frequency of the four leadership styles (telling, selling, participating, and delegating). Each school was classified into one of the four groups based upon the principal's leadership profile.

The job satisfaction surveys were scored individually. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the effect of principal age, total years of principal experience, principal experience in the present school, highest degree completed, and principal leadership style on the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total score of job satisfaction, and the style adaptability score. ANOVA tests whether differences exist among population means. T-tests were used to analyze differences between gender and the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total score of job satisfaction, and the style adaptability score. Since all of the principals were White, race/ethnicity was eliminated from the study. Cross tabulations and post-hoc Tukey tests were used to determine the prominent level of each area of satisfaction, the total satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score.

The data analysis was divided into two sections. The first section analyzed the demographic data and the second section focused on the research questions on leadership style.

Summary

This chapter provided information on the research design, the population, sampling, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis included in the study of the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The populations consisted of 19 principals and 251 teachers from 19 schools where the principal had been at the same site for at least one complete year. The instruments used were the LEAD-Other, the Job Satisfaction Survey, and demographic surveys. ANOVA, t-tests, and frequency distribution were used to analyze the data. The following chapter will present the analyses of the data.

CHAPTER IV

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study that analyzed the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Three types of data were collected in this study. Data on principal leadership style came from administering the LEAD-Other to participating teachers. Data on teacher job satisfaction was obtained from administering the Job Satisfaction Survey to the same participating teachers. Demographic data on principals was collected through questionnaires. This chapter, which will examine and analyze the data, is divided into four sections: Description of the Sample, Analyses of Instrument Data, Results of Analyses of Data, and Summary.

Description of the Sample

This study focused on elementary schools in Morris County, New Jersey, in District Factor Groupings of GH, I or J, in which the principal had been at the school at least one year. Out of the twenty-four districts in DFG GH, I or J, twenty districts had elementary schools with principals in at least their second year. Nine superintendents agreed to allow their principals to be contacted to participate in this study. This accounted for thirty eligible elementary schools. Of this thirty, twenty-three principals agreed to participate after receiving the informed consent letter. After collecting the questionnaires, nineteen schools had usable data. Out of 396 teachers, 251 completed the questionnaires for a return rate of 63%.

Principals of participating schools were asked to indicate their age, gender, race, years of experience as principal, years of experience at the present school and highest degree received. A copy of the principal demographic questions can be found in Appendix A. A summary of the data can be found in Tables 1 - 5.

Age: Principals were asked to give the range their age fell into. Three principals were 26 – 35 years old. Two principals were 36 – 45 years old. Nine principals were 46 – 55 years old. Four principals were 56 – 65 years old. One principal was over 65.

Gender: Ten of the principals were males and nine were females.

Race: All of the nineteen participating principals were white.

Principal Experience: Principals were asked the number of years of experience as a principal. Eight principals had two or three years of experience. Four principals had between four and ten years of experience. Three principals had between eleven and fifteen years of experience. Two had between sixteen and twenty years of experience, and two had over twenty years of experience.

Principal experience at present school: Seven principals were in their second year at the present school. Six had been at the present school between three and five years. Five had been at the present school between six and ten years. One had been at the present school for more than ten years.

Highest degree completed: Principals were asked the highest degree earned. Seventeen had completed a Masters degree. Of these seventeen, seven had a Masters degree plus at least thirty credits towards a doctorate degree. Five described themselves as, 'all but dissertation'. Two of the principals have earned a doctorate degree.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution for Principal Age

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	26-35	3	15.8	15.8	15.8
	36-45	2	10.5	10.5	26.3
	46-55	9	47.4	47.4	73.7
	55-65	4	21.1	21.1	94.7
	65+	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0	

Table 2

Frequency Distribution for Principal Gender

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	female	9	47.4	47.4	47.4
	male	10	52.6	52.6	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0	

Table 3

Frequency Distribution for Principal Experience

Principal Experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2-3 years	8	42.1	42.1	42.1
	4-10 years	4	21.1	21.1	63.2
	11-15 years	3	15.8	15.8	78.9
	16-20 years	2	10.5	10.5	89.5
	20+ years	2	10.5	10.5	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0	

Table 4

Frequency Distribution for Principal Experience in Present School

Principal Experience in Present School

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 2 years	7	36.8	36.8	36.8
	3-5 years	6	31.6	31.6	68.4
	6-10 years	5	26.3	26.3	94.7
	10+ years	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0	

Table 5

Frequency Distribution for Highest Degree Earned

Highest degree earned

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MA	4	21.1	21.1	21.1
	MA + 30	8	42.1	42.1	63.2
	ABD	5	26.3	26.3	89.5
	EdD	2	10.5	10.5	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0	

Analysis of Instrument Data

LEAD-Other

The data on principal leadership style was obtained from the LEAD-Other instrument

(Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) administered to participating teachers. The LEAD-

Other was developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1976) to gather data on principals, based on the

situational leadership model. The LEAD-Other contains twelve leadership situations and asked

the respondents to choose, from four alternate actions, the one he/she believes the leader would

choose. The instrument measures the leadership style, the style range and the style adaptability. All will be discussed later in this chapter.

The LEAD-Other instrument (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) was validated based on responses from 264 managers in a North American sample. Twelve items validated for the adaptability scores ranged from .11 to .52, ten of the coefficients were .25 or higher. In two administrations over a six-week period, 75% of the managers demonstrated their dominant style and 71% maintained their alternate style. The contingency coefficients were both .71 and were significant (p=. 01). The LEAD-Other scores remained stable over time.

Validity studies have been conducted at the Center for Leadership Studies in California (1979) as well as by Benit (1991) and Perkins (1991). The reliability of the LEAD-Other showed internal consistency scores of 0.81 and 0.613, respectively.

The LEAD-Other questionnaire instrument (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) identifies a leader's primary leadership style and secondary leadership style. Hersey and Blanchard (1976) stated that all leaders have a primary style and most have a secondary style. The primary style is the behaviors one use most often when trying to influence others. All leaders demonstrate one pattern of behavior most often, their primary style.

The telling style of leadership gives instructions and supervises staff members closely. This is a high-task, low relationship style and is useful for followers with lower ability or motivation. The selling style of leadership explains decisions and solicits suggestions from followers, but continues to direct tasks. This style of leadership is useful for followers gaining confidence and competence, but still learning the responsibilities of the job. This is a high-task, high relationship style. It is effective with those who have sufficient motivation, but who lack skill development or ability. The participating leadership style of a leader makes decisions together with followers and supports their effort toward performing tasks. This style works well with highly creative followers when they come up with ideas but need help implementing them.

This style is effective with those who have ability, but are lower in motivation. The delegating style turns over decisions and responsibility to members of the group. This leadership style works well with followers who go above and beyond their instructions. This style is low-task and low relationship. It is effective for those who are highly motivated and display high ability.

The teachers, who completed the questionnaire, identified the leadership style of each principal. The majority of teachers at six of the nineteen schools identified their principal as Style 1/Telling. The majority of teachers at eight of the nineteen schools identified their principal as style 2/Selling. The majority of teachers at three of the nineteen schools identified their principal as Style 3/participating. The majority of teachers at two of the nineteen schools identified their principal as Style 4/delegating. This data is summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

Primary Leadership Style

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Telling	6	31.6	31.6	31.6
	Selling	8	42.1	42.1	73.7
	Participating	3	15.8	15.8	89.5
	Delegating	2	10.5	10.5	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0	

Teachers' responses on the LEAD-Other instrument (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) also provide a style frequency range for the principal. This style range indicates how flexible a principal is in varying his or her behavior. Each answer on the LEAD-Other corresponds to a quadrant. The quadrant with the most responses indicates the leadership style. Three or more responses in a given quadrant indicate a high degree of flexibility in the use of that leadership style. Two responses indicate a moderate degree of flexibility and one response

is not enough to indicate a pattern of behavior. These responses are transferred to a scale that depicts a style adaptability score.

Style adaptability is the degree that a leader appropriately varies the leadership style depending on the readiness level of the followers. The number of points is determined by how closely the alternate action matches the given situation. Style adaptability scores range from 0-36. Scores between 30 and 36 indicate a high degree of adaptability. This leader accurately considers the readiness level of the group and adjusts behavior accordingly. Scores between 24 and 29 indicate a moderate degree of adaptability. This leader will have a well-defined primary leadership style and have less flexibility using other styles. Scores between 0 and 23 indicate a low degree of adaptability. This leader seldom uses any style except the primary leadership style.

Job Satisfaction Survey

This study used the Job Satisfaction Survey developed by Paul S. Spector (1994). This survey poses 36 questions that are related to nine areas of job satisfaction. These areas include pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, communication, and a total job satisfaction score. Respondents are asked to read each item and choose from six responses. The response ranges from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Each sub-area is totaled, giving a possible score of 24 in each area. The closer the answer is to 24, the more satisfied the respondent is in that area. The sub-areas are totaled, giving a possible total of 216. The closer the total score is to this number, the higher the job satisfaction.

Results of the Analyses

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the effect of principal age, total years of principal experience, principal experience in the present school, highest degree completed, and principal leadership style on the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total score of job satisfaction, and the style adaptability score. ANOVA tests whether differences exist among population means. T-tests were used to analyze differences between gender and the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total score of job satisfaction, and the style adaptability score. Since all of the principals were white, race/ethnicity was eliminated from the study. Cross tabulations were used to determine the prominent level of each area of satisfaction, the total satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score.

The results of ANOVA on age and the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total score of job satisfaction, and the style adaptability score can be found in Table 7. This table shows that there is a significant effect of age on style adaptability. When determining the effect, using Cohen's rule (1988), the effect, the estimated difference among the population means, is 0.055. This is considered a medium effect. Approximately 5.5% of the variance in style adaptability can be explained by principal age.

Post-hoc Tukey tests were conducted on age and style adaptability. The results of these tests can be found in Table 8. The results indicate the age group 25-36, tended to have lower style adaptability scores than the age group 56-65. This mean difference is significant at $p < .05$.

Table 7

ANOVA - Age

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pay	Between Groups	128.615	4	32.154	1.360	.249
	Within Groups	5723.595	242	23.651		
	Total	5852.211	246			
Promotion	Between Groups	100.160	4	25.040	1.357	.250
	Within Groups	4465.694	242	18.453		
	Total	4565.854	246			
Supervision	Between Groups	151.541	4	37.885	1.830	.124
	Within Groups	5009.723	242	20.701		
	Total	5161.263	246			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	75.927	4	18.982	.919	.453
	Within Groups	4996.130	242	20.645		
	Total	5072.057	246			
Contingent Rewards	Between Groups	87.696	4	21.924	.883	.475
	Within Groups	6007.673	242	24.825		
	Total	6095.368	246			
Operating Conditions	Between Groups	13.001	4	3.250	.209	.933
	Within Groups	3756.205	242	15.522		
	Total	3769.206	246			
Co-Workers	Between Groups	98.817	4	24.704	1.930	.106
	Within Groups	3097.830	242	12.801		
	Total	3196.648	246			
Nature of Work	Between Groups	3.251	4	.813	.104	.981
	Within Groups	1897.655	242	7.842		
	Total	1900.907	246			
Communication	Between Groups	94.156	4	23.539	1.208	.308
	Within Groups	4717.439	242	19.494		
	Total	4811.595	246			
Total	Between Groups	1763.727	4	440.932	.852	.494
	Within Groups	125305.706	242	517.792		
	Total	127069.433	246			
Style Adaptability	Between Groups	232.712	4	58.178	3.524	.008
	Within Groups	3995.450	242	16.510		
	Total	4228.162	246			

Table 8

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Style Adaptability

Tukey HSD

(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
26-35	36-45	1.44	.873	.464	-.95	3.84
	46-55	1.72	.671	.080	-.12	3.56
	56-65	2.98*	.821	.003	.73	5.24
	65+	2.26	1.457	.532	-1.75	6.26
36-45	26-35	-1.44	.873	.464	-3.84	.95
	46-55	.28	.795	.997	-1.91	2.46
	56-65	1.54	.925	.460	-1.01	4.08
	65+	.81	1.519	.984	-3.36	4.99
46-55	26-35	-1.72	.671	.080	-3.56	.12
	36-45	-.28	.795	.997	-2.46	1.91
	56-65	1.26	.738	.431	-.77	3.29
	65+	.54	1.412	.996	-3.35	4.42
56-65	26-35	-2.98*	.821	.003	-5.24	-.73
	36-45	-1.54	.925	.460	-4.08	1.01
	46-55	-1.26	.738	.431	-3.29	.77
	65+	-.72	1.489	.989	-4.82	3.37
65+	26-35	-2.26	1.457	.532	-6.26	1.75
	36-45	-.81	1.519	.984	-4.99	3.36
	46-55	-.54	1.412	.996	-4.42	3.35
	56-65	.72	1.489	.989	-3.37	4.82

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

T-tests were used to analyze differences in means between genders. Results of this can be found in Table 9.   In the t-test for gender on the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total job satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score, differences between means were not found to be statistically significant. There were, however, trends noted in the areas of coworkers and communication. In the areas of coworkers, teachers who worked for a male principal responded

with slightly higher levels of job satisfaction. This was also true in the area of communication.

The mean scores can be found in Table 10.

Table 9

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pay	Female	111	13.29	4.609	.437
	Male	136	13.53	5.100	.437
Promotion	Female	111	12.32	3.690	.350
	Male	136	11.79	4.754	.408
Supervision	Female	111	20.14	4.229	.401
	Male	136	19.69	4.854	.416
Fringe Benefits	Female	111	15.23	4.586	.435
	Male	136	15.15	4.520	.388
Contingent Rewards	Female	111	15.82	4.991	.474
	Male	136	15.57	4.982	.427
Operating Conditions	Female	111	13.49	3.797	.360
	Male	136	13.26	4.019	.345
Co-Workers	Female	111	19.97	3.976	.377
	Male	136	20.81	3.238	.278
Nature of Work	Female	111	21.76	2.976	.282
	Male	136	21.76	2.620	.225
Communication	Female	111	16.51	4.522	.429
	Male	136	17.47	4.308	.369
Total	Female	111	148.53	23.147	2.197
	Male	136	149.04	22.463	1.926
Style Adaptability	Female	111	22.59	4.401	.418
	Male	136	21.85	3.910	.335

ANOVA was used to analyze the differences in total years of principal experience and

the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total job satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score.

Results of the ANOVA can be found in Table 11.

Table 10

Independent Samples Test - Gender

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Pay	Equal variances assumed	1.305	.254	-.386	245	.700	-.24	.625	-1.472	.990
	Equal variances not assumed			-.390	242.436	.697	-.24	.619	-1.460	.977
Promotion	Equal variances assumed	8.170	.005	.959	245	.339	.53	.551	-.557	1.614
	Equal variances not assumed			.983	244.419	.326	.53	.537	-.530	1.587
Supervision	Equal variances assumed	.347	.556	.772	245	.441	.45	.586	-.702	1.608
	Equal variances not assumed			.783	243.931	.434	.45	.578	-.686	1.592
Fringe Benefits	Equal variances assumed	.045	.833	.137	245	.891	.08	.582	-1.067	1.226
	Equal variances not assumed			.137	233.799	.891	.08	.583	-1.068	1.228
Contingent Rewards	Equal variances assumed	.007	.933	.386	245	.700	.25	.638	-1.010	1.503
	Equal variances not assumed			.386	235.018	.700	.25	.638	-1.011	1.503
Operating Conditions	Equal variances assumed	.441	.507	.442	245	.659	.22	.502	-.766	1.210
	Equal variances not assumed			.445	239.784	.657	.22	.499	-.760	1.204
Co-Workers	Equal variances assumed	5.753	.017	-1.821	245	.070	-.84	.459	-1.740	.068
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.784	210.936	.076	-.84	.468	-1.759	.088
Nature of Work	Equal variances assumed	.290	.591	-.022	245	.982	-.01	.356	-.710	.694
	Equal variances not assumed			-.022	221.068	.982	-.01	.361	-.719	.703
Communication	Equal variances assumed	.446	.505	-1.698	245	.091	-.96	.564	-2.067	.153
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.690	230.339	.092	-.96	.566	-2.073	.159
Total	Equal variances assumed	.084	.773	-.176	245	.860	-.51	2.913	-6.250	5.225
	Equal variances not assumed			-.175	232.274	.861	-.51	2.922	-6.269	5.244
Style Adaptability	Equal variances assumed	.914	.340	1.398	245	.163	.74	.529	-.303	1.783
	Equal variances not assumed			1.381	222.216	.169	.74	.536	-.316	1.796

Table 11

ANOVA - Principal Experience

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pay	Between Groups	378.856	4	94.714	4.188	.003
	Within Groups	5473.355	242	22.617		
	Total	5852.211	246			
Promotion	Between Groups	179.947	4	44.987	2.482	.044
	Within Groups	4385.907	242	18.124		
	Total	4565.854	246			
Supervision	Between Groups	141.955	4	35.489	1.711	.148
	Within Groups	5019.308	242	20.741		
	Total	5161.263	246			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	59.615	4	14.904	.720	.579
	Within Groups	5012.442	242	20.713		
	Total	5072.057	246			
Contingent Rewards	Between Groups	88.976	4	22.244	.896	.467
	Within Groups	6006.393	242	24.820		
	Total	6095.368	246			
Operating Conditions	Between Groups	119.677	4	29.919	1.984	.098
	Within Groups	3649.530	242	15.081		
	Total	3769.206	246			
Co-Workers	Between Groups	46.714	4	11.679	.897	.466
	Within Groups	3149.934	242	13.016		
	Total	3196.648	246			
Nature of Work	Between Groups	4.665	4	1.166	.149	.963
	Within Groups	1896.242	242	7.836		
	Total	1900.907	246			
Communication	Between Groups	205.135	4	51.284	2.694	.032
	Within Groups	4606.460	242	19.035		
	Total	4811.595	246			
Total	Between Groups	1187.238	4	296.809	.571	.684
	Within Groups	125882.196	242	520.174		
	Total	127069.433	246			
Style Adaptability	Between Groups	202.247	4	50.562	3.039	.018
	Within Groups	4025.915	242	16.636		
	Total	4228.162	246			

In terms of total years experience as principal, there were several areas found to be significantly significant at the level p<.05. These areas were pay, promotion, communication, and style adaptability. Cohen's rule was applied again to determine the size of the effect. The effect of total years experience on pay was determined to be 0.065. This is a medium effect. Approximately seven percent of the differences in satisfaction with pay can be attributed to the number of years of principal experience. The effect of total years of principal experience on promotion was determined to be 0.039. This is considered to be a small effect. Approximately four percent of the differences in satisfaction with promotion can be attributed by the differences in the years of principal experience. The effect of total years of principal experience on communication was determined to be 0.043. Approximately four percent of the differences in satisfaction with communication can be attributed by the differences in the years of principal experience. The effect of total years experience on style adaptability was determined to be 0.049. This is also considered a small effect. Approximately five percent of the differences in style adaptability can be explained by the number of years of principal experience.

Post-hoc Tukey tests and crosstabulations were used to further analyze the areas of pay, promotion, communication and style adaptability. The post-hoc results can be found in Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Table 12 shows a significant difference in means between 2-3 years of experience and 11-15 years of experience in the area of pay. There is also a significant difference between 4-10 years of experience and 11-15 years of experience. Principals with 11-15 years of experience tended to have lower levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of pay than principals with 2-3 years of experience and 4-10 years of experience.

Table 12

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Pay

Tukey HSD

(I) Principal Experience	(J) Principal Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
2-3 years	4-10 years	1.07	.792	.660	-1.11	3.25
	11-15 years	-3.45*	1.030	.008	-6.28	-.62
	16-20 years	-.90	.926	.866	-3.45	1.64
	20+ years	-.46	1.234	.996	-3.85	2.93
4-10 years	2-3 years	-1.07	.792	.660	-3.25	1.11
	11-15 years	-4.52*	1.142	.001	-7.66	-1.38
	16-20 years	-1.97	1.049	.331	-4.85	.91
	20+ years	-1.53	1.329	.779	-5.18	2.12
11-15 years	2-3 years	3.45*	1.030	.008	.62	6.28
	4-10 years	4.52*	1.142	.001	1.38	7.66
	16-20 years	2.55	1.239	.243	-.86	5.95
	20+ years	2.99	1.483	.262	-1.09	7.07
16-20 years	2-3 years	.90	.926	.866	-1.64	3.45
	4-10 years	1.97	1.049	.331	-.91	4.85
	11-15 years	-2.55	1.239	.243	-5.95	.86
	20+ years	.44	1.413	.998	-3.44	4.32
20+ years	2-3 years	.46	1.234	.996	-2.93	3.85
	4-10 years	1.53	1.329	.779	-2.12	5.18
	11-15 years	-2.99	1.483	.262	-7.07	1.09
	16-20 years	-.44	1.413	.998	-4.32	3.44

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 13 shows that the post-hoc Tukey test did not display any areas of statistical

significance in the area of promotion, even though they were shown in the ANOVA. However,

principals with 2-3 years of principal experience tended to have higher scores reported in the area

of promotion than principals with 11-15 or 16-20 years of experience. Principals with over

twenty years of principal experience tended to have higher levels of satisfaction in the area of promotion reported than all other levels of experience.

Table 13

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Promotion

Tukey HSD

(I) Principal Experience	(J) Principal Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
2-3 years	4-10 years	.97	.709	.650	-.98	2.92
	11-15 years	-.78	.922	.915	-3.32	1.75
	16-20 years	-1.56	.829	.328	-3.84	.71
	20+ years	1.38	1.104	.723	-1.66	4.41
4-10 years	2-3 years	-.97	.709	.650	-2.92	.98
	11-15 years	-1.75	1.023	.429	-4.56	1.06
	16-20 years	-2.53	.939	.058	-5.11	.05
	20+ years	.41	1.189	.997	-2.86	3.68
11-15 years	2-3 years	.78	.922	.915	-1.75	3.32
	4-10 years	1.75	1.023	.429	-1.06	4.56
	16-20 years	-.78	1.109	.955	-3.83	2.27
	20+ years	2.16	1.328	.481	-1.49	5.81
16-20 years	2-3 years	1.56	.829	.328	-.71	3.84
	4-10 years	2.53	.939	.058	-.05	5.11
	11-15 years	.78	1.109	.955	-2.27	3.83
	20+ years	2.94	1.265	.140	-.53	6.42
20+ years	2-3 years	-1.38	1.104	.723	-4.41	1.66
	4-10 years	-.41	1.189	.997	-3.68	2.86
	11-15 years	-2.16	1.328	.481	-5.81	1.49
	16-20 years	-2.94	1.265	.140	-6.42	.53

Table 14 shows a significant difference in means between principals with 11-15 years of experience and principals with over twenty years of experience in the area of communication.

Principals with 11-15 years of experience tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of communication than principals with over twenty years of experience.

Table 14

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Communication

Tukey HSD

(I) Principal Experience	(J) Principal Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
2-3 years	4-10 years	.32	.726	.992	-1.68	2.32
	11-15 years	1.63	.945	.422	-.97	4.23
	16-20 years	-1.03	.849	.747	-3.36	1.31
	20+ years	-2.38	1.132	.223	-5.49	.73
4-10 years	2-3 years	-.32	.726	.992	-2.32	1.68
	11-15 years	1.31	1.048	.723	-1.57	4.19
	16-20 years	-1.35	.962	.629	-3.99	1.30
	20+ years	-2.70	1.219	.178	-6.05	.65
11-15 years	2-3 years	-1.63	.945	.422	-4.23	.97
	4-10 years	-1.31	1.048	.723	-4.19	1.57
	16-20 years	-2.65	1.137	.138	-5.78	.47
	20+ years	-4.01*	1.361	.029	-7.75	-.27
16-20 years	2-3 years	1.03	.849	.747	-1.31	3.36
	4-10 years	1.35	.962	.629	-1.30	3.99
	11-15 years	2.65	1.137	.138	-.47	5.78
	20+ years	-1.35	1.296	.835	-4.91	2.21
20+ years	2-3 years	2.38	1.132	.223	-.73	5.49
	4-10 years	2.70	1.219	.178	-.65	6.05
	11-15 years	4.01*	1.361	.029	.27	7.75
	16-20 years	1.35	1.296	.835	-2.21	4.91

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 15 shows a significant difference in means of style adaptability scores between principals with 2-3 years of experience and principals with 11-15 years of experience. Principals with 11-15 years of experience tended to have higher style adaptability scores reported than principals with 2-3 years of experience.

Table 15

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Style Adaptability

Tukey HSD

(I) Principal Experience	(J) Principal Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
2-3 years	4-10 years	.69	.679	.848	-1.18	2.56
	11-15 years	2.65*	.884	.025	.22	5.08
	16-20 years	.33	.794	.993	-1.85	2.52
	20+ years	2.28	1.058	.202	-.63	5.18
4-10 years	2-3 years	-.69	.679	.848	-2.56	1.18
	11-15 years	1.96	.980	.268	-.73	4.65
	16-20 years	-.36	.900	.995	-2.83	2.12
	20+ years	1.59	1.140	.634	-1.55	4.72
11-15 years	2-3 years	-2.65*	.884	.025	-5.08	-.22
	4-10 years	-1.96	.980	.268	-4.65	.73
	16-20 years	-2.32	1.063	.191	-5.24	.60
	20+ years	-.38	1.272	.998	-3.87	3.12
16-20 years	2-3 years	-.33	.794	.993	-2.52	1.85
	4-10 years	.36	.900	.995	-2.12	2.83
	11-15 years	2.32	1.063	.191	-.60	5.24
	20+ years	1.94	1.212	.497	-1.39	5.27
20+ years	2-3 years	-2.28	1.058	.202	-5.18	.63
	4-10 years	-1.59	1.140	.634	-4.72	1.55
	11-15 years	.38	1.272	.998	-3.12	3.87
	16-20 years	-1.94	1.212	.497	-5.27	1.39

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

ANOVA was used to analyze differences between years of principal experience in the present school and the nine areas of teacher job satisfaction, the total satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score. Results can be found in Table 16.

Table 16

ANOVA - Principal Experience in the Present School

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pay	Between Groups	117.975	3	39.325	1.666	.175
	Within Groups	5734.236	243	23.598		
	Total	5852.211	246			
Promotion	Between Groups	72.891	3	24.297	1.314	.270
	Within Groups	4492.963	243	18.490		
	Total	4565.854	246			
Supervision	Between Groups	63.190	3	21.063	1.004	.392
	Within Groups	5098.073	243	20.980		
	Total	5161.263	246			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	91.574	3	30.525	1.489	.218
	Within Groups	4980.482	243	20.496		
	Total	5072.057	246			
Contingent Rewards	Between Groups	124.768	3	41.589	1.693	.169
	Within Groups	5970.600	243	24.570		
	Total	6095.368	246			
Operating Conditions	Between Groups	248.634	3	82.878	5.720	.001
	Within Groups	3520.573	243	14.488		
	Total	3769.206	246			
Co-Workers	Between Groups	55.606	3	18.535	1.434	.233
	Within Groups	3141.041	243	12.926		
	Total	3196.648	246			
Nature of Work	Between Groups	30.946	3	10.315	1.340	.262
	Within Groups	1869.961	243	7.695		
	Total	1900.907	246			
Communication	Between Groups	191.878	3	63.959	3.364	.019
	Within Groups	4619.717	243	19.011		
	Total	4811.595	246			
Total	Between Groups	4087.412	3	1362.471	2.692	.047
	Within Groups	122982.021	243	506.099		
	Total	127069.433	246			
Style Adaptability	Between Groups	119.394	3	39.798	2.354	.073
	Within Groups	4108.768	243	16.909		
	Total	4228.162	246			

Table 16 shows statistically significant differences in means between the areas of

operating conditions, communication, and total satisfaction scores and the years of principal

experience in the present school. Cohen's rule was applied to determine the effect. The effect of

principal experience in the present school on operating conditions was determined to be 0.066. This is considered to be a medium effect. Approximately six and a half percent of the differences in operating condition scores can be attributed to years of principal experience in the present school. The effect of principal experience in the present school on communication was determined to be 0.04. This is considered to be a small effect. Four percent of the differences in communication scores can be attributed to years of principal experience in the present school. The effect of principal experience in the present school on total job satisfaction was determined to be 0.32. This is considered to be a small effect. Approximately three percent of the differences in total job satisfaction scores can be attributed to years of principal experience in the present school.

Post-hoc Tukey tests were used to further analyze the differences. These results can be found in Tables 17, 18, and 19.

Table 17 shows a statistically significant difference in means between principals with less than two years experience in the present school and those principals with more than ten years experience in the present school in the area of operating conditions. Principals with less than two years experience in the present school tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of operating conditions than principals with more than ten years experience in the present school. There was a statistically significant difference in means between principals with 3-5 years of experience in the present school and principals with more ten years of experience in the present school. Principals with 3-5 years of experience in the present school tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of operating conditions than principals with more than ten years of experience in the present school. The same was true for principals with principals with 6-10 years of experience. These principals also tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of operating

Table 17

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Operating Conditions
Tukey HSD

(I) Principal Experience in Present School	(J) Principal Experience in Present School	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Less than 2 years	3-5 years	-1.04	.580	.275	-2.54	.45
	6-10 years	.17	.652	.994	-1.52	1.86
	10+ years	-4.48*	1.227	.002	-7.65	-1.31
3-5 years	Less than 2 years	1.04	.580	.275	-.45	2.54
	6-10 years	1.21	.621	.208	-.39	2.82
	10+ years	-3.44*	1.210	.025	-6.57	-.30
6-10 years	Less than 2 years	-.17	.652	.994	-1.86	1.52
	3-5 years	-1.21	.621	.208	-2.82	.39
	10+ years	-4.65*	1.247	.001	-7.88	-1.42
10+ years	Less than 2 years	4.48*	1.227	.002	1.31	7.65
	3-5 years	3.44*	1.210	.025	.30	6.57
	6-10 years	4.65*	1.247	.001	1.42	7.88

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

conditions than principals with more than ten years of experience in the present school.

Table 18 shows a statistically significant difference in means between principal with less than two years experience in the present school and those principals with more than ten years experience in the present school in the area of communication. Principals with less than two years experience in the present school tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of communication than principals with more than ten years experience in the present school.

Table 18

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Communication

Tukey HSD

(I) Principal Experienc in Present School	(J) Principal Experience in Present School	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Less than 2 years	3-5 years	-.92	.664	.506	-2.64	.79
	6-10 years	-.89	.747	.635	-2.82	1.05
	10+ years	-4.38*	1.405	.011	-8.01	-.74
3-5 years	Less than 2 years	.92	.664	.506	-.79	2.64
	6-10 years	.04	.711	1.000	-1.80	1.88
	10+ years	-3.45	1.386	.064	-7.04	.13
6-10 years	Less than 2 years	.89	.747	.635	-1.05	2.82
	3-5 years	-.04	.711	1.000	-1.88	1.80
	10+ years	-3.49	1.428	.072	-7.18	.21
10+ years	Less than 2 years	4.38*	1.405	.011	.74	8.01
	3-5 years	3.45	1.386	.064	-.13	7.04
	6-10 years	3.49	1.428	.072	-.21	7.18

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 19 shows statistically significant differences in means between principals with less than two years experience in the present school and those with more than ten years experience in the present school in total job satisfaction scores. Principals with more than ten years of experience in the present school tended to have lower levels of total teacher job satisfaction reported than principals with less than two years experience in the present school.

Table 19

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Total

Tukey HSD

(I) Principal Experienc in Present School	(J) Principal Experience in Present School	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Less than 2 years	3-5 years	-3.76	3.426	.692	-12.62	5.11
	6-10 years	-1.72	3.856	.970	-11.70	8.25
	10+ years	-20.18*	7.251	.029	-38.94	-1.42
3-5 years	Less than 2 years	3.76	3.426	.692	-5.11	12.62
	6-10 years	2.03	3.669	.945	-7.46	11.52
	10+ years	-16.43	7.154	.102	-34.93	2.08
6-10 years	Less than 2 years	1.72	3.856	.970	-8.25	11.70
	3-5 years	-2.03	3.669	.945	-11.52	7.46
	10+ years	-18.46	7.369	.062	-37.52	.60
10+ years	Less than 2 years	20.18*	7.251	.029	1.42	38.94
	3-5 years	16.43	7.154	.102	-2.08	34.93
	6-10 years	18.46	7.369	.062	-.60	37.52

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

ANOVA was used to analyze differences between the highest degree earned and the nine

areas of teacher job satisfaction, the total satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score.

Results can be found in Table 20.

Table 20

ANOVA - Highest Degree Earned

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pay	Between Groups	199.269	3	66.423	2.855	.038
	Within Groups	5652.942	243	23.263		
	Total	5852.211	246			
Promotion	Between Groups	117.135	3	39.045	2.133	.097
	Within Groups	4448.719	243	18.307		
	Total	4565.854	246			
Supervision	Between Groups	47.635	3	15.878	.755	.521
	Within Groups	5113.628	243	21.044		
	Total	5161.263	246			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	4.592	3	1.531	.073	.974
	Within Groups	5067.465	243	20.854		
	Total	5072.057	246			
Contingent Rewards	Between Groups	212.797	3	70.932	2.930	.034
	Within Groups	5882.571	243	24.208		
	Total	6095.368	246			
Operating Conditions	Between Groups	17.484	3	5.828	.377	.769
	Within Groups	3751.723	243	15.439		
	Total	3769.206	246			
Co-Workers	Between Groups	92.215	3	30.738	2.406	.068
	Within Groups	3104.432	243	12.775		
	Total	3196.648	246			
Nature of Work	Between Groups	20.967	3	6.989	.903	.440
	Within Groups	1879.940	243	7.736		
	Total	1900.907	246			
Communication	Between Groups	58.629	3	19.543	.999	.394
	Within Groups	4752.966	243	19.560		
	Total	4811.595	246			
Total	Between Groups	899.254	3	299.751	.577	.630
	Within Groups	126170.179	243	519.219		
	Total	127069.433	246			
Style Adaptability	Between Groups	225.007	3	75.002	4.553	.004
	Within Groups	4003.155	243	16.474		
	Total	4228.162	246			

There were statistically significant differences between highest degree earned and the areas of pay, contingent rewards, and style adaptability. Cohen's rule was applied to determine the effect of the highest degree earned and the area of pay in job satisfaction. The effect was determined to be 0.034. This is considered to be a small effect. Approximately 3.4 percent of the differences in the area of pay can be attributed to differences in the degree earned. The effect in the area of contingent rewards was determined to be 0.035. Approximately 3.5 percent of the differences in the area of contingent rewards can be attributed to the differences in the highest degree earned. The effect in the area of style adaptability was determined to be 0.053. Approximately 5.3 percent of the differences style adaptability scores can be attributed to differences in highest degree earned. Post-hoc Tukey tests were used to further analyze these differences. The results can be found in tables 21, 22 and 23.

Table 21

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Pay

Tukey HSD

(I) Highest Degree Earned	(J) Highest Degree Earned	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Masters	Masters + 30	-1.06	.874	.622	-3.32	1.21
	ABD	.80	.932	.826	-1.61	3.21
	Ed.D.	1.11	1.035	.705	-1.56	3.79
Masters + 30	Masters	1.06	.874	.622	-1.21	3.32
	ABD	1.86	.775	.080	-.15	3.86
	Ed.D.	2.17	.895	.075	-.15	4.48
ABD	Masters	-.80	.932	.826	-3.21	1.61
	Masters + 30	-1.86	.775	.080	-3.86	.15
	Ed.D.	.31	.952	.988	-2.15	2.77
Ed.D.	Masters	-1.11	1.035	.705	-3.79	1.56
	Masters + 30	-2.17	.895	.075	-4.48	.15
	ABD	-.31	.952	.988	-2.77	2.15

Table 22

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Contingent Rewards
Tukey HSD

(I) Highest Degree Earned	(J) Highest Degree Earned	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Masters	Masters + 30	.81	.892	.803	-1.50	3.11
	ABD	-.59	.951	.926	-3.05	1.87
	Ed.D.	2.15	1.056	.177	-.58	4.88
Masters + 30	Masters	-.81	.892	.803	-3.11	1.50
	ABD	-1.39	.790	.293	-3.44	.65
	Ed.D.	1.35	.913	.455	-1.02	3.71
ABD	Masters	.59	.951	.926	-1.87	3.05
	Masters + 30	1.39	.790	.293	-.65	3.44
	Ed.D.	2.74*	.971	.026	.23	5.25
Ed.D.	Masters	-2.15	1.056	.177	-4.88	.58
	Masters + 30	-1.35	.913	.455	-3.71	1.02
	ABD	-2.74*	.971	.026	-5.25	-.23

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 21 does not show statistically significant differences in means in the area of pay and the highest degree earned. However, trends were noted between principals with a Masters + 30 and those who identified themselves as ABD, and those with a Doctorate in Education. Masters+30 tended to be lower than ABD and Ed.D.

Table 18 shows statistically significant differences in means between principals who described themselves as ABD and those with a Doctorate in Education. Principals with a Doctorate in Education tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of contingent rewards than principals who described themselves as ABD.

Table 23

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Style Adaptability

Tukey HSD

(I) Highest Degree Earned	(J) Highest Degree Earned	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Masters	Masters + 30	.06	.736	1.000	-1.84	1.96
	ABD	-1.94	.785	.067	-3.97	.09
	Ed.D.	-1.79	.871	.171	-4.04	.46
Masters + 30	Masters	-.06	.736	1.000	-1.96	1.84
	ABD	-2.00*	.652	.013	-3.69	-.31
	Ed.D.	-1.85	.753	.070	-3.80	.10
ABD	Masters	1.94	.785	.067	-.09	3.97
	Masters + 30	2.00*	.652	.013	.31	3.69
	Ed.D.	.15	.801	.998	-1.92	2.22
Ed.D.	Masters	1.79	.871	.171	-.46	4.04
	Masters + 30	1.85	.753	.070	-.10	3.80
	ABD	-.15	.801	.998	-2.22	1.92

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 23 shows a statistically significant difference in means between principals who described themselves as ABD and those with a Masters +30 in the style adaptability score. Principals with a Masters +30 tended to have higher style adaptability score than principals who described themselves as ABD.

ANOVA was used to analyze differences between principal leadership style and the nine areas of teacher job satisfaction, the total satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score. Results can be found in Table 24. Statistically significant differences between the means were found in the areas of supervision, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-workers, communication, total job satisfaction scores, and the style adaptability scores.

Table 24

ANOVA - Leadership Style

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pay	Between Groups	84.350	3	28.117	1.185	.316
	Within Groups	5767.860	243	23.736		
	Total	5852.211	246			
Promotion	Between Groups	131.856	3	43.952	2.409	.068
	Within Groups	4433.998	243	18.247		
	Total	4565.854	246			
Supervision	Between Groups	491.000	3	163.667	8.516	.000
	Within Groups	4670.263	243	19.219		
	Total	5161.263	246			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	37.646	3	12.549	.606	.612
	Within Groups	5034.410	243	20.718		
	Total	5072.057	246			
Contingent Rewards	Between Groups	278.836	3	92.945	3.883	.010
	Within Groups	5816.533	243	23.936		
	Total	6095.368	246			
Operating Conditions	Between Groups	331.716	3	110.572	7.816	.000
	Within Groups	3437.491	243	14.146		
	Total	3769.206	246			
Co-Workers	Between Groups	113.783	3	37.928	2.990	.032
	Within Groups	3082.864	243	12.687		
	Total	3196.648	246			
Nature of Work	Between Groups	26.497	3	8.832	1.145	.332
	Within Groups	1874.410	243	7.714		
	Total	1900.907	246			
Communication	Between Groups	168.931	3	56.310	2.947	.034
	Within Groups	4642.664	243	19.106		
	Total	4811.595	246			
Total	Between Groups	6703.066	3	2234.355	4.511	.004
	Within Groups	120366.367	243	495.335		
	Total	127069.433	246			
Style Adaptability	Between Groups	430.756	3	143.585	9.188	.000
	Within Groups	3797.406	243	15.627		
	Total	4228.162	246			

Cohen's rule (as cited in Witte, 1997) was applied to determine the effect. The effect of leadership style on supervision was determined to be 0.095. This is considered to be a medium effect. Almost ten percent of the differences in levels of satisfaction in the area of supervision can be attributed to principal leadership style. The effect of leadership style on contingent rewards was determined to be 0.046. This is considered to be a small effect. Almost five percent of the differences in levels of satisfaction in the area of contingent rewards can be attributed to principal leadership style. The effect of leadership style on operating conditions was determined to be 0.088. This is considered to be a medium effect. Almost nine percent of the differences in levels of satisfaction in the area of contingent rewards can be attributed to principal leadership style. The effect of leadership style on co-workers was determined to be 0.036. This is considered to be a small effect. Almost four percent of the differences in levels of satisfaction in the area of co-workers can be attributed to principal leadership style. The effect of leadership style on communication was determined to be 0.035. This is considered to be a small effect. Almost four percent of the differences in levels of satisfaction in the area of supervision can be attributed to principal leadership style. The effect of leadership style on total teacher job satisfaction was determined to be 0.053. This is considered to be a small effect. Approximately five percent of the differences in levels of satisfaction in the total satisfaction can be attributed to principal leadership style. The effect of leadership style on style adaptability was determined to be 0.102. This is considered to be a medium effect. Over ten percent of the differences in levels of style adaptability can be attributed to principal leadership style.

Post-hoc Tukey tests were used to further analyze the results. Tables 51 through Tables 31 display the results.

Table 25

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Supervision
Tukey HSD

(I) Leadership Style	(J) Leadership Style	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Telling	Selling	-2.95*	.704	.000	-4.78	-1.13
	Participating	-3.67*	.978	.001	-6.20	-1.14
	Delegating	-.30	1.092	.993	-3.13	2.52
Selling	Telling	2.95*	.704	.000	1.13	4.78
	Participating	-.71	.860	.842	-2.94	1.51
	Delegating	2.65*	.987	.038	.10	5.21
Participating	Telling	3.67*	.978	.001	1.14	6.20
	Selling	.71	.860	.842	-1.51	2.94
	Delegating	3.36*	1.198	.028	.26	6.46
Delegating	Telling	.30	1.092	.993	-2.52	3.13
	Selling	-2.65*	.987	.038	-5.21	-.10
	Participating	-3.36*	1.198	.028	-6.46	-.26

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

In the area of supervision, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of job satisfaction than the selling and participating styles. The delegating style tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of job satisfaction than the selling and participating styles.

Table 26

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Contingent Rewards

Tukey HSD

(I) Leadership Style	(J) Leadership Style	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Telling	Selling	-1.61	.785	.173	-3.64	.42
	Participating	-3.68*	1.091	.005	-6.51	-.86
	Delegating	-1.91	1.218	.397	-5.07	1.24
Selling	Telling	1.61	.785	.173	-.42	3.64
	Participating	-2.07	.960	.138	-4.56	.41
	Delegating	-.30	1.102	.993	-3.15	2.55
Participating	Telling	3.68*	1.091	.005	.86	6.51
	Selling	2.07	.960	.138	-.41	4.56
	Delegating	1.77	1.337	.549	-1.69	5.23
Delegating	Telling	1.91	1.218	.397	-1.24	5.07
	Selling	.30	1.102	.993	-2.55	3.15
	Participating	-1.77	1.337	.549	-5.23	1.69

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 26 shows that in the area of contingent rewards, the leadership style, telling,

tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher satisfaction than the leadership

style, participating.

Table 27

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Operating Conditions

Tukey HSD

(I) Leadership Style	(J) Leadership Style	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Telling	Selling	-1.03	.604	.321	-2.59	.53
	Participating	-2.88*	.839	.004	-5.05	-.71
	Delegating	-3.86*	.936	.000	-6.28	-1.43
Selling	Telling	1.03	.604	.321	-.53	2.59
	Participating	-1.85	.738	.061	-3.76	.06
	Delegating	-2.83*	.847	.005	-5.02	-.63
Participating	Telling	2.88*	.839	.004	.71	5.05
	Selling	1.85	.738	.061	-.06	3.76
	Delegating	-.98	1.028	.778	-3.64	1.68
Delegating	Telling	3.86*	.936	.000	1.43	6.28
	Selling	2.83*	.847	.005	.63	5.02
	Participating	.98	1.028	.778	-1.68	3.64

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 27 shows that in the area of operating conditions, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership styles, participating and delegating.

Table 28

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Co-Workers

Tukey HSD

(I) Leadership Style	(J) Leadership Style	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Telling	Selling	-1.20	.572	.154	-2.68	.27
	Participating	-.58	.795	.883	-2.64	1.47
	Delegating	.80	.887	.802	-1.49	3.10
Selling	Telling	1.20	.572	.154	-.27	2.68
	Participating	.62	.699	.812	-1.19	2.43
	Delegating	2.01	.802	.062	-.07	4.08
Participating	Telling	.58	.795	.883	-1.47	2.64
	Selling	-.62	.699	.812	-2.43	1.19
	Delegating	1.39	.974	.485	-1.13	3.91
Delegating	Telling	-.80	.887	.802	-3.10	1.49
	Selling	-2.01	.802	.062	-4.08	.07
	Participating	-1.39	.974	.485	-3.91	1.13

Table 28 does not show any statistically significant differences between means. There are, however trends between the selling and delegating styles, with the selling style tending to be slightly higher than the delegating style.

Table 29

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Communication

Tukey HSD

(I) Leadership Style	(J) Leadership Style	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Telling	Selling	-1.45	.702	.167	-3.26	.37
	Participating	-2.70*	.975	.031	-5.22	-.18
	Delegating	-.51	1.088	.965	-3.33	2.30
Selling	Telling	1.45	.702	.167	-.37	3.26
	Participating	-1.25	.858	.466	-3.47	.97
	Delegating	.93	.984	.778	-1.61	3.48
Participating	Telling	2.70*	.975	.031	.18	5.22
	Selling	1.25	.858	.466	-.97	3.47
	Delegating	2.18	1.195	.263	-.91	5.27
Delegating	Telling	.51	1.088	.965	-2.30	3.33
	Selling	-.93	.984	.778	-3.48	1.61
	Participating	-2.18	1.195	.263	-5.27	.91

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 29 shows that in the area of communication, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership style, participating.

Table 30

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Total
Tukey HSD

(I) Leadership Style	(J) Leadership Style	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Telling	Selling	-10.69*	3.572	.016	-19.93	-1.44
	Participating	-16.78*	4.965	.005	-29.62	-3.93
	Delegating	-9.19	5.542	.349	-23.52	5.15
Selling	Telling	10.69*	3.572	.016	1.44	19.93
	Participating	-6.09	4.367	.503	-17.39	5.20
	Delegating	1.50	5.013	.991	-11.47	14.47
Participating	Telling	16.78*	4.965	.005	3.93	29.62
	Selling	6.09	4.367	.503	-5.20	17.39
	Delegating	7.59	6.084	.597	-8.15	23.33
Delegating	Telling	9.19	5.542	.349	-5.15	23.52
	Selling	-1.50	5.013	.991	-14.47	11.47
	Participating	-7.59	6.084	.597	-23.33	8.15

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 30 shows that in the total satisfaction scores, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership styles, selling and participating.

Table 31

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Style Adaptability

Tukey HSD

(I) Leadership Style	(J) Leadership Style	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Telling	Selling	-3.22*	.635	.000	-4.87	-1.58
	Participating	-1.62	.882	.259	-3.90	.66
	Delegating	-1.40	.984	.488	-3.94	1.15
Selling	Telling	3.22*	.635	.000	1.58	4.87
	Participating	1.60	.776	.166	-.40	3.61
	Delegating	1.83	.890	.172	-.48	4.13
Participating	Telling	1.62	.882	.259	-.66	3.90
	Selling	-1.60	.776	.166	-3.61	.40
	Delegating	.22	1.081	.997	-2.57	3.02
Delegating	Telling	1.40	.984	.488	-1.15	3.94
	Selling	-1.83	.890	.172	-4.13	.48
	Participating	-.22	1.081	.997	-3.02	2.57

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 31 shows that in the style adaptability scores, the leadership style, telling, tended

to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership style,

selling.

Summary

This chapter presented the results of the study that analyzed the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Three types of data were collected in this study. Data on principal leadership style came from administering the LEAD-Other instrument (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) to participating teachers. Data on teacher job satisfaction was obtained from administering the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1994) to the same participating teachers. Demographic data on principals was collected through questionnaires.

There is a significant effect of age on style adaptability. When determining the effect, using Cohen's rule (as cited in Witte, 1997), the effect, the estimated difference among the population means, is 0.055. This is considered a medium effect. Approximately 5.5% of the variance in style adaptability can be explained by the principal age.

The results of the post-hoc Tukey Test indicate the age group 25-36, tended to result in lower style adaptability score than the age group 56-65. This mean difference is significant at $p < .05$.

In the t-test for gender on the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total job satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score, differences between means were not found to be statistically significant. There were, however, trends noted in the areas of coworkers and communication. In the areas of coworkers, teachers who worked for a male principal tended to respond with slightly higher levels of job satisfaction. This was also true in the area of communication.

There was a significant difference in means between principals with 2-3 years of experience and principals with 11-15 years of experience. There is also a significant difference between 4-10 years of experience and 11-15 years of experience. Principals with 11-15 years of

experience tended to have lower levels of satisfaction reported in the area of pay than principals

with 2-3 years of experience and 4-10 years of experience. Principals with 2-3 years of principal

experience tended to have higher scores reported in the area of promotion than principals with

11-15 or 16-20 years of experience. Principals with over twenty years of principal experience

tended to have higher levels of satisfaction in the area of promotion reported than all other levels

of experience. There was a significant difference in means between principals with 11-15 years

of experience and principals with over twenty years of experience. Principals with 11-15 years

of experience tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of

communication than principals with over twenty years of experience. There was a significant

difference in means of style adaptability scores between principals with 2-3 years of experience

and principals with 11-15 years of experience. Principals with 11-15 years of experience tended

to have higher style adaptability scores reported than principals with 2-3 years of experience.

There was a statistically significant difference in means between principals with less

than two years experience in the present school and those principals with more than ten years

experience in the present school in the area of operating conditions. Principals with less than

two years experience in the present school tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction

reported in the area of operating conditions than principals with more than ten years experience

in the present school. There was a statistically significant difference in means between

principals with 3-5 years of experience in the present school and principals with more ten years

of experience in the present school. Principals with 3-5 years of experience in the present school

tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of operating

conditions than principals with more than ten years of experience in the present school. The

same was true for principals with 6-10 years of experience. These principals also tended to have

higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of operating conditions than

principals with more than ten years of experience in the present school. There was a statistically

significant difference in means between principal with less than two years experience in the present school and those principals with more than ten years experience in the present school. Principals with less than two years experience in the present school tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of communication than principals with more than ten years experience in the present school. There were statistically significant differences in means between principals with less than two years experience in the present school and those with more than ten years experience in the present school in total job satisfaction scores. Principals with more than ten years of experience in the present school tended to have lower levels of total teacher job satisfaction reported than principals with less than two years experience in the present school.

Trends were noted between principals with a Masters +30 and those who identified themselves as ABD, and those with a Doctorate in Education. There were statistically significant differences in means between principals who described themselves as ABD and those with a Doctorate in Education. Principals with a Doctorate in Education tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of contingent rewards than principals who described themselves as ABD.

In the area of supervision, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of job satisfaction than the selling and participating styles. The delegating style tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of job satisfaction than the selling and participating styles.

In the area of contingent rewards, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher satisfaction than the leadership style, participating.

In the area of operating conditions, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership styles, participating and delegating.

There were trends between the selling and delegating styles, with the selling style tending to be slightly higher than the delegating style.

In the area of communication, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership style, participating.

In the total satisfaction scores, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership styles, selling and participating.

In the style adaptability scores, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership style, selling.

Chapter V will examine the implications of these findings against the current research.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations

This study has examined the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Chapter V will present a summary of the study's procedures, methodology, a discussion of the findings, conclusions and recommendations for future research.

Summary

Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to determine if there was a relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. A problem of teacher attrition and high turnover among teacher minimizes the opportunity for students to have access to experienced principals. One possible method to retain teachers in the profession is to study factors affecting job satisfaction. A clearer understanding of teacher job satisfaction in relation to principal leadership style may help school districts create principal training to improve teacher job satisfaction.

Review of the literature

Principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction has been researched as both separate and related topics. This literature review examined existing research on these topics to determine if there were related themes to assist in answering the research questions. Teacher job satisfaction was reviewed, particularly in the area of attrition. The literature examined the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction in attempts to find out if that relationship can help keep teachers satisfied, limit attrition, and ultimately have a positive impact on school effectiveness. The literature review was divided into three main sections: (a) overviews of teacher job satisfaction/teacher attrition, (b) overview of leadership theories and

leadership styles, and (c) the influence of principal leadership style. Principal leadership style was further broken down into sub categories, teacher effectiveness, student achievement, change, school effectiveness, and specifically, teacher job satisfaction.

The teacher shortage was found to be a national concern (National Education Association, 2001, Boe, 1996, Hall, 1987). Teachers leaving the profession tended to be those with less than five years experiences, who scored highest on national teacher exams (Konanc, 1996). Some states have offered signing bonuses to entice teachers to their district and offered other incentives to remain in the profession (Education World, 1999).

The definition of leadership used in this study was the process of influencing an individual or group in efforts to achieve a goal. There are many models and theories of leadership, but the one used in this study was the model of situational leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1976).

Hersey and Blanchard's (1976) situational leadership model described four leadership styles. There are four quadrants characterizing basic leadership styles, namely (1) high task/low relationship, or "telling," (2) high task/high relationship, or "selling," (3) high relationship/low task, or "participating," and (4) low relationship/low task, or "delegating." To determine a principal's leadership style, a LEAD-Other instrument (Center for Leadership Studies, 1979) was used. Subordinates answer questions based upon the leader's actions in different scenarios. The quadrant in which most of the responses fall identifies the leadership style. The more the respondent's choices reflect and equal distribution among the four styles, the more effective is the leader.

The literature found that teachers are more effective when the principal includes them in the decision making process (Greenblatt, Cooper, & Muth, 1984). Students have higher levels of achievement when the principal uses leadership abilities in organizing the school (Andrews and Soder, 1987), building a positive climate (Heck & Marcoulides, 1993), and monitoring the school instruction (Edington, 1988, Schmitt, 1990). The principal's relationship with teachers was

important in restructuring the school and initiating change (Davidson & Dell, 1996). School-based management is effective when there is a positive relationship between the principal and the teachers (Delaney, 1995). Principals with transformational leadership style are associated with effective schools (Evans, 1996). Principals with the leadership style of 'participating' or 'selling' were found to have teachers with a higher level of job satisfaction (Perkins, 1991, Smith, 2000). Job satisfaction was found to be more influenced by principal leadership style than other factors such as age of the principal, gender of the principal, years of experience of the teacher or the type of school (Zigrang, 2000). Empowering teachers was found to be related to teacher job satisfaction, teacher motivation, and self-esteem (Davis and Wilson).

Research design

This purpose of this study was to ascertain if there is a relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The research was conducted using a descriptive/correlational design. In this study, leadership style, as perceived by the teachers, was the independent variable and teacher job satisfaction was the dependent variable. Demographics of the principal were also independent variables. Since this study was correlational, the findings should not be used to determine cause-effect relationships.

Research questions

The research questions for this study were as follows:

1. Will there be any significant differences in teacher job satisfaction based upon the principal' leadership style?

2. Will the following demographic characteristics of the principal account for some differences in teacher job satisfaction?

Age of the principal

Gender of the principal

Total years of experience as a principal

Highest degree completed

Race/ethnicity

3. Is there a particular leadership style that has more of an impact on teacher job satisfaction than other leadership styles?

Population and sample

This study focused on elementary schools in Morris County, New Jersey, in District Factor Groupings of GH, I or J, in which the principal had been at the school at least one year. The decision to limit the principal sample to those who had been at the site for at least two years was to ensure they had time to affect teacher job satisfaction. Out of the twenty-four districts in DFG GH, J, or I twenty districts had elementary schools with principals in at least their second year. Nine superintendents agreed to allow their principals to be contacted to participate in this study. This accounted for thirty eligible elementary schools. Of this thirty, twenty-three principals agreed to participate after receiving the informed consent letter. After collecting the questionnaires, nineteen schools had usable data. Out of 396 teachers, 251 completed the questionnaires for a return rate of 63%.

Instrumentation

The methodology of this study utilized the following instruments to collect data:

Hersey and Blanchard's Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description - Other (LEAD-Other) (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979).

Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1994)

Principal Demographic Questions

The LEAD-Other instrument (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) describes twelve situations and four possible behaviors of a leader in each situation. The teacher is asked to select

the behavior he/she thinks the principal would choose if faced with the given situation. Each possible alternative reflects the following combinations of task-relationship behavior:

1. High task/low relationship, or style 1 (quadrant 1), also known as "telling."

2. High task/high relationship, or style 2 (quadrant 2), also known as "selling."

3. High relationship/low task, or style 3 (quadrant 3), also known as "participating."

4. Low relationship/low task, or style 4 (quadrant 4), also known as "delegating."

The four leadership styles are described as follows:

1. Telling - This style of leader provides specific instruction, defines roles of followers, and closely supervises them.

2. Selling - This style of leader explains decisions and attempt to get the followers to 'buy into' the decision made.

3. Participating - This style of leader shares the decision making process with followers. These followers have the ability and knowledge to complete tasks.

4. Delegating - This style of leader gives the responsibility of decision making to the followers. The followers are high in maturity and are willing to take responsibility for directing their own behavior.

Selection of an action in each of the twelve situations yields one of four scores. Each score corresponds to one of four leadership style quadrants and describe the leader's style. The dominant leadership style was defined as that quadrant where the majority of responses fell.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1994) is a questionnaire that assesses employee attitudes about the job and aspects of the job. It consists of thirty-six questions about nine areas of satisfaction. These areas are Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication. Each area is assessed with four questions and a total score is computed using all thirty-six questions.

Respondents are asked to rate each item, with six choices per item ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The items are written in two directions, some positive, and some negative. The survey is scored by assigning a number to each answer, 1 representing strongest disagreement, to six representing strongest agreement. The negatively worded items are reversed scored, one representing the strongest agreement to six representing strongest disagreement. Scores in each area can range from one to twenty-four. The total scores on the JSS range from 36 to 216. High scores on the scale represent high job satisfaction.

The following demographic characteristics of the principal were asked using survey type questions:

1. Age

2. Gender

3. Race/ethnicity

4. Total principal experience

5. Principal experience in the present school

6. Highest degree completed

Data collection procedures

Twenty-four school districts were identified in District Factor grouping GH, J or I in Morris County, New Jersey. Twenty districts had elementary schools with principals in at least their second year. Nine superintendents agreed to allow their principals to be contacted to participate in this study. This accounted for thirty eligible elementary schools.

A letter of solicitation was sent to the principals of the schools eligible for this study. This letter asked for permission for the school to be used in the study. Twenty-three principals, who were willing to participate, provided answers to the demographic data questions. Questionnaires and informed consent letters were distributed to teachers in each school. A box

was placed in a central location in the school for surveys to be returned. The box was collected after sufficient time was given to complete the questionnaires.

Data analysis procedures:

The data was analyzed using SPSS 11.0 for Microsoft Windows and the research questions were answered using ANOVA (one-way analysis of variance) and t-tests. The LEAD-Other questionnaires (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) were scored using frequency distributions to determine the frequency of each response as related to the four leadership styles. Each school was classified into one of the four groups based upon the principal's leadership style. ANOVA was used to determine which leadership style resulted in the highest teacher job satisfaction in the nine areas and the total job satisfaction score.

To summarize, the research focused on experienced elementary school principals in District Factor Groupings GH, I and J in Morris County, New Jersey. Principal leadership style was measured using the LEAD-Other Questionnaires and teacher job satisfaction was measured using the Job Satisfaction Survey. A survey instrument was used to collect demographic data on the principals in participating schools.

Discussion

Demographic variables

The nineteen principals represented 36% of the 53 elementary principals in at least their second year in DFG's GH, I or J in Morris County, New Jersey. Responses to the demographic questions showed that the principals were mainly in the 46-55 age group, had been a principal for two to ten years, had been at the present site for two-five years, had earned a Master's degree as their highest degree and were White. There was almost an equal distribution of males and females

Benit's (1991) similar study utilized twenty-seven principals in the Detroit area of Michigan. This is considered an urban area. Responses to the principal demographic questions showed that the principals were mainly in the 41-50 age group, had been a principal for 3 – 9 years, had been at the present site for 3 – 9 years, had a Master's degree as their highest degree. Ethnic background was not analyzed.

Smith (2000) also conducted a similar study in Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System in North Carolina. This is a large urban school district. Responses to the principal demographic questions showed that the principals were mainly in the 46-55 age group, female, had been a principal for 3-10 years, had been at the present site for 3-10 years, and had earned a Master's degree as their highest degree. Ethnic background was not analyzed.

The demographic characteristics in the three studies were similar. The areas studied, however, were different. Smith and Benit focused on urban areas and this study was limited to suburban areas with higher District Factor Groupings.

LEAD-Other

The results of the LEAD-Other questionnaires (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 1979) revealed that principals in six schools were identified as Style 1 (high task/low relationship), eight were identified as Style 2 (high task/high relationship), three were identified as Style 3 (high relationship/low task) and two were identified as Style 4 (low relationship/low task).

Three research questions were posed by this study. These questions examined the relationship between teacher perceptions of principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction and the relationship between principal demographic variables and teacher job satisfaction.

Research question 1.

Will there be any significant differences in teacher job satisfaction based upon the principal' leadership style?

Research question 2.

Will the following demographic characteristics of the principal account for some differences in teacher job satisfaction?

Age of the principal

Gender of the principal

Total years of experience as a principal

Highest degree completed

Race/ethnicity

Research question 3.

Is there a particular leadership style that has more of an impact on teacher job satisfaction than other leadership styles?

Research question number one was answered using one-way ANOVA. With an alpha level of 0.05, the effect of principal leadership style on several areas of job satisfaction was found to be statistically significant. In the area of supervision, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of job satisfaction than the selling and participating styles. The delegating style tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of job satisfaction than the selling and participating styles. In the area of contingent rewards, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher satisfaction than the leadership style, participating. In the area of operating conditions, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership styles, participating and delegating. There are trends between the selling and delegating styles, with the selling style tending to be slightly higher than the delegating style. In the area of communication, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership style, participating. In the total satisfaction scores, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership styles, selling

and participating. In the style adaptability scores, the leadership style, telling, tended to elicit statistically significant higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than the leadership style, selling.

Research question number two was answered using one-way ANOVA and t-tests. The answer to the question on the age of the principal, differences in means between age and the nine areas of teacher job satisfaction and the total job satisfaction score were not found to be statistically significant. There was, however, a statistically significant difference in the style adaptability score. Principals in the age group 25-36 tended to have lower style adaptability scores than principals in the age group 56-65.

In the t-test for gender on the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total job satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score, differences between means were not found to be statistically significant. There were, however, trends noted in the areas of coworkers and communication. In the areas of coworkers, teachers who worked for a male principal tended to respond with slightly higher levels of job satisfaction. This was also true in the area of communication.

Using ANOVA to analyze differences in means between years of principal experience and the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total job satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score, statistically significant differences were found. Principals with 11-15 years of experience tended to have lower levels of satisfaction reported in the area of pay, than principals with two to three years of experience and four to ten years of experience. Principals with 2-3 years of principal experience tended to have higher scores reported in the area of promotion than principals with 11-15 or 16-20 years of experience. Principals with over twenty years of principal experience tended to have higher levels of satisfaction in the area of promotion reported than all other levels of experience. Principals with 11-15 years of experience tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of communication than principals with over twenty years of experience. Principals with 11-15 years of experience tended to have higher style adaptability scores reported than principals with two to three years of experience.

Using ANOVA to analyze differences in means between years of principal experience at the present school and the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total job satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score, statistically significant differences were found. Principals with less than two years or three to five years of experience in the present school tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of operating conditions than principals with more than ten years experience in the present school. Principals with less than two years experience in the present school tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of communication than principals with more than ten years experience in the present school. Principals with more than ten years of experience in the present school tended to have lower levels of total teacher job satisfaction reported than principals with less than two years experience in the present school.

Using ANOVA to analyze differences in means between highest degree earned and the nine areas of job satisfaction, the total job satisfaction score, and the style adaptability score, statistically significant differences were found. Principals with a Doctorate in Education tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of contingent rewards than principals who described themselves as ABD (complete all requirements for a doctorate, except dissertation). Trends were noted between principals with a Masters + 30 and those who identified themselves as ABD, and those with a Doctorate in Education. Principals with a Master's + 30 tended to have lower levels of teacher job satisfaction reported than principals who described themselves as ABD, or those with a Doctorate in Education.

Research Question number three was connected to the first question, which used ANOVA to analyze differences between means. In analyzing the leadership style and the total job satisfaction score, principal identified as Style 1, telling, tended to have higher levels of total teacher job satisfaction than the three other leadership styles. The differences were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level between Style 1 and Style 2, and also between Style 1 and Style 3.

Limitations.

The findings of this research were limited by several factors. The nature of the design, which was descriptive-correlational, did not allow for the establishment of any cause-effect relationships. This study was limited to elementary schools in suburban areas of New Jersey, in Morris County. Districts used in the study will have a District Factor Grouping (DFG) of GH or higher in order to study similar district and eliminate factors that may cloud research. Because this study did not include a sample of principals across the state, the findings of the study can only be generalized to schools of similar levels and District Factor Groups. The study included only principals who are in at least their second year at the same school. The study made the assumption that a principal's first year is spent learning about the staff, students and community. The second year, this basis of knowledge can be utilized when determining the level of competence and commitment of the teachers, and then decide which leadership style to employ. It will also provide principals more time to have an impact on teacher job satisfaction. Results can only be generalized to schools with principals of at least one year of experience in the present school.

Conclusions

In analyzing the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, several general conclusions can be drawn. In analyzing means, the leadership Style 1, telling, tended to elicit higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. This difference was significant in the areas of supervision, contingent rewards, operating conditions, communication, total job satisfaction, and style adaptability. The leadership style, telling, according to Hersey and Blanchard (1986) is effective when used with those followers who have low ability or motivation to complete a task. This study did not focus on maturity, or ability and motivation, of the

teachers. Although the leadership style, telling, appeared to generate the higher levels of satisfaction, it could be because the participating teachers were of lower levels of maturity.

The Style 1 leader provides specific instruction, defines roles of followers and closely supervises staff members. The finding in this research contradicts other's findings. Lumsden (1998) found the teacher job satisfaction is associated with teacher autonomy. The United States Department of Education Office of Educational Research (1997) found that teacher job satisfaction is strongly associated with participation in decision making and influence over school policy. Bogler (1999) also found that teachers felt highly satisfied when the work allowed for school based decision making. Both Perkins (1991) and Smith (2000) found that teachers were more satisfied with the leadership Style 2, selling. Benit (1991) found that job satisfaction had a positive correlation with principals perceived as Style 2, selling and Style 3, participating.

The population in this study differs from the populations in the studies conducted by Smith (2000), Perkins (1991), and Benit (1991). The difference lies in the area of the schools, urban versus suburban. The findings of this study could suggest that teachers in the elementary schools in Morris County in DFG GH, I, or J have a greater level of job satisfaction with a principal who is specific in direction, instruction, and provides close supervision. It could be that the teachers involved were those of lower ability, or maturity, and are those followers who work best with a telling style leader. The findings could also suggest that the teachers who are less satisfied with the three other style principals are not ready for those levels of leadership. Analysis of the level of maturity of each respondent would explain if the leadership style, telling, produces higher levels of teacher job satisfaction from all teachers in this area, or just those with the lower levels of ability and motivation.

Davis and Wilson (2000) found that principal empowering behaviors were not related to teacher job satisfaction or stress. This is consistent with the findings of this research. The Style 4, delegating, did not tend to elicit the highest levels of teacher job satisfaction. Smith (2000) and Benit (1991) also found the leadership style, delegating to result in lower levels of job

satisfaction. This style of leader allows the followers the decision making power. This finding suggests that teachers in the elementary schools in Morris County in DFG GH, I, or J do not prefer to have this level of decision making power. Perhaps these teachers are more comfortable with a principal making the majority of decisions and taking on the responsibility of the results of those decisions.

Greenblatt, Cooper, and Muth (1984) found that principals with an authoritarian style of leadership, one that can be compared to the telling style, had the least effective teachers. This study did not examine effectiveness of teachers, but it was interesting that the effective teachers tended to work for a non-authoritarian style leader and the most satisfied tended to work with a telling style leader. This could mean effective teachers are capable of a higher level of leadership style and the teachers included in this study are not prepared to have a say in the decision making process.

Heck and Marcoulides (1993) found a relationship between school climate and the principals' leadership role in monitoring the school and instruction. Those principals who were strong instructional leaders and who effectively monitored the school were found to have a positive school climate. The findings of this research may support this. Style 1 principals are highly involved in the decision making process. The higher level of job satisfaction could suggest a more positive school climate.

In the analysis of age on teacher job satisfaction, statistically significant differences in means were not found. This is consistent with the findings of Clark (1998), and Sagor (1992) who also did not find a relationship between age and job satisfaction.

In the analysis of the effect of gender on teacher job satisfaction, teachers tended to report higher levels of satisfaction with male principals in the areas of pay, co-workers, communication, and total job satisfaction. Teachers tended to report higher levels of satisfaction with female principals in the area of promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions and style adaptability. These differences were not statistically significant. This

finding is consistent with Smith (2000) and Benit (1991) who also found no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction based on principal gender. This study suggests that female principals may have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction in some areas, and lower in others. Overall, the difference in levels of teacher job satisfaction between genders is not significant.

In the area of total years of principal experience, statistically significant difference in means was not found when comparing total job satisfaction to total years of principal experience. Statistically significant differences were found in several sub-areas of job satisfaction. These areas were pay, promotion, communication and style adaptability. Principals with 11-15 years of principal experiences tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of pay, promotion, communication, and higher style adaptability scores. This is consistent with the findings of Smith (2000) who noted that principals with more than eleven years of experience had higher mean scores for teacher job satisfaction than principals with less than ten years of experience. Smith did not find this difference to be statistically significant.

Primarily, teacher pay is a negotiated item. Although the principal may not have input in the level of pay, perhaps after several years of experiences, these principals can effect the level of satisfaction with pay by being more empathetic towards lower paid teachers. This may also be connected to promotion. The numbers of positions above the teacher level in a school district is limited. The higher level of teacher job satisfaction suggests that these district support teachers in being promoted to positions within the district, as opposed always filling supervisory positions with outside applicants. The higher style adaptability scores suggest that the principals with 11-15 years of experience have learned to adjust their leadership style according to the situation. This is a skill that could come with experience. As the principal encounters new situations and varying staff members, he/she may learn to adjust style and be flexible depending upon the teacher and the situation.

In the area of principal experience at the present school, there were statistically significant differences between the means.   Principals with over ten years of experience at the

present school tended to have lower levels of teacher job satisfaction in the areas of operating conditions, communication and total job satisfaction. This suggests that as a principal gains experience in a given school, the level of teacher job satisfaction may decline, but experience gained from different schools may add to teacher job satisfaction. This could mean that a principal learns how to be more effective in these areas while working in different settings. A principal could gather the best practices from different settings and apply them to the present school. A principal could also make mistakes, learn from them, and then apply the learning to the new school without the new staff having knowledge of any previous errors.

For highest degree earned, teachers seemed to be more satisfied with principals who had earned a Doctorate in Education in the areas of pay and contingent rewards, but this was not statistically significant. This is consistent with the findings of Smith (2000).

Style adaptability was analyzed. The higher the score on the style adaptability, the more flexible the principal is in choosing different leadership styles, depending on the situation. According to Hersey and Blanchard (1976), this is the basis for the situational leadership model. Principals in the age group 56-65, with 11-15 years of principal experience, and who earned a Master's degree + 30, tended to have higher levels of style adaptability. This is an interesting finding, but cannot be connected to any current research, due to limited research in the area of style adaptability. This finding could suggest that as the level of experience increases, which would also mean an increase in age, the principal learns the appropriate level of leadership for a given situation, based on the circumstances and the teachers involved.

This study found that the leadership style, telling, tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction in the areas of supervision, contingent rewards, operating conditions, communication, total job satisfaction, and style adaptability. Principals with 11-15 years of principal experiences tended to have higher levels of teacher job satisfaction reported in the area of pay, promotion, communication, and higher style adaptability scores. Principals with over ten years of experience at the present school tended to have lower levels of teacher job satisfaction in

the areas of operating conditions, communication and total job satisfaction. Differences in age, gender, and highest degree earned were not found to be statistically significant.

Principals need to be aware of their primary leadership style. This would be helpful when working with teachers of various levels of ability and motivation. Principals should be aware that providing direction, clear instructions, and supervision could lead to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. School districts should include professional development for principals in the area of leadership. This would aide in the awareness of leadership style and its impact on interactions with staff.

Recommendations for further research

The analysis of the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction was descriptive and correlational in nature. The findings of this study and the limitations of this study have led the researcher to make the following recommendation for further research:

1. A similar study should be conducted in elementary schools in DFG's GH, I and J across other counties in New Jersey. A larger sample size could produce different results.

2. Further research on specific leadership styles that are associated with higher levels of job satisfaction should be conducted in order to assist districts with training of principals.

3. The study of the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction should be expanded to include student achievement, teacher effectiveness, change, and school effectiveness.

4. Further research should be conducted on teacher turn over rate and job satisfaction to determine the areas of job satisfaction that mostly affects the reason for leaving the profession.

5. Research to include the maturity level of the teacher should be conducted when studying principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

6. Further research in the area of style adaptability is needed to support the situational leadership model.

7. Further studies comparing principals who have experience in one school compared to those with experience in different schools is needed to further substantiate conclusions in this area.

8.   Further studies to investigate grade level differences in terms of middle school or secondary school preferences of principal leadership style.

9. Examine teacher preferences to leadership style in specific situations.

Concluding remarks

Chapter V has presented the findings of the study that determined if there is a relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Some of the results of this study were found to be statistically significant and can serve as a basis for future studies. If teacher job satisfaction can be improved given a specific leadership style, it is possible that effective teachers will remain in the profession and contribute to school effectiveness and student achievement.

REFERENCES

Anderman, E.M. (1991). Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: The role of school culture and principal leadership. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 375 497

Andrews, R. L. & Soder, R. (1987). Principal leadership and student achievement. Educational Leadership, 44(6), 9-11.

Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.

Benit, D.A. (1991). The relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Doctoral Dissertation, Wayne State University, Michigan.

Boe, E.E. (1996). Research on the shortage of teachers in the United States: Models, methods, and findings. Paper presented at the Joint Meetings of the Education Research Association and the Australian Association for Research in Education. Singapore. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 406 363.

Bulach, C. & Lunenberg, F.C. (1995). The influence of the principal's leadership style on school climate and student achievement. People and Education, 3(3) 333-351.

Bobbitt, S.A.et.al, (1994). Characteristics of stayers, movers, and leavers: Results from the teacher followup survey: 1991-92. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 374 134.

Bogler, R. (1999). Reassessing the behavior of principals as a multiple factor in teachers' job satisfaction. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 432 800.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. (Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession). New York: Carnegie.

Choy, S. P. et al. (1993). Schools and staffing in the United States: A statistical profile, 1990-91. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 360 378.

Clark, R. (1998). School choice and administrators: Will principals become marketers? Clearing House, 71(2), 95-98.

Davidson, B. M., & Dell, G. L. (1996). Transforming teacher's work: The impact of two principal's leadership styles. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 396 448.

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

Delaney, J.G. (1997). Principal leadership: A primary factor in school-based management and school improvement. NASSP Bulletin, 81(585), 107-111.

Derlin, R. & Schneider, G.T. (1994). Understanding job satisfaction: Principals and teachers, urban and suburban. Urban Education, 29(1), 63-88.

Dow, I. & Oakley, W.F. (1992). School effectiveness and leadership. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 38(1), 33-47.

Edington, E.D. (1988). Principal leadership style and student achievement in small and rural schools of New Mexico. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 770.

Evans, L. & Teddlie, C. (1993). Principals' change facilitator styles in schools that differ in effectiveness and SES. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 727.

Evans, T.J. (1996). Elementary teachers' and principals' perceptions of principal leadership style and school social organization. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 403 637.

Feuer, R. (1995). State report shows higher turnover rate for novice teachers. The Chronicle Online. [On-line].

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Furtwengler, W. J. & Hurst, D. (1992). Leadership for school quality - Personal challenge, the missing factor. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348 772.

Gallagher, K. S. (1984). The effect of style on teachers' perceptions of the principals instructional leadership in the supervision of a model school. Planning and Changing, 15 (1), 10-17.

Gallimer, K. (1992). The effectiveness of principal leadership style on teacher motivation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Chicago State University, Illinois.

Greenblatt, Cooper & Muth (1984). Managing for effective change. Educational Leadership, 42 (5), 57-59.

Guignon, A. (1998) 1998 – Is this the year of the teacher shortage? Education World. [On-line].

Haberman, & Rickards (1990). Urban teachers who quit: Why they leave and what they do. Urban Education, 25(3), 297-303.

Hall, B. (1987). Teachers at risk: A profile of the teacher predisposed to quit. Florida Journal of Educational Research 29(1), 55-72.

Hanson, E.M. (1996). Educational administration and organizational behavior. (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon..

Heck, R.H. & Marcoulides, A. (1993). Principal leadership behaviors and school achievement. NASSP Bulletin, 77(553), 20-28.

Heller, H.W., Clay, R. & Perkins, C. (1993), The relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal leadership style. Journal of School Leadership, 3(1), 74-86.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. (1959). The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1976). Situational Leadership. Columbus: Ohio State University, Center for Leadership Studies.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1977). Management of Organizational Behavior. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Job Satisfaction Survey. (1994). Spector, P.E. University of South Florida.

Karge, B. D. (1993). Beginning teachers: In danger of attrition. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED360 281.

Konanc, M.E. (1996). Teacher attrition 1980-1006. Statistical notes no. 002. Raleigh, NC: State Department of Public Instruction.

LEAD-Other. (1979). Center for Leadership Studies. California.

Lumsden, L. (1998). Teacher morale. Eugene, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 422 601.

Likert, R. (1961). New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McCurdy, J. (1983). The role of the principal in effective schools: Problems & solutions. Sacramento, CA: Education News Services. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254 900.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1994). The condition of education – 1994. (NCES 94-149). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

National Education Association. (2001) Wanted: Teachers. Communicator, the Monthly Newsletter of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, 25(2) 1-2.

Palmer, R. (1998). Collaborative reflection, dialogue, and inquiry: Empowering experienced teachers to cultivate dispositions and abilities that transform practice. Available: ERIC Reproduction Document Service No. ED 417 146. New Jersey: Clearinghouse.

Parker, N.N. (1984). The work of public and private elementary school principals (Managerial behavior, personnel, role, activities, curriculum, interactions). Available from: ProQuest Digital Dissertations No. ATT 8510178).

Patrick, J.E. (1995). Correlation between administrative style and school climate. Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 387 853.

Perkins, C.M. (1991). A study to investigate experienced teachers' job satisfaction and the teachers' perception of their principals' leadership style. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Piscotta, J. (1997). Teacher satisfaction in private and public schools. San Antonio, TX: Texas Public Policy Foundation.

Sagor, R.D. (1992). Three principals who make a difference. Educational Leadership, 49(5), 13-18.

Schein, E. (1970). Organizational Psychology. New York: Prentice Hall.

Schmitt, D.R. (1990). The effect a principal has on the effective school program. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Louisiana Evaluators, New Orleans, LA Available: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 089.

Smith, J.M. (2000). Analysis of the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Teaching to Teach. (2001, Feb. 25). The Newark Star Ledger, p. 7.

U.S. Department of Education, Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94. Washington DC, USDE, National Center for Education Statistics.

Walter, J.E., Caldwell, S.D. & Marshall , J. (1980).Evidence for validity of situational leadership theory. Educational Leadership, 37(5), 618-621.

Winter, J.S. & Sweeney, J. (1994). Improving school climate: Administrators are key. NASP Bulletin, 7 (683), 65-69.

Witte, R. S. & Witte, J. S. (1997). Statistics Fifth Edition. New York: Harcout Brace College Publications.

Zigrang, C.B. (2000). The correlation between a principal's leadership style and teacher personality, as perceived by the teacher, and its effect on teacher job satisfaction. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Regent University, Center for Leadership Studies.

Appendix A

Letters of Solicitation/Informed Consent - Principals

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY.

December 15, 2001

Dear Principal,

I am a student at Seton Hall University, conducting a study on 'The Relationship Between Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction. This research will focus on elementary schools in Morris County, whose district factor grouping is I or J and whose principal has been at the school for at least one year. You and your school have been identified as meeting that description.

The study will use demographic questions completed by each principal, the LEAD-Other Questionnaire, completed by teachers, and the Job Satisfaction Survey, also completed by teachers. The demographic questions will require minimal time to complete. The questionnaires completed by teachers will take approximately ten minutes each to complete.

I am asking your permission to distribute and collect questionnaires to the teachers in your school. Participation by you and teachers is voluntary. If permission is granted, I will bring the questionnaires to your school and distribute them using the customary means of distribution your school practices. I will place a box labeled, 'Leadership and Satisfaction Questionnaires' in a central location in the school, for a specified period of time. Teachers can place their completed surveys in the box.

The questionnaires to be used are the LEAD-Other and a Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. The LEAD-Other instrument describes twelve situations and for possible behaviors of a leader in each situation. The teacher is asked to select the behavior he/she thinks the principals would choose if faced with the given situation. Responses indicate one of four possible leadership styles. There are no correct or incorrect answers in choosing the behaviors. The Job Satisfaction Survey consists of thirty-six questions about nine areas of job satisfaction. Each area is assessed with four questions and an overall score is computed using all thirty-six questions.

The information obtained from principals and teachers will remain strictly confidential and the reporting of results will be by group analysis only. No names will be used in any reporting of results. The participation on part of the school and the teachers will be voluntary. Teachers not willing to participate will not complete the questionnaires. Questionnaires will be secured and only the researcher will have access to them.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at (973) 275-2974.

Please use the enclosed form to notify me of your decision to participate in this study. If you agree to participate, please complete the principal demographic questions. Those principals willing to participate will be contacted by phone to set a date for the distribution and collection of questionnaires.

Please accept my sincere appreciation for your professional assistance with this research. If you would like a copy of the dissertation abstract mailed to you after completion, please contact me at (908) 647-2312 ext. 2115.

Sincerely,

Karen Wetherell

Karen Wetherell

APPROVED

DEC 0 7 2001

IRB
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY

College of Education and Human Services
Department of Educational Administration and Supervision
Tel. 973.761.9397
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685

ENRICHING THE MIND, THE HEART AND THE SPIRIT

Principal Name: _____

School _____

District _____

_____I have read the material above, and any questions I asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity, realizing that I may withdraw without prejudice at any time.

_____ I do not wish to participate.

Please only complete the demographic questions if you are willing to participate in this study. Your completion of the following questions indicates your understanding of this project and your willingness to participate.

Principal Demographic Questions

1. Age: _____ 26 – 35
   _____ 36 – 45
   _____ 46 – 55
   _____ 56 – 65
   _____ Over 65

2. Gender: Male _____   Female _____

3. Race/ethnicity: _____ White
   _____ Black or African American
   _____ Asian
   _____ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   _____ Hispanic or Latino
   _____ American Indian or Alaska Native
   _____ Other (please specify)

4. Total years as Principal: _____

5. Number of Years in present school: _____

6. Highest degree completed: _____

Appendix B

Letters of Solicitation/Informed Consent - Teachers

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY.
Letter of Solicitation/Informed Consent Form - Teachers

Dear Teacher,

I am a student at Seton Hall University, conducting a study on 'The Relationship Between Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction. This research will focus on elementary schools in Morris County, whose district factor grouping is I or J, and whose principal has been at the school for at least one year. Your school has been identified as meeting that description.

The study will use demographic questions completed by each principal, the LEAD-Other Questionnaire, completed by teachers, and the Job Satisfaction Survey, also completed by teachers. The surveys will take approximately ten minutes each to complete.

Your principal has given me permission to distribute and collect the necessary questionnaires. Enclosed you will find a copy of the LEAD-Other Questionnaire and the Job Satisfaction Survey. Kindly complete the questionnaires and put them in the box labeled, 'Leadership and Satisfaction Questionnaires' which is located in the _____. I will return to the school to collect the box on _____.

Participation in this study is voluntary. I know our schedules are very busy, but I ask for your assistance in my research. The more returns of the questionnaires, the more data will be relevant in identifying factors related to teacher job satisfaction.

The LEAD-Other instrument describes twelve situations and for possible behaviors of a leader in each situation. The teacher is asked to select the behavior he/she thinks the principals would choose if faced with the given situation. Responses indicate one of four possible leadership styles. There are no correct or incorrect answers in choosing the behaviors. The Job Satisfaction Survey consists of thirty-six questions about nine areas of job satisfaction. Each area is assessed with four questions and an overall score is computed using all thirty-six questions.

The information obtained from principals and teachers will remain strictly confidential and the reporting of results will be by group analysis only. No names will be used in any reporting of results. The participation on part of the school and the teachers will be voluntary. Teachers not willing to participate will not complete the questionnaires. The questionnaires will be secured and only the researcher will have access to them.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at (973) 275-2974.

Please accept my sincere appreciation for your professional assistance with this research. Your completion and return of the completed questionnaires indicates your understanding of this project and your willingness to participate. If you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact me at (908) 647-2312 ext. 2115.

Sincerely,

Karen Wetherell

Karen Wetherell

College of Education and Human Services
Department of Educational Administration and Supervision
Tel. 973.761.9397
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685

APPROVED

DEC 0 7 2001

IRB
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY

Appendix C

LEAD-Other Questionnaire

Copyrighted material not included

Appendix D

Job Satisfaction Survey

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Paul E. Spector

Department of Psychology

University of South Florida

1 = Disagree very much 4 = Agree slightly 2 = Disagree moderately 5 = Agree moderately 3 = Disagree slightly 6 = Agree very much	Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it using the choices to the left.
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7	I like the people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1 2 3 4 5 6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1 2 3 4 5 6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1 2 3 4 5 6
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6

(OVER PLEASE)

	1 = Disagree very much 4 = Agree slightly 2 = Disagree moderately 5 = Agree moderately 3 = Disagree slightly 6 = Agree very much Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.	Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it using the choices to the left.
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1 2 3 4 5 6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1 2 3 4 5 6
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1 2 3 4 5 6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1 2 3 4 5 6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1 2 3 4 5 6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1 2 3 4 5 6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1 2 3 4 5 6
30	I like my supervisor.	1 2 3 4 5 6
31	I have too much paperwork.	1 2 3 4 5 6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1 2 3 4 5 6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1 2 3 4 5 6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1 2 3 4 5 6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1 2 3 4 5 6