

THE CORRELATION OF THE PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP STYLE OF MIDDLE
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS TO TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION AND EFFICACY

by

Jack C. Dale, Jr.

Liberty University

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Liberty University

November, 2012

The Correlation of the Perceived Leadership Style of Middle School Principals to
Teacher Job Satisfaction and Efficacy

By Jack C. Dale, Jr.

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

November, 2012

APPROVED BY:

Deanna Keith, EdD, Chair

John Bartlett, EdD, Committee

Brian Bell, EdD, Committee

Scott Watson, PhD, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

THE CORRELATION OF THE PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP STYLE OF MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS TO TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION AND EFFICACY.

ABSTRACT

This quantitative study addressed the idea that a middle school principal could possibly impact teacher effectiveness in the classroom through the relationship of the teacher-perceived leadership style of the principal to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. The sample consisted of 142 certified teachers from 8 public middle schools in an East Tennessee school district. Teachers completed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, (Bass & Avolio, 2004) and the Job Satisfaction Survey, (Spector, 1994). Findings from this study suggest that the middle school teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership did not have a statistically significant relationship to teacher job satisfaction. A new insight from this study suggests that principals should find ways to lead beyond teacher perceptions to address the needs of teachers in order to promote and encourage higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. Furthermore, findings from this study suggest that the middle school teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style had a statistically significant relationship to teacher efficacy. Findings from the exploratory question at the end of the surveys further validated this study by indicating teachers perceived their need for principal leadership to help them become more effective in the classroom by incorporating elements of both transformational and transactional leadership. This research may assist in developing leadership style training for principals desiring to indirectly influence academic achievement by influencing teacher job satisfaction and efficacy within their schools.

Dedication

It has been by the amazing grace of my Lord Jesus Christ that I am able to finish the race He has set before me. Where I have been weak, He has been strong and has provided the determination and insight to complete the task for His glory.

Sherry Dale, my beautiful wife and the love of my life, has been my biggest fan and cheerleader throughout this four-year journey. She has walked with me through the ups and downs, the long nights and early mornings. When my heart grew faint with frustration and weariness, Sherry was my inspiration to keep on keeping on. She gave up hours of her time to proofread for me. She was never without a hug and “I’m so proud of you,” “you can do this,” or “I sure love you.” She continues to see in me what I cannot see in myself. I love her with all my heart and I am so grateful God hand-picked her just for me. I am forever in her debt and in her love.

Summer and Jackson, my “Kid” and my “Bubba” have been the most amazing daughter and son anyone could ever have. I know God has great things in store for both of them and my prayer is that they have learned by my example the rewards for hard work and determination. I want to thank Summer so much for helping me edit portions of my manuscript. I also want to thank Jackson for the times we had to cancel our “Daleman time” so that I could work on this project.

There is one who has been there for me since I was born, Vivian Dale, my mother. I would not be the man I am today if it were not for her selfless love and sacrificial investments into my life. She has been my prayer warrior and continues to lift my family and me up before the Lord. I thank God for my mom.

Finally, I want to acknowledge Barbara King, aka “Mammaw,” my mother-in-

law, who is no longer with us. She was so proud of me for pursuing this doctorate. Her generous heart and loving support was a great encouragement to Sherry and me. I thank God I had the privilege of knowing her.

Acknowledgements

Dr. Deanna Keith, my dissertation chairperson, has been a beacon of light for me through this dissertation process. She has been the voice of reason, guidance, and support for me. Dr. Keith will never know how much her enthusiasm and encouragement has meant to me. I am so grateful she saw something in me that led her to agree to be my chairperson.

Dr. Brian Bell, my dissertation committee member, has been a friend as well as a leader to me. Dr. Bell made time for me on many occasions to guide me through the times I needed guidance or feedback concerning specific areas of my dissertation. His wisdom and encouragement has been invaluable to me. I am truly honored to have had Dr. Bell as one of my dissertation committee members.

Dr. John Bartlett, my dissertation committee member, was instrumental in talking me through a time of great frustration. His wisdom and genuine concern was strategic in providing me with a renewed strength to stay the course to the end. I truly believe it was divinely inspired that we met and that Dr. Bartlett agreed to serve as one of my dissertation committee members.

I want to thank all my friends who helped and encouraged me throughout this four-year journey. Special thanks to Dr. David Stanton who was a semester ahead of me and provided friendship as well as advice along the way. I also want to thank Meme Carter who used her librarian skills to help me organize my plethora of references and citations, and Tom Sowder who provided me with statistical help during a time I was struggling. I want to especially thank my principal Gary Critselous with whom I've had the honor of serving and who continued to support me through this process.

Table of Contents

Dedication	2
Acknowledgements	4
List of Tables	9
List of Abbreviations	11
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	12
Background	12
Problem Statement	14
Purpose Statement	15
Significance of the Study	16
Definitions	17
Research Questions	18
Research and Null Hypotheses	19
Identification of Variables	22
Research Plan.....	23
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	24
Introduction	24
Conceptual Models of Leadership	24
Theoretical Framework.....	29
Review of Literature	31
Principal Effects on Student Achievement.....	32
Instructional Leadership	33
Transformational Leadership.....	34
Transactional Leadership	38

Passive Avoidant Leadership.....	40
Job Satisfaction	43
Principal Leadership and Job Satisfaction.....	45
Teacher Efficacy	49
Principal Leadership and Teacher Efficacy.....	50
Summary.....	52
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	55
Introduction.....	55
Research Design.....	55
Research Questions	56
Research and Null Hypotheses	57
Participants.....	60
Setting.....	63
Instrumentation	63
Procedures.....	69
Data Analysis	72
Summary.....	79
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS.....	81
Introduction.....	81
Demographic Statistics	81
Descriptive Statistics	87
Assumption Testing.....	89
Data Analysis	92

Research Hypotheses 1.1	93
Research Hypotheses 1.2	96
Research Hypotheses 1.3	99
Research Hypotheses 2.1	102
Research Hypotheses 2.2	105
Research Hypotheses 2.3	108
Exploratory Open-Ended Question	111
Summary	114
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	115
Introduction	115
Problem Statement	115
Review of Methodology	116
Summary of the Findings	117
Relationship to Prior Research	122
Principal Leadership Style to Teacher Job Satisfaction	122
Principal Leadership Style to Teacher Efficacy	125
Theoretical Implications	129
Implications for Practice	131
Limitations	136
Recommendations for Future Research	138
Conclusion	139
REFERENCES	141
APPENDIX A	160

APPENDIX B	161
APPENDIX C	162
APPENDIX D	163
APPENDIX E	164
APPENDIX F	165
APPENDIX G	166
APPENDIX H	169
APPENDIX I	171
APPENDIX J	172
APPENDIX K	177
APPENDIX L	178
APPENDIX M	179

List of Tables

Table 1: Reliability and Questions for Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire	
Subscales.....	66
Table 2: Reliability and Questions for Job Satisfaction Subscales.....	68
Table 3: Frequency Distribution of All Middle School Teacher Participants	82
Table 4: Reliability Distribution by Gender of Teacher Participation.....	83
Table 5: Reliability Distribution by Ethnic Background of Teacher Participation	84
Table 6: Reliability Distribution by Age of Teacher Participation.....	85
Table 7: Reliability Distribution by Total Years Teaching of Teacher Participation.....	86
Table 8: Reliability Distribution by Total Years Teaching at Current School by Participants.....	87
Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Principal Leadership Style, Teacher Job Satisfaction, and Efficacy	89
Table 10: Shapiro-Wilk Test of Normality	91
Table 11: Spearman's Rho Correlations of Transformational Leadership Style and Subscales to Teacher Job Satisfaction	96
Table 12: Spearman's Rho Correlations of Transactional Leadership Style and Subscales to Teacher Job Satisfaction	99
Table 13: Spearman's Rho Correlations of Passive Avoidant Leadership Style and Subscales to Teacher Job Satisfaction	102
Table 14: Spearman's Rho Correlations of Transformational Leadership Style and Subscales to Teacher Efficacy	105

Table 15: Spearman’s Rho Correlations of Transactional Leadership Style and	
Subscales to Teacher Job Satisfaction	108
Table 16: Spearman’s Rho Correlations of Passive Avoidant Leadership Style and	
Subscales to Teacher Efficacy	111
Table 17: Exploratory Open-Ended Question Ranking	113

List of Abbreviations

TF=Transformational Leadership

IIA=Idealized Influence (Attribute)

IIB=Idealized Influence (Behavior)

IM=Inspirational Motivation

IS=Intellectual Stimulation

TA=Transactional Leadership

CR=Contingent Reward

MBEA=Management by Exception (Active)

PA=Passive Avoidant Leadership

MBEP=Management by Exception (Passive)

LF=Laissez Faire

JS=Job Satisfaction

EE=Efficacy

MLQ=Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

JSS=Job Satisfaction Survey

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This study sought to ascertain whether a relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of principal leadership styles to teachers' job satisfaction and efficacy (willingness to exert extra effort). This study also sought to explore teachers' perceptions of principal leadership practices that could lead to teacher effectiveness in the classroom. This chapter provides the (a) background, (b) purpose statement, (c) problem statement, (d) significance of the study, (e) definitions, (f) research questions, (g) research and null hypotheses, (h) identification of variables, (i) assumptions and limitations, and (j) research plan for this study.

Background

The issue of accountability has continued to cause anxiety and great concern among principals as well as teachers (Fullan, 2010). School environments have continued to change at a rapid pace presenting principals with many new challenges. At the same time, higher expectations and increasing demands on principals rarely make concession for all the school changes taking place (Bartlett, 2008).

Principals are not present daily in the classroom, which means student achievement is not directly affected by the principal (Orr & Orphanos, 2007; Perry & Mankin, 2007; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). In order to influence student achievement, principals may have to provide an indirect leadership approach. Studies such as the one conducted by Valentine and Prater (2011) have indicated a correlation between principals who use instructional leadership to train and develop teaching skills in teachers to an influence on student academic achievement. Teachers require more than just training and pressure to learn more teaching skills. Teachers must feel a sense of

satisfaction in their job and motivation to exert extra effort in the classroom. MacNeil, Prater and Busch (2009) suggested that, “Highly motivated teachers have greater success in terms of student performance and student outcomes” (p. 77). Beyond instructional leadership, principals must engage teachers with a leadership style that promotes job satisfaction and encourage teachers to be more effective in their classrooms. Horn-Turpin (2009) references two earlier studies, Billingsley and Cross (1992), and Gersten, Keating, Yovanoff, and Harniss (2001), which reported that administrative support correlated to higher levels of teacher satisfaction and commitment to their jobs. Teachers’ perceptions of leadership will influence their sense of efficacy and job satisfaction (Printy & Marks, 2006; Ross & Gray, 2006). Teachers who are motivated and satisfied significantly contribute to the academic success of their school. The supportive role of the principal is directly related to the leadership style of the principal (Johnson, 2007).

The success of a school relies on the strength of its administrative leadership (Sarros & Sarros, 2007). Principals are given the task of leading the school to higher test scores, providing discipline to students, working with parents and stakeholders, maintaining a school budget, and cultivating teacher job satisfaction (Rowland, 2008). The principal of the school must develop a level of trust among the teachers if the school is going to be effective (Nguni, Slegers, & Denessen, 2006; Sarros & Sarros, 2007; Stroh, 2007). Teachers may feel that the leadership is not supporting them in their efforts. Morale and attitudes may become greatly reduced, and teachers’ efforts diminish when the teachers’ trust lessens for the principal (Gallos, 2008). When teachers are not satisfied with their job, it becomes more difficult to exert the effort

needed to consistently motivate students to learn. When teachers feel their principal supports them, commitment to students increases and teacher morale is enhanced (Mackenzie, 2007). It is important that principals recognize the value of teachers within their schools and the impact principal leadership plays in cultivating teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy, which can in turn contribute to the academic success of the school.

Problem Statement

The problem addressed in this study involved the effects of principal leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy. Research indicates that a principal's leadership style can influence job satisfaction and teaching efforts among school teachers (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Hulpia, Devos, & Rosseel, 2009; Ross & Gray, 2006).

When workers feel their needs are being met and experience a sense of satisfaction in their job, they experience a stronger motivation to exert extra effort to accomplish organizational goals (Mackenzie, 2007). When employees feel overwhelmed with their job and feel they have little support from their leader, they experience low levels of job satisfaction (Fuming & Jiliang, 2008). It is imperative that principals exhibit strong educational leadership within the school in order to provide the support teachers need to be successful in the classroom.

Some studies have suggested that a principal's influence on teacher job satisfaction and efficacy may have a direct bearing on student achievement, such as reported by Nguni et al., (2006). Research has also shown that principal leadership can correlate to job satisfaction and efficacy among teachers, which can also lead to

increased teacher effectiveness in the classroom (Printy & Marks, 2006; Ross & Gray, 2006; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). This study sought to ascertain if there is a leadership style perceived by teachers that shows a significant relationship to teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' perceived principal leadership styles to job satisfaction. Did the job satisfaction of the teachers show a significant correlation to teachers' perceptions of the leadership of the principal? This topic has been researched in informal reports, in formal studies, and in dissertations (Gaither, 2008; Johnson, 2007; Williams, 2009). A review of literature by these authors provides evidence that there have been few definitive conclusions drawn. Johnson (2007) stated,

A plethora of research has been compiled in regards to leadership style and employee motivation independently and succinctly; however, there is no definitive evidence to delineate consistent variables that contribute to job satisfaction, and whether or not a relationship exists with leadership style (p. 17).

Suggestions by Johnson (2007), as well as others address the need for further research in this area. Further investigation of teacher-perceived principal leadership's relationship to teacher job satisfaction, specifically on the middle school level, contributed to filling this gap in literature.

Furthermore, this study sought to explore the possible relationship between principal leadership style and teacher efficacy. Did principal leadership influence the teachers' willingness to exert extra effort, which for the purpose of this study was called

teacher efficacy? Teachers will try harder and employ various teaching and learning strategies in order to promote student learning regardless of ability when efficacy is at a high level (Ross & Gray, 2006). Nir & Kranot (2006) purported that a principal's leadership style has a strong relationship with teacher overall satisfaction, support, autonomy, and professional growth; with all of these factors having a strong link to teacher efficacy.

In addition, this study specifically researched the middle schools of an urban school district located in East Tennessee. Most research focusing on principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction or principal leadership styles and teacher efficacy occurred at the elementary or high school level (Butz, 2010; Johnson, 2007; Shatzer, 2009; Shumate, 2011). This study further fills the gap in literature by researching the middle school level.

Significance of the Study

In this new frontier of educational reform, principals are evaluating their current leadership style. They are confronted with the reality that the way they led in the past may not be the way they need to lead now. A review of literature revealed that there are numerous research studies investigating the relationship between principal leadership to job satisfaction, and principal leadership to teacher efficacy (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Hulpia et al., 2009; Mackenzie, 2007; Ross & Gray, 2006). There were very few research studies specifically investigating the relationship between middle school administrative leadership styles to teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy within the same study. Further examination researching the correlation of teachers' perceptions of principal leadership styles to both teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy in

middle schools was warranted.

Whether a principal's leadership style's relationship to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy has a direct or indirect influence on student achievement is a subject of some debate (Kythreotis, Pashiardis, & Kyrakides, 2010). The current study did not focus directly on student achievement. The need for future research has been suggested at the end of this study as to whether a principal's leadership style has a direct or indirect influence on student achievement based on the relationship a principal's leadership style has to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy.

Definitions

The following terms are defined according to their use in this study:

Principal leadership style: The behavior patterns that a principal uses to influence, coordinate, and support the work of others in an effort to achieve a goal as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) by Bass and Avolio, (2004). This questionnaire provided teachers with an instrument to report their perceptions of their principals' daily leadership practices.

Instructional leadership: A leadership style that influences teachers through the design of curriculum and instruction (Hart, 2006). Instructional leadership includes the principal concentrating on supervision, coordinating, controlling, and developing curriculum and instruction (Hallinger, 2003).

Transactional leadership: A leadership style offering reward or punishment for services rendered or not rendered (Bass & Avolio, 2004). "Such leaders emphasize extrinsic motivations to shape goal setting in an attempt to strengthen organizational culture, structure, and strategy" (Bucic, Robinson, & Ramburuth, 2009, p. 231).

Transformational leadership: A leadership style with the goal of transforming followers into leaders themselves (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The transformational leader gains trust and respect from his/her followers by providing a vision and sense of pride (Bass, 1998). The core of transformational leadership is strengthening the commitment of the staff and helping them to grow by elevating their goals (Mulford, 2008).

Passive avoidant leadership: A leadership style that is more passive and reactive. “Passive leaders avoid specifying agreements, clarifying expectations, and providing goals and standards to be achieved by followers” (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 96). This style of leadership has been classified as a “no leadership” style (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Teacher job satisfaction: The degree of satisfaction or gratification experienced by teachers as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1994). This survey reports the results of measured job satisfaction variables provided by teachers within their school (Spector, 1994).

Teacher efficacy: The extra effort a teacher exhibits in the classroom as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000, 2004).

Walker & Slear (2011) identified teacher efficacy as the effort teachers exhibit to have a positive effect on student learning.

Research Questions

The following research questions were investigated:

1. Is there a statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived leadership style of middle school principals (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership

Questionnaire (MLQ) to teacher job satisfaction as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district?

2. Is there a statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived leadership style of middle school principals (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ) in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district?

Research and Null Hypotheses

The following are the research and null hypotheses for the research questions:

Hypothesis 1.1a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher- perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 1.1b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Null Hypothesis 1.1: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 1.2a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as

measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 1.2b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Null Hypothesis 1.2: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 1.3a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 1.3b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Null Hypothesis 1.3: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 2.1a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.1b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between

the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Null Hypothesis 2.1: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.2a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.2b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Null Hypothesis 2.2: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy to (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.3a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.3b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Null Hypothesis 2.3: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Identification of Variables

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if there was a significant relationship between principal leadership styles to teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy. The variables of interest were principal leadership styles and subscales, as perceived by the teachers, teacher job satisfaction, and teacher efficacy. Since this was a correlation study, which showed the relationship between variables, the variables were not manipulated and therefore were considered variables of interest (Howell, 2008).

Two surveys were used to acquire the necessary data for the investigation. The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) measured the levels of job satisfaction each teacher was experiencing (Spector, 1994). To measure the leadership style of the principal as perceived by the teachers and teacher efficacy, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was used (Avolio & Bass 1995, 2000, 2004). An exploratory open-ended question designed to assess teacher-perceived needs of principal leadership behaviors or practices that influence effectiveness in the classroom provided deeper and richer data for the study. A demographic survey was included in order to obtain certain

characteristics of the teachers who participated. All hypotheses were tested using the data collected from these sources.

Research Plan

Creswell (2002) stated, “Quantitative research will be used to study research problems requiring a description of trends or to test a theory regarding the relationship among variables” (p.50). This research was not designed to prove a cause and effect relationship between the leadership of the principal to teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy. This study rather sought to determine if a correlation existed between two or more variables.

Correlational research methodology provided the data guiding this study (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009). Quantitative research has been described as assigning numerical values to all of the objects under investigation and drawing a conclusion based on the collection and analysis of the numerical data (Hart, 2006). The correlation study examines variables in their natural environment and does not include researcher-imposed treatments. Correlation studies conduct research after the variations in the variable have occurred naturally (Simon, 2006). The variables in the current study were not manipulated or controlled; therefore, a correlation design was deemed appropriate for the quantitative portion of the study (Johnson, 2004).

An exploratory open-ended question at the end of the survey provided a richer layer of data for this study. The question engaged teacher perceptions concerning principal leadership practices that influenced teacher effectiveness in the classroom. The use of the exploratory component in this study provided rich data of the perceptions of teachers concerning principal leadership practices contributing to the current research.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Throughout the years, studies have been conducted concerning what variables related to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. Likewise, much has been written concerning the effectiveness of the leadership styles of principals. This literature review provides a theoretical framework and basis for this study's research on how teacher job satisfaction and efficacy may have a significant relationship to the principal's leadership style as perceived by the teachers.

This chapter begins with a discussion of conceptual models of leadership, ultimately leading to the definition and explanation of transformational and transactional leadership theory, which provides the basis for this study's theoretical framework. This chapter then discusses research and supporting literature on federal and Tennessee state mandated school achievement accountability, Tennessee principals' responsibility for school achievement, and the indirect influence of principals on school achievement by providing leadership that influences teachers. Literature is also reviewed and discussed on the instructional, transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership styles. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the principal leadership style's influence on teacher job satisfaction and efficacy.

Conceptual Models of Leadership

"The all encompassing topic of 'leadership' has subsumed such a diversity of perspectives and topics, that hardly anyone can determine what leadership actually is, nor how it should be defined" (Stewart, 2006, p. 3). Antonakis, Cianciolo, and Sternberg, (2004), and Burns (1978) acknowledge the topic of leadership as one of the least understood, yet most studied phenomena in the social sciences. A definition of

leadership as defined by Bass (1990) states,

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

Maxwell (2007) said that everything rises and falls on leadership, which attests to the extreme importance and influence of a leader and his or her leadership. Fullan (2007) acknowledged that leadership is a universal concept that filtrates into every aspect of human endeavors, including business, government, church, and education. It is apparent from the numerous studies on leadership, that it is a continually evolving process that challenges leaders to be catalysts for change (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

From the early 1800s to the mid 1970s, the dominant models for the study of leadership have evolved from researchers emphasizing traits, behavior, and situations that influenced a person's leadership, to the more dynamic leadership models seen today (Amoroso, 2002; Bass & Riggs, 2006; Creighton, 2005; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Prominent leadership styles such as authoritarian, democratic, laissez faire, situational, servant, and more recently instructional, transactional, transformational, and passive avoidant have been the target of many research studies. Each leadership style has provided positive as well as negative frameworks for leaders to assess in order to improve their own leadership behaviors.

Lewin and his associates laid a seminal foundation for what was termed

behavioral approaches to leadership (Hemphill & Coons, 1957). More specifically, Lewin, Lippit, and White (1939) identified three styles of leadership: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez faire. Authoritarians, also known as autocratic leaders, tend to make decisions without the input of others (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939). These leaders are clear about distinguishing between who is the leader and who are the followers. Authoritarian leadership is directive and task-oriented. The leader is often very organized and concise about providing directions of how, what, and when the tasks are to be completed by the followers (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939). Authoritarian leaders tend to be micromanagers and dictators in their leadership behaviors (Jenson, 2000).

Lewin, Lippit, and White (1939) described leaders exhibiting a democratic leadership style as leaders who encourage subordinates to provide input and ideas. Democratic leadership is both participative and relationship oriented. Democratic leaders invite their followers to participate with them in the decision-making process. Democratic leaders also provide the freedom for subordinates to work with each other in order to accomplish their goals (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939). Subordinates are allowed to take risks, expand their professional growth, and their sense of well-being is protected by the democratic leader (Jones, 2003).

Lewin, Lippit, and White (1939) identified laissez faire leaders as those who provide subordinates with what they need in order to accomplish their tasks, but do not take any initiative in a leadership role or intervene unless subordinates ask for assistance. Laissez faire leadership is non-directive and lacks formal leadership (Thomas, 1997). Laissez faire leaders do not involve themselves in the leadership role

of decision-making or the decision-making process of the organization. A laissez faire leadership style is characterized by not being actively involved and allowing the subordinates to make decisions for themselves (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939).

A study by Etheridge and Hall (1991) (as cited by Howard, 2007) on leadership style and school faculty team development reported that authoritarian leadership hindered team performance, while the laissez faire leadership style did not assist in team development at all. Only the democratic leadership style had an effect on team progress for school leadership.

The most prominent situational leadership style discussed in research literature is the Hersey-Blanchard Situational Leadership style. The Hersey-Blanchard Situational Leadership style explains that a leader is either task-oriented – telling followers what to do, or is relation-oriented – sharing decision-making (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). This situational leadership style has four components: telling, selling, participating, and delegating. The telling component is a part of the task-oriented leadership where leaders tell new followers what to do. As the follower gains more experience, the leader then leads the follower to be sold on doing the task. In the participating component, the leader becomes more relational in engaging the follower's knowledge and maturity. In the delegating component of situational leadership, the leader delegates tasks to qualified and experienced followers (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). Hersey and Blanchard (1976) also believed there was not a particular leadership style that was more effective than another. They believed the situation dictated which leadership style would be the most effective. Hersey and Blanchard (1976) also believed that the leader must be adaptable. The leader uses experience and maturity to

adapt to any given situation and provide the best possible leadership. Though situational leadership style had adequate qualities as a viable leadership style, this researcher felt there were other leadership styles more appropriate to study in the area of educational leadership.

Robert Greenleaf in his seminal essay, *The Servant as Leader* coined the term *servant leadership* in the late 1970s (Northouse, 2007). Servant leadership emphasizes that leaders should be thoughtful to the needs of their subordinates and empathize with them, care for them, and cultivate them (Northouse, 2007). “Servant leaders are often supportive, participative, and charismatic with their followers. They are excellent listeners; they seek to fully understand their followers’ problems and concerns and to affirm their confidence in the followers” (Howell, 2001, p. 392).

Servant leadership is a practical form of leadership that focuses on serving others first, and then leading as a way of expanding service. Servant leaders effectively communicate vision and direction to their subordinates with passion and excitement. Servant leaders provide the followers with whatever they need to complete a given task. They communicate the vision and mission to all the subordinates in a manner that is challenging and exciting. The servant leader encourages ethical behavior and resists prejudices in the organization. Howell (2001) used Mother Teresa as an example of a totally committed servant leader who devoted her life to serving the sick and poor in India, while inspiring many followers and raising millions of dollars in donations from around the world for her cause. While the servant leadership style possesses many of the qualities necessary for effective leadership, other leadership styles provide a more effective leadership model necessary for the theoretical framework for this study.

Instructional leadership, which will be discussed in further detail in the following pages of this literature review, was effective in the 1980s and early 1990s by meeting many of the expectations of educational leadership from the public and the principal. It was later believed that with the increased demands placed on school administrators, instructional leadership was no longer a style of leadership that could sustain the high demands and expectations required. Therefore, the instructional leadership model falls short as the theoretical model necessary for this study.

Theoretical Framework

Avolio (2007) broadly described leadership as transformational and transactional leadership behavior. The transformational and transactional leadership theory developed from an in-depth review of literature provides the basis for this study's theoretical framework. The distinction between the transformational-transactional leadership theory was first made by James McGregor Burns in 1978 (Avolio, 2007). Transactional leadership provides reward or punishment based on the performance of the worker (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Kurland, Peretz, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 2010). The two leadership components based on the transactional style are contingent reward and management-by-exception (active) (Bass & Avolio, 2000; Kurland et al., 2010).

The transformational leadership style has made a significant impact in the field of leadership. One of the great strengths of transformational leadership is the high level of value placed on the perceived needs of the staff instead of those of the leader, differentiating transformational leadership from other leadership theories (Horn-Turpin, 2009). In the transformational style of leadership, both the leader and followers grow in

the process of leading through transformation. By focusing on the goals of the organization, the transformational leader is able to motivate followers above what they believe they could do (Avolio, 2007).

Transformational leadership is based on the five components of idealized influence (behavior and attributed), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Burns (1978) explained that transformational leadership is “when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p.20).

The differences between the transactional and the transformational style of leadership are substantial. One difference is that the transactional leader leads the organization within the context of the already existing culture. Osborn and Marion (2009) explained that by focusing on short-term exchanges of resources, the transactional leader clarifies job expectations and offers appropriate reward for completing all the requirements necessary to fulfill the existing job. In contrast, by offering vision and purpose that surpasses short-term exchanges, the transformational leader motivates staff to exceed organizational expectations (Bass, 1998). The transformational leader motivates followers to engage in changing the existing culture of the organization (Burns, 1978).

Passive avoidant is a third leadership style theorized by Burns (1978) and is considered a non-leadership style (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Because the current study involved the examination of principal leadership, the theories of transactional and transformational leadership provide a theoretical underpinning for this research based

on the work of Burns, Bass, Avolio and others.

Review of Literature

Federal influence on school accountability and increasing academic achievement has been the focal point of educational reform since the election of George W. Bush as President. The legislative signing of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2002 (Brooks & Miles, 2006, p. 9) stated, “In the United States, 2002’s No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) signaled the beginning of an educational policy era marked by accountability and an emphasis on increasing student achievement.” NCLB has brought added demands on principals to make sure student achievement scores continue to increase every year. “If schools do not perform adequately and students do not perform on level, stiff penalties are invoked to the point of firing the principal and reconstituting the school” (Bartlett, 2008, p. 11).

In 2010, President Obama presented a blueprint for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The main idea is that effective teachers are the most important component to student achievement. This blueprint has five priorities: (a) College and career ready students; (b) Great teachers and leaders in every school; (c) Equity of opportunity; (d) Raise the bar and promote excellence; and (e) Promote innovation and continuous improvements (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). The foundation for all initiatives for all educational priorities under President Obama’s blueprint plan hinges on the second priority of having great teachers and great leaders in every school (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). This blueprint challenges states to “identify highly effective teachers and principals based on student growth and other factors” (p. 6). This identification will “support ambitious efforts to recruit, place,

reward, retain and promote effective teachers and principals and enhance the profession of teaching” (U.S. Department of Education, 2010, p. 6).

Race To The Top is a highly competitive grant program overseen by the U.S. Department of Education. Forty states applied for the grant and the state of Tennessee was one of the winners. Race To The Top parallels the strategic goals of President Obama’s blueprint and is funded as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Race To The Top requires principals and teachers to be evaluated based on student achievement (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). As one of the winners of the Race To The Top competition, the state of Tennessee enacted all of the Race To The Top proposals in the First To The Top Act (Gabriel, 2011). All elements are now Tennessee state law and federally mandated in order to receive \$501 million in federal grant money. As of the 2011-2012 school year, implementation of the new teacher evaluation, tenure, recruitment, and preparation policy decisions pertaining to teachers and principals are being put in place to ensure effective teachers in every classroom (Gabriel, 2011).

Tennessee middle school principals are under tremendous pressure to lead their schools to academic achievement every year. Because of the mandates legislated by NCLB (2001) and more recently by Race To The Top, Tennessee schools are challenged with the expectation to produce student academic progress every year. The success or failure of schools is determined by state standardized test scores. Principals are under tremendous pressure to provide effective leadership that will produce the student scores needed to show mandated successful gains.

Principal Effects on Student Achievement

One of the problems principals face in achieving the school's goal of academic success is that the principal cannot be in every classroom every day in order to personally affect student performance (Gentilucci & Muto, 2007). Bartlett (2008) suggested that research still needs to be conducted at the middle school level concerning whether there is a direct effect between principal leadership and student achievement. Kythreotis, et al. (2010) cited numerous earlier studies producing contradictory findings concerning the direct influence principal leadership has on student academic achievement.

If a principal cannot directly affect student learning, principals must provide leadership that can somehow indirectly influence student achievement. Research suggests that a possible way principals can indirectly affect student learning is by providing leadership for teachers (Ross & Gray, 2006). Though principals cannot be in the classroom every day, teachers are directly teaching and influencing students in the classroom on a daily basis. A study conducted by Ross and Gray (2006) suggested that a principal's leadership style and behavior may have an impact on teacher effectiveness in the classroom.

Instructional Leadership

Research suggests that in order to lead teachers in pursuit of student achievement, principals must implement multiple leadership strategies (Gentilucci & Muto, 2007). One strategy used by a number of principals is the instructional leadership model. Some principals have adopted instructional leadership strategies that are designed to help teachers refine and support teaching skills in the classroom. Principals as instructional leaders should have an understanding of what students need

academically in order to help with strategies teachers can use to raise student achievement (Kahan, Byrd, & Drew, 2008).

Leithwood (1994), as cited by Valentine & Prater (2011), defined instructional leadership in terms of “a series of behaviors designed to affect classroom instruction directly through; for example, supervision, coaching, staff development, modeling, and other such means of influencing teachers’ thinking and practice” (p. 7). A problem with instructional leadership is that the principal in many schools is not the expert in the educational area (Stewart, 2006). Principals may perceive their role more as administrative instead of as an instructional leader and may intentionally evade opportunities to interact with the classroom environment (Stewart, 2006).

A study conducted by Valentine and Prater (2011) showed that “principal leadership behaviors promoting instructional and curriculum improvement were linked to achievement” (p. 1). However, instructional leadership by itself is not enough to effectively meet the challenges of the changing context of school function. Valentine and Prater (2011) suggested that instructional leadership has value in providing teachers support for classroom teaching. They go on to suggest that there may be other leadership styles that strongly relate to academic achievement, such as the transformational leadership style.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a term coined by James McGregor Burns in 1978. Bass and Avolio took the concept of transformational leadership and did further extensive research on the concept. Bass (1997) said transformational leadership is, “the moving of followers beyond their self-interests for the good of the group, organization,

or society by a transformational leader” (p. 1).

The efforts of a transformational leader are not just focused on the task, but also engage followers by motivating them to higher levels of performance (Burns, 1978). Transformational leaders not only manage the organization but also lead the organization to change. Central to transformational leadership is the ability to cast a vision, enable others to become a part of the process, and empower them through shared leadership (Bass, 1997).

Key to the success of a transformational leader is the relationship the leader has with his/her followers. Based more on trust and commitment than reward and punishment, transformational leadership emphasizes organizational change through a new vision for the future (Hay, 2006). Transformational leaders inspire and motivate followers to engage in the collective purpose of the team and lay aside their personal agendas. The followers are motivated to become a part of the team in order to achieve or even surpass the goals (Bucic, Robinson, & Ramburuth, 2010). Masood, Dani, Burns, & Blackhouse (2006) further suggested that transformational leaders have influence to raise followers to a higher moral purpose.

Transformational leaders are those who stimulate and inspire followers to both achieve extraordinary outcomes and, in the process, develop their own leadership capacity. Transformational leaders help followers grow and develop into leaders by responding to individual followers’ needs by empowering them and by aligning the objectives and goals of the individual followers, the leader, the group, and the larger organization. Evidence has accumulated to demonstrate that transformational leadership can move followers to exceed

expected performance, as well as lead to high levels of follower satisfaction and commitment to the group and organization (Bass & Riggio 2006, p. 3).

Bass and Riggio (2006) listed and explained the five components of transformational leadership: (a) individual consideration, (b) intellectual stimulation, (c) inspirational motivation, (d) idealized influence (attribute), and (e) idealized influence (behavior).

Individual consideration. Transformational leaders pay special attention to followers' needs for achievement and growth, acting as mentors or coaches. Transformational leaders demonstrate individual consideration through effective listening and acceptance of employees' individual differences. Individualized consideration incorporates two-way communication and personal interaction with followers. Though followers are monitored when given a task to complete, they understand the intent is for support or additional direction (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Intellectual stimulation. When problems need to be solved, the transformational leader encourages new ideas and creative answers from followers. Instead of following old approaches to situations, the transformational leader who is intellectually stimulating, engages followers to contribute in innovative and creative ways, such as questioning assumptions and reframing problems. Mutual respect is shown even when a follower makes a mistake or differs from the leader (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Inspirational motivation. The transformational leader inspires spirit, enthusiasm, and optimism in followers by challenging and imparting meaning to their work. In addition, leaders who practice inspirational motivation, compellingly articulate

a commitment to a shared vision and organizational goals. Transformational leaders clearly communicate expectations to be met and an anticipation of a vision for the future (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Idealized influence (attribute and behavior). Transformational leaders are careful to model behavior that followers should emulate. Followers feel admiration, respect, and trust for their leader. They believe their leader exhibits high levels of persistence, commitment, determination, and possesses exceptional ability as a leader. Leaders who exhibit idealized influence cultivate follower admiration because they are consistent in ethical and moral behavior. The leader is not afraid to take risks and encourages followers to take risks as well. Followers feel their leader is worth following and there is a mutual sense of loyalty to one another (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

The transformational leadership model began to appear in educational literature in the 1980s because of the need for school systems to improve academic achievement, and the acknowledgement that leadership had influence on school effectiveness (Stewart, 2006). Transformational leadership also emerged when many were becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the instructional leadership model, which originally focused on the principal as the only expert (Kurland et al., 2010). In terms of educational leadership, Mulford (2008) suggested that transformational leadership is a more powerful way of thinking about educational leadership than other approaches such as instructional leadership, “because it leads to an investigation of all workplace conditions that contribute to all school outcomes, not just instructional strategies” (p. 41). The confluence of the transformational leadership style on teacher job satisfaction and efficacy shows potential for providing a more satisfied and committed staff of

teachers within the school.

Transactional Leadership

The successful leadership and management of any school must take into account the leadership style of the principal. A prominent style of leadership is transactional leadership. James McGregor Burns is credited for his seminal work on transactional leadership by publishing an extensive work on political leaders in 1978 entitled *Leadership* (Bass, 1978; Hay, 2006). Burns explained that transactional leaders focus on the leader-follower relationship through the exchange of rewards and punishments with followers for services rendered or not completed (Hay, 2006; Staker, n.d).

Bernard Bass, building on Burns' highly influential work, was one of the early investigators interested in finding out the validity to Burns' theory of transactional leadership (Hay, 2006). Other researchers, including Bass, expanded Burns' explanation of transactional leadership to include an economic exchange in order to meet the material and emotional needs of the follower in return for agreed upon services provided by the follower (Bass, 1985; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1998; Nur, 1998).

Research shows that reward and punishment are effective motivators in the lives of individuals. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs provides further research-based evidence to these concepts (Russell, 2008). Many organizations believe that reward and punishment are effective sources of motivation for followers to experience. When the follower does what is desired or goes over and above what is required, compensation is provided. If the follower fails to complete the required goal or work, punishment or withholding of the reward occurs (Hay, 2006). Bass (1997) expressed that transactional leadership is a matter of contingent reinforcement of followers by the leader. The

workers acknowledge the leader's authority based on the promise of remuneration for a job well done.

The transactional leadership style is often termed a more traditional form of leadership that follows a structure of leader-follower relationship based on the fulfillment of contractual obligations (Brymer & Gray, 2006; Kurland et al., 2010). The two components of transactional leadership include: (a) Contingent reward, and (b) Management by exception (active).

Contingent reward. Contingent reward leadership is an exchange between the follower and the leader, which is both active and positive. The reward is given to a follower based on a previously agreed upon task, and when completed satisfactorily, ends. As long as both leader and follower are happy with the agreed upon arrangement, the relationship will continue and satisfactory completion of tasks will be rewarded (Byer & Gray, 2006).

Management by exception (active). When a leader is managing by exception in the active form, the followers are given clear standards, expectations, and measures for monitoring and assessment at the start of the task or work. The leader actively provides the follower with instruction, oversight, and supervision in order to provide corrective action quickly in an attempt to arrest any deviation from performance expectations and standards (Byer & Gray, 2006).

The transactional leadership style has been predominant in most school systems across the United States. This approach to leadership lends itself to a management style rather than a leadership style (Russell, 2008). Pepper (2010) stated,

In addition to effective academic practices for improving student achievement, a

school environment conducive to learning is an important element related to student academic success. This aspect of leadership is best accomplished through the transactional leadership style which provides the effective oversight of the daily management and organizational needs of the school (p. 48).

In order to accomplish organizational goals and expectations, the transactional leadership style focuses on rules, procedures, and job descriptions (Sergiovanni, 2007). In educational leadership, the principal adopting a transactional style maintains a tightly structured organizational operation. The organization is managed by the principal with this leadership style with mechanical precision (Sergiovanni, 2007). Set routines, clean environment, orderly procedures, and maintenance of a safe and healthy school environment provide a positive influence on student learning (Johnson & Stevens, 2006; MacNeil, Prater, & Bucsh, 2009). Pepper (2010) suggested that the “transactional leadership applied to this aspect of education should provide the positive environment for effective teaching and academic success for students” (p. 49).

Passive Avoidant Leadership

Bass and Avolio (2004) have continued to refine the definition and characteristics of transformational and transactional leadership. Originally, both passive and active management by exception were placed as subscales of transactional leadership because they both focused on the exceptions of either passive management or active management. As they researched further, it became obvious to Bass and Avolio that there was a significant difference between management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive). Management by exception (active) is when a leader systematically approaches leadership in a proactive manner. Management by

exception (passive) is where the leader is passive and doesn't deal with problems, and often fails to address the problem even when it becomes chronic.

Bass and Avolio (2004) revised the construct of passive avoidant leadership by appointing management by exception (passive) as one of its subscales, when they found that the behavior of a leader exhibiting management by exception (passive) traits showed similar behavior to the leader with laissez faire traits. The passive avoidant leader has tendencies to avoid involvement in important issues and is most often not engaged with his or her followers. Bass and Avolio further explained that the passive avoidant style of leadership "has a negative effect on desired outcomes - opposite to what is intended by the leader-manager. In this regard it is similar to laissez faire styles or 'no leadership' both types of behavior have negative impacts on followers and associates" (p. 96).

As a result, Bass and Avolio (2004) reconstructed the passive avoidant leadership to include management by exception (passive) and laissez-faire as subscales. Consequently, by developing a higher-level construct of passive avoidant leadership, Bass and Avolio's leadership styles now include transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant.

The two components of passive avoidant leadership include: (a) management by exception (passive), and (b) laissez faire.

Management by exception (passive). Passive management by exception occurs when a leader waits until the task or work is completed before assessing if a problem has occurred. Only at the end of a task and when a problem has been identified, or deviation from standards has taken place does the leader take corrective action. Standards are not

made clear until after the mistake is made. Negative impact on follower job satisfaction and efficacy has been associated with the passive form of management by exception (Byer & Gray, 2006).

Laissez faire leadership. Transformational and transactional leaders are highly active in the way they lead (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio 1994, 1995, 2000), yet laissez faire leadership is the absence of leadership and the act of avoiding intervention when needed (Bass & Avolio, 1995; Stewart, 2006). The laissez faire leader in essence offers no leadership to subordinates nor fulfills the expectations of his or her superiors (Skogstad, et al., 2007). Studies such as the one conducted by Judge and Piccolo (2004), have shown the negative effects that laissez faire leadership style has on subordinate job satisfaction. In earlier studies, such as the one conducted by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939), found that the laissez faire leadership style had a negative impact on follower job satisfaction, as well as a negative influence on productivity rates. In essence, a person with a laissez faire leadership style is not really leading. The laissez faire leader avoids issues involving conflict or that require intervention (Kurland et al., 2010).

Because of the absence of leadership found in the passive avoidant leadership style, Bass and Avolio (2004) indicated that the leader would have a negative impact on the performance of his or her followers. Passive avoidant leaders possess an ineffective style of leadership that passively disengages from their followers unless the situation becomes critical (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The passive avoidant leader will avoid engaging in important issues, is absent when needed, avoids decision-making, and will put off decisions on important inquiries. Transformational or transactional leadership traits are not found in the passive avoidant leader (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Job Satisfaction

Tillman and Tillman (2008) identified job satisfaction as the like or dislike of the job in response to pay, promotion, recognition or other factors deemed important by the worker. Spector (1994) defined job satisfaction as how people feel about their job and the different facets of their job. Though these definitions vary in some aspects of the content, most would agree that job satisfaction is an emotional response to one's job, either in part or as a whole.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, (1959) provided valuable information concerning the factors influencing job satisfaction from their seminal study of 203 accountants and engineers in Pittsburgh. Herzberg et al., (1959) proposed two domains of motivations. Herzberg (1974) explained in the two-factor theory or hygiene-motivation theory that there are certain variables within a person's job that motivate him/her toward job satisfaction, while there are another totally different set of variables within the job experience that motivates the worker toward job dissatisfaction.

Five intrinsic factors strongly influencing job satisfaction are labeled motivators, and 11 extrinsic factors contributing to job dissatisfaction are labeled hygiene factors (Williams & Lankford, 2003). According to Herzberg's hygiene-motivation theory, factors leading to job dissatisfaction are based on the hygiene extrinsic factors such as supervision, interpersonal relationships, salary, job security, and working conditions. Factors leading to teacher job satisfaction are the motivator intrinsic factors such as achievement, responsibility, growth, advancement, and recognition (Herzberg, 1974, 1987; Jones, 1997).

In explaining the factors influencing job satisfaction, Herzberg et al., (1959)

posited that there must be both positive motivators and positive hygiene factors present in order to obtain the level of job satisfaction and performance desired. In light of Herzberg's theory, it is imperative that the leadership of the school takes into account both intrinsic and extrinsic factors in order to cultivate job satisfaction, which in turn may possibly lead to higher levels of teacher success in the classroom.

An earlier study using Herzberg's theory as a framework provided significant findings about which factors affect teacher job satisfaction. Sergiovanni (1966) studied 56 teachers in New York using Herzberg's hypothesis as the premise for the research. He found that factors leading to teacher dissatisfaction included unrealistic school policies, poor relationships with other teachers, poor relationships with students, and inadequate supervision from the principal. Achievement and recognition were found to significantly contribute to teacher job satisfaction. Sergiovanni surmised from his research that, "The satisfaction factors tended to focus on the work itself, and the dissatisfaction factors tended to focus on the conditions of work" (p. 124). It was apparent that Sergiovanni's research supported Herzberg's hypothesis.

In another earlier study conducted in an educational setting, Schmidt (1976) replicated the Herzberg et al. study using administrators as participants. Overall, Schmidt's research supported Herzberg et al.'s, (1959) original findings. With some minor differences, the studies by Sergiovanni (1966) and Schmidt supported Herzberg's hygiene-motivation theory, showing one set of factors relating to job satisfaction and a different set of factors relating to job dissatisfaction. Therefore, according to the hygiene-motivation theory, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate dimensions of work experiences. One is not affected by the other. The motivator factors produce

satisfaction independently of the hygiene factors that produce dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1959, 1974, 1987; Jones, 1997; Schmidt, 1976; Sergiovanni, 1966; Williams & Lankford, 2003). The implication is that leaders of organizations and principals of schools must focus on what influences greater levels of job satisfaction. Adding higher levels of factors accounting for job dissatisfaction will not produce job satisfaction.

Principal Leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaction

According to Nguni et al. (2006), empirical studies in most work environments including education have shown that leadership greatly influences the job satisfaction of employees. Current studies have shown that a principal's leadership style can have an effect on the satisfaction of school teachers (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Hulpia et al., 2009). When included in the decision-making process, having more autonomy in their classes, and having supportive effective principal leadership, teachers tend to be more satisfied (Hulpia et al., 2009; Tillman & Tillman, 2008). These findings provide support for the possibility that principals may have a direct or indirect effect on the satisfaction of their teachers (Hulpia et al., 2009; Shatzer, 2009; Tillman & Tillman, 2008). Barnett, Marsh and Craven (2003) noted higher levels of teacher job satisfaction when the principal was perceived as caring for them as individuals and was present when an important issue was presented.

Hunter-Boykin and Evans (1995) concluded from their research that the school principal is the person who not only determined the basic rules for the operational environment in the school, but was ultimately responsible for high teacher morale. Sergiovanni (1995), emphasizing the importance of the principal's leadership, stated,

In many ways the school principal is the most important and influential

individual in any school . . . It is his [or her] leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become . . . one can almost always point to the principal's leadership as the key to success (p. 83).

Many sources add to the body of literature that supports the idea that the principal is the key leadership influence in the school (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Fullan, 1993, 1999; Ouyang & Paprock, 2006; Sergiovanni, 1995).

A literature review conducted by Ouyang & Paprock (2006) revealed teachers in China and the United States placed a high importance on administrative support. Research supported by this study indicated that principal leadership has a significant influence on teacher job satisfaction. Podsakoff, Makenzie, and Bommer (1996) indicated that leaders who are inspirational will motivate teachers to work harder, which in turn influences teachers' job satisfaction.

One of the biggest needs of teachers within the first five years of teaching is emotional support and safety from their principal (Richards, 2005). The greatest need for teachers with 10 years or more experience was that of their principal's respect for the wealth of expertise and experience those teachers brought to the classroom (Richards, 2005). Ingersoll (2001) attributed one of the factors for teacher attrition as job dissatisfaction. Guarino, Santibañez, and Daley (2006) studied first and second year teachers in the state of Massachusetts. Their research revealed that major factors that influenced teachers leaving their jobs within the first three years of employment were feelings of frustration or failure.

Studies have shown that a principal's motivational leadership makes a tremendous impact on teacher job satisfaction. Principals are the catalysts who motivate teachers to a higher purpose. People will gravitate toward those who cause them to grow and away from those who do not cause them to grow (Maxwell, 2005). When teachers feel they are a part of something worthwhile, and are contributing to something greater than themselves, they have a greater sense of motivation and job satisfaction.

Covey (1990) explains in his book, *Principal-Centered Leadership*:

People want to contribute to the accomplishments of worthwhile objectives.

They want to be a part of a mission that transcends their individual tasks. They don't want to work in a job that has little meaning. They want purposes and principles that lift them, ennoble them, inspire them, empower them, and encourage them to their best selves (pp. 179-180).

Davis and Wilson (2000) found through their research that a significant relationship existed between teacher motivation and the empowering leadership of the principal. Because the principal gave teachers freedom to make more choices, the teachers felt they were making a significant impact in the classroom. Greater levels of teacher motivation and job satisfaction were a result of the principal's leadership practices.

Empirical research stretches across the globe regarding the significance of principal leadership. In a more recent study of 434 teachers in China, a significant relationship was found between principals' leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction (Bolin, 2007). When 81 U.S. teachers were studied, principal supervision showed a significant correlation to teachers' work satisfaction (Tillman & Tillman,

2008).

A study by Bogler (2001) investigated teacher-perceived principal transformational and transactional leadership styles, and the principals' decision making strategies in regard to teacher job satisfaction and occupation. The findings from Bogler's study suggested that teacher job satisfaction was significantly correlated to principals exhibiting transformational leadership and transactional leadership.

Nguni et al. (2006) conducted a study of 700 Tanzanian teachers about their perception of the relationship between the transformational and transactional leadership styles of the principal and how they related it to teacher job satisfaction. Results indicated that both transformational and transactional leadership influenced teacher job satisfaction, as well as other variables in the study.

In another study, Korkmaz (2007) surveyed 630 teachers in Turkey about their perceptions of the transformational and transactional leadership styles of principals and the effects on teacher job satisfaction and the school's organizational health. Results of the study indicated that the more transformational the teachers perceived the principals to be, the more the teachers' job satisfaction increased. Conversely, the less the teachers perceived the principals' leadership style as transactional, the more teacher job satisfaction increased.

Pepper's (2010) study, in contrast to Korkmaz's (2007), indicated that transactional leadership, when applied to an educational setting, creates a positive environment for effective teaching. Byer and Gray (2006) indicated that the transactional subscale contingent reward can have a positive effect on job satisfaction. Opposite of contingent reward, the transactional subscale management by exception

(active) has been linked to lower teacher job satisfaction, which has influenced teachers to resist change and has increased job absences (Rafferty, 2002). Management by exception (passive), a subscale of the passive avoidant leadership, was indicated as having a weak positive correlation to teacher job satisfaction (Korkmaz, 2007), while Barnett et al. (2003) presented research findings with a negative correlation between management by exception (passive) and teacher job satisfaction. Barnett et al. (2003) and Korkmaz (2007) indicated a negative correlation between the laissez faire subscales of the passive avoidant leadership style to teacher job satisfaction. It is evident by the research presented in these studies that principal leadership has an effect on teacher job satisfaction.

Teacher Efficacy

RAND Corporation, a research group, was the first to begin researching teacher efficacy (Armor, et al., 1976). Rotter's (1966) seminal work on locus of control became the theoretical underpinning for many standards of teacher efficacy and RAND's inspiration in its investigation of how environmental influences can overwhelm teachers. When a teacher becomes overwhelmed with teaching, student learning is diminished.

Current educational reform has caused a major paradigm shift in how a teacher must teach the students. Teachers are now mandated to teach students curriculum specifically geared to passing the state mandated test (Fuming & Jiliang, 2008). When students from a teacher's class fail to score proficient or higher on the state mandated test, teacher satisfaction decreases and the teacher experiences lower efficacy levels (Fuming & Jiliang, 2008).

What Rotter (1966) found in his research on locus of control was that teachers

needed external influences to provide reinforcement for their efforts. It was discovered that a teacher did not have the ability to reinforce his/her own efforts alone. Rotter also found that when teachers were able to experience levels of confidence in their own teaching abilities, they experienced internal self-validation.

Printy and Marks (2006) proposed that teacher self-efficacy relates to the hard work and commitment of a teacher who continually strives to help students learn. Teachers become more committed to teaching when they experience success at helping students become academically successful (Ross & Gray, 2006). Researchers whose studies focused on school improvement have discovered that increased teacher efficacy is a consistent indicator among teachers who are willing to try new teaching ideas (Ross & Gray, 2006).

Teachers who exhibit low self-efficacy rarely admit responsibility for unsuccessful academic achievement, but tend to blame other influences instead (Printy & Marks, 2006). Teachers who have confidence that they will be able to help a student who has previously experienced low academic success usually exhibit high levels of efficacy and will work hard to help the student experience improved academic success (Printy & Marks, 2006).

Principal Leadership and Teacher Efficacy

A principal's leadership can have a significant influence on increasing teacher efficacy by providing learning opportunities, sharing leadership, and acknowledging successes (Nir & Kranot, 2006). Teachers will tend to work harder when they feel they are appreciated by school leadership (Youngs & King, 2002).

Principals can improve teacher efficacy by providing opportunities for teachers

to help one another. Teachers who at one time may have felt alone and unsuccessful can experience higher levels of efficacy when they are able to collaborate with other teachers to improve teaching practices (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Teachers will passionately strive to make academic improvements in student learning when principals commit to making teachers feel they are successful (Printy & Marks, 2006).

Research provides evidence that a principal's leadership style must incorporate helping teachers obtain and sustain feelings of efficacy (Rossmiller, 1992, as cited by Hipp, 1997). Educational research has shown that transformational leadership has a positive effect on teachers' extra effort in public school settings (Binkowski, Cordeiro, Iwanicki, 1995; Leithwood, Jantzi, Silins, & Dart, 1993; Silin, 1994).

In a study by Nir and Kranot (2006), a strong correlation between transformational leadership style and teacher efficacy was reported. Nir and Kranot indicated that the higher the level of transformational leadership present in the school, the higher the levels of teacher efficacy.

Bass (1985), in one of his earlier works, investigated the transformational and transactional leadership styles and subscales relationship to follower extra effort (efficacy). Bass studied 45 New Zealand employees and managers by having the employees complete the MLQ, rating their manager's leadership. The results indicated that the employees exhibited higher efficacy when their managers displayed higher idealized influence ($r = .50, p < .01$), intellectual stimulation ($r = .49, p < .01$), and contingent reward ($r = .38, p < .01$) leadership attributes.

Bass (1985) also studied 23 educational administrators in New Zealand by researching teacher perceptions of their principal's leadership style and its relationship

to teacher efficacy, leader effectiveness, and satisfaction, through administration of the MLQ. Once again the transformational leadership subscales of idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration were positively correlated to teacher efficacy (willingness to exert extra effort).

Another study investigated the perceived teacher efficacy, satisfaction, and effectiveness in relation to principal transformational and transactional leadership in U.S. private secondary schools (Hoover, 1987). One hundred fifty-one teachers participated in the MLQ questionnaire and rated 45 principals. The results indicated a positive relationship between the transformational leadership style and subscales to teacher efficacy, as well as to the other leadership outcome factors. Other past empirical research has shown that a positive relationship exists between transformational leadership, as well as transactional leadership to follower extra effort (efficacy) (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1995; Philbin, 1997; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993).

One study that examined which principal leadership style as perceived by the teacher impacted teacher efficacy, indicated that laissez faire leadership, a subscale of the passive avoidant leadership style, was less efficacious as it related to classroom management (Griffin, 2009).

Summary

The literature review in this chapter provided research-based evidence that Tennessee middle school principals are under tremendous pressure because of the governmental mandates to produce student academic progress every year (Bartlett, 2008; Brooks & Miles, 2006; Gabriel, 2011). Principals are not present in each classroom on a daily basis, but teachers must instruct students daily. Ross and Gray's

(2006) study indicated that the principal's leadership style influences teacher effectiveness in the classroom. Valentine and Prater's (2011) research suggested that other leadership styles, such as transformational or transactional leadership may influence teachers more than the instructional leadership style.

This chapter also provided research showing past leadership models, as well as the justification for the studies' theoretical framework utilizing the transactional - transformational leadership model. The chapter also reviewed current literature providing evidence that the effect transformational leadership has on teacher job satisfaction and efficacy potentially provides a more satisfied and committed staff of teachers within the school (Nguni et al., 2006). Pepper (2010) suggested that transactional leadership should provide the positive environment for effective teaching and academic success for students as well. Bass and Avolio (2004) indicated that passive avoidant leaders produce a negative impact on the performance of their followers. Passive avoidant leaders possess an ineffective style of leadership that passively disengages from their followers unless the situation becomes critical (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Also pertinent to the current study was the research of Ouyang and Paprock, (2006), Bogler, (2001), and Korkmaz, (2007), revealing that principal leadership had a significant influence on job satisfaction with teachers in the United States and China. Finally, the literature reviewed provided evidence that a principal's leadership style can help teachers acquire feelings of efficacy (Hipp, 1997; Nir & Kranot, 2006).

This review of literature revealed that a principal's leadership style and behavior may have an influence on the job satisfaction and efficacy of teachers, possibly

indirectly affecting teacher effectiveness in the classroom and student academic achievement. In light of the in-depth review of literature, the current study further examined teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style and behavior in relation to the factors of teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. In Chapter Three, the methodology for completing the study is presented.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This study sought to determine if there was a correlation between middle school principal leadership styles to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. This chapter describes the (a) research questions, hypotheses and null hypotheses, (b) participants, (c) setting, (d) instrumentation, (e) procedures, (f) design, and (g) data analysis methods used to answer the research questions developed in Chapter One.

Research Design

This study consisted of a quantitative approach utilizing a bivariate correlational research design. Ary et al., (2006) stated that quantitative research is the “Inquiry employing operational definitions to generate numeric data to answer predetermined hypotheses or questions” (p. 637). Unlike qualitative research, quantitative research minimizes researcher or contextual bias by limiting the framework to the analysis of objective numerical data (Cooper & Schindler, 2008). A bivariate correlation helps examine the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables (Szapkiw, n.d.). A bivariate correlational study is appropriate because it examines variables in their natural environment and does not include researcher-imposed treatments (Simon, 2006). Correlation studies conduct research after the variations in the variables have occurred naturally (Simon, 2006).

A causal comparative approach, also known as ex post facto, was not considered for this study because it determines a relationship between independent and dependent variables of two or more groups (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2010). This study sought to determine a relationship between the variables of one group, middle school teachers. Causal comparative design was also not chosen because the intent of this study was not

to determine if principal leadership styles cause teacher job satisfaction and efficacy, but rather to determine the relationships that exist between principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction and efficacy (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). Correlation does not attempt to understand cause and effect but seeks to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between variables (Ary et al., 2006).

Regression was not chosen because “regression is used to predict one variable from the other (or many others). Correlation is used to measure the association between variables” (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 56). The researcher’s intent for this study was to measure teacher perception of the relationship between principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. A correlation design was deemed as the most useful tool for determining a relationship between two variables and was most appropriate for this study.

Data were also collected through an exploratory open-ended question at the conclusion of the surveys. Themes from the data provided valuable information about specific leadership practices perceived by teachers that could influence effectiveness in the classroom, adding to the richness of this study’s findings. Analysis of these data also added to the validity and strength of the research results.

Research Questions

The following research questions were investigated:

1. Is there a statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived leadership style of middle school principals (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to teacher job satisfaction as measured by the Job

Satisfaction Survey (JSS) in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district?

2. Is there a statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived leadership style of middle school principals (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ) in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district?

Research and Null Hypotheses

The following are the research and null hypotheses for the research questions:

Hypothesis 1.1a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher- perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 1.1b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Null Hypothesis 1.1: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 1.2a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 1.2b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Null Hypothesis 1.2: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 1.3a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 1.3b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Null Hypothesis 1.3: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypothesis 2.1a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.1b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as

measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Null Hypothesis 2.1: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.2a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.2b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Null Hypothesis 2.2: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy to (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.3a: There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.3b: There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between

the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Null Hypothesis 2.3: There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Participants

The target population of the study was 14 middle schools with 860 middle school teachers in a school district of East Tennessee. Fink (1995) stated that the “target population consists of the institutions, persons, problems, and systems to which or whom the survey’s findings are to be applied or generalized” (p. 2).

A convenience sample was utilized and participants provided specific inclusion criteria for teachers in order to be included in the sample. Random sampling is generally considered beneficial because members of the population will have the same chance of being selected and the results can be generalized to the larger population of individuals (Schumacher & McMillan, 1993). However, in educational settings random sampling is often not feasible, facilitating the use of a more accessible group called a convenience sample (Gall et al., 2010; Schumacher & McMillan, 1993). Convenience sampling is often used in educational research because of its practical benefits. It is seldom possible to obtain an ideal sample, so researchers “often need to select a convenience sample or face the possibility that they will be unable to do the study” (Gall et al., 2010, p. 175). Other educational researchers have used convenience sampling, such as Braggs (2008)

in his dissertation entitled, *The Application of Transformational Leadership among Christian School Leaders in the Southeast and Mid-Atlantic North Regions*, and Patton (2008) in his dissertation entitled, *The Effect of School Size on the Utilization of Educational Technologies*.

One of the problems of convenience sampling is bias. The sample may have features that are not representative of the target population. For example, some participants may be more motivated or enthusiastic than others not associated with this study. Convenience sampling makes no claim that the sample is representative of the population, and therefore has limitations in terms of generalization of the results from the sample to the population it represents (Schumacher & McMillan, 1993). A convenience sample was utilized because a large enough sample size was desired in order to ensure sufficient power for the correlational analysis. It was determined by this researcher that random sampling would not have been able to provide a large enough sample for the study. By using convenience sampling, a large enough sample was provided. The researcher attempted to control bias by collecting data from teachers who had met specific criteria to be included in the study. To control the potential for Type I and Type II errors, a two-tailed significance test, medium effect size of $r_s = .30$, an alpha level set at .05, and a sample size of 142 participants was obtained in order to ensure a statistical power of .95 (Cohen, 1988). Responses from teachers of this school district do not reflect responses from other school districts; therefore, caution should be used when generalizing the results of the survey back to the larger population (Dillman, 2007), as noted in the limitations section.

Qualification for participation in the study consisted of being a certified middle

school teacher who had served with the principal at their current school for at least the last full academic year of 2010-2011, and currently still employed at the school. Of the 14 middle schools invited to participate, 5 declined and 1 was disqualified due to the principal not serving at that school for one year. Every teacher in the population had an equal chance to participate at the beginning of the study. Of the 860 teachers comprising the total population, 393 teachers met the qualifications in order to be selected to participate. To prevent bias, only respondents who met the inclusion criteria were used in the sample. An email was sent to the selected teachers inviting them to participate in the study. One hundred sixty-one teachers responded to the email and entered responses to the surveys. One hundred forty-two teachers provided usable data constituting the sample used in this study. A minimum of 138 participants were needed to ensure sufficient power of .95 for a bivariate correlational analysis with a two-tailed significance test, a medium effect size of $r_s = .30$, and an alpha set at .05 (Cohen, 1988). Therefore, the 142 teachers provided a large enough sample size for this study. Teachers who had taught less than one year at the school, transferred after the 2010-2011 or 2011-2012 school years had begun, interim teachers, teaching assistants, and substitute teachers were excluded from the study to make sure all data were equally researched. Likewise, only schools that had the same principal for the last full school year of 2010-2011 and were still serving in that school were allowed to participate in the study.

A demographic survey was included in the online surveys addressing the years of service for both the principal and teachers of the school. The data obtained from the demographic portion of the surveys ensured that only schools and teachers that met the

qualifications were accepted to participate in the study.

Setting

The setting for this study included all middle schools located in an East Tennessee county school district. This was a predominantly urban county with approximately 432,226 residents (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). There were 14 middle schools with approximately 860 certified school teachers. The district served 87 schools, of which 14 were middle school level. The student body demographics consisted of African American 14.7%; Asian/Pacific Islander 2.1%; Hispanic 4.0%; Native American/Alaskan .3%; and White 78.8%.

Instrumentation

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if there was a relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy. In this study, variables included leadership style as perceived by the teachers, teacher job satisfaction, and teacher efficacy.

Two surveys, a demographic survey, and an exploratory open-ended question probing the teachers' perceptions of needed leadership practices were used to acquire the necessary data for the investigation. The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was used to measure the level of job satisfaction experienced by each teacher responding. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) measured the transformational, transactional, or passive avoidant leadership style of the principal as perceived by the teachers. The MLQ also measured teacher efficacy. Demographic data were obtained from the teacher demographic data survey. The demographic data were ancillary and only used to confirm the schools, principals, and teachers qualifying for this study.

Demographic data were not used in any other way for this research. The data collected from the surveys were used to test the hypotheses.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Rater Form 5x Short (MLQ) is a survey developed by Bernard M. Bass and his associates based upon the theoretical research of Burns (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The survey assesses the degree to which the principal exhibits transformational, transactional, or passive avoidant leadership. The MLQ is a comprehensive survey and usually takes approximately 15 minutes to complete the 45 questions. Thirty-six questions measure leadership practices and nine questions measure specific leader outcome factors (Bass & Avolio, 2000).

The MLQ survey uses a 5-point Likert scale: (0) Not at all, (1) Once in a while, (2) Sometimes, (3) Fairly often, and (4) Frequently, if not always. Thirty-six questions are linked to nine subscales relating to transformational, transactional, or passive avoidant leadership. The transformational leadership style is measured by five subscales, each implementing four questions: (a) idealized influence (attribute), (b) idealized influence (behavior), (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual stimulation, and (e) individualized consideration. Two subscales measure transactional leadership style, each implementing four questions: (a) contingent reward and (b) management by exception (active). Two subscales measure the passive avoidant leadership style, each implementing four questions: (a) management by exception (passive) and (b) laissez-faire (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

The nine questions measuring specific leader outcome factors include: extra effort (three questions), effectiveness (four questions), and satisfaction (three questions). Only teacher extra effort, which for the purposes of this study is called teacher efficacy,

was analyzed of the three leader outcome factors. The leader outcome factors of effectiveness and satisfaction were not analyzed.

Throughout the years, the MLQ has been revised many times, strengthening its validity and reliability (Bass & Avolio, 2000). The newest version of the MLQ has been used in nearly 300 research studies including doctoral dissertations, master's theses, and various research endeavors from 1995 to 2004 (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The MLQ has also been used worldwide in various disciplines, including groups associated with "military, government, educational, manufacturing, high technology, church, correctional, hospital, and volunteer organizations" (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 12).

Through extensive applications in various fields of study, the MLQ's validity has been thoroughly tested. Bass & Avolio (2000) disclosed that the application of a confirmatory factor analysis examined the reliability and further validated the structure of the survey. Wagnor (2009) defined the function of a confirmatory factor analysis that "allows testing to determine whether relationships expected in a specific theoretical model actually appear in the data" (p. 26). Brown (2009) cited earlier research studies (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Bagozzi, Yi, & Philips, 1991; Kenny & Kashy, 1992) explaining that "a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is a widely used technique for testing the psychometric properties of measurement instruments because it tests a pre-specified factor structure and the goodness of fit of the resulting solution" (p. 53).

Further reliabilities for the MLQ were conducted for all scales using the rater form only (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Based on the most recent United States normative sample, the reliability scores show proof of acceptable levels of reliability. Coefficient alphas of .70 or higher are generally considered acceptable (Green & Salkind, 2011).

Reliability scores ranged from .70 to .84 after testing the nine scales of leadership in a sample of 12,118 raters (Bass & Avolio, 2004). These scores fall within the acceptable range for the current study. MLQ reliability scores are listed in Table 1. These data are taken from the sample of raters at a lower level than the focal leader table (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Table 1

Reliability and Questions for Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Subscales

Subscale	Alpha	Questions
Idealized Influence (attributed)	.77	10, 18, 21, 25
Idealized Influence (behavior)	.70	6, 14, 23, 34
Inspirational Motivation	.83	9, 13, 26, 36
Intellectual Stimulation	.75	2, 8, 30, 32
Individual Consideration	.80	15, 19, 29, 31
Contingent Reward	.73	1, 11, 16, 35
Management by Exception (Active)	.74	4, 22, 24, 27
Management by Exception (Passive)	.70	3, 12, 17, 20
Laissez-Faire	.74	5, 7, 28, 33
Extra Effort (Efficacy)	.84	39, 42, 44

The Job Satisfaction Survey was created by Spector (1994) to assess overall job satisfaction as well as satisfaction over nine subscale areas of job satisfaction. The JSS was given to teachers participating in this study to measure their level of job satisfaction in their school. This survey has been extensively field tested in previous studies

including doctoral dissertations and other professional works in the United States and around the world (Spector, 1994). The survey consists of 36 questions covering 9 areas of pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operation procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication.

The respondent must choose one of the 6 choices provided for each of the 36 questions on the survey. A 6-point Likert scale is used providing the following answers for each of the 36 questions: (1) Disagree very much, (2) Disagree moderately, (3) Disagree slightly, (4) Agree slightly, (5) Agree moderately, and (6) Agree very much. Answering with a one represents maximum disagreement and scoring with a six represents maximum agreement. Each of the 9 subscales when totaled can indicate a possible score of 24 in each area. When a subscale is totaled, the closer the score is to 24, the more satisfied the teacher is in that area. A possible maximum score of 216 exists when all 9 subscale scores are totaled. The possible minimum overall score would be 36. Indication of a higher level of overall satisfaction with the job exists when the total of all 9 subscale scores move closer to the maximum total of 216. Higher satisfaction with a specific subscale would render a number closer to a total of 24.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was chosen for this study for its acceptable levels of reliability, validity, and internal consistency. The JSS was also chosen for its norms of use by educators in primary through secondary education ($n=9,507$).

Based on a sample size of 2,870, the total internal consistency reliabilities were .91 (coefficient alpha). Reliability subscales ranged from .60 to .82. Though the subscale coworker .60 (coefficient alpha) and nature of work .62 (coefficient alpha) were somewhat low, the rest of the subscales range from .71 to .82, with the overall total

coefficient alpha score of .91 falling within the acceptable range of this study. JSS reliability scores are listed in Table 2. These data are taken from the internal consistency reliability (coefficient alpha) table (Spector, 1994).

Table 2

Reliability and Questions for Job Satisfaction Subscales

Subscale	alpha	Questions
Pay	.75	1, 10r, 19r, 28
Promotion	.73	2r, 11, 20, 33
Supervision	.82	3, 12r, 21r, 30
Fringe Benefits	.73	4r, 13, 22, 29r
Contingent Rewards	.76	5, 14r, 23r, 32r
Operating Procedures	.62	6r, 15, 24r, 31r
Coworkers	.60	7, 16r, 25, 34r
Nature of Work	.78	8r, 17, 27, 35
Communication	.71	9, 18r, 26r, 36r
Total	.91	

Note. r=reverse scored.

The demographic survey was used to gather demographic data from teachers and included the following characteristics: (a) gender; (b) race/ethnicity; (c) age; (d) total years of teaching experience; (e) years of service with the principal in your current location; and (f) certified teacher or non-certified teacher. The demographic questions were ancillary and limited to teachers because only the perceptions of the teachers were researched in this study. Demographic data from the survey were used only to qualify schools, principals, and teachers for the study.

An exploratory open-ended question at the end of the surveys was designed to assess teacher-perceived needs of principal leadership behaviors or practices that influence effectiveness in the classroom. The exploratory question provided deeper and richer data on how principal leadership influences teachers in the classroom.

Procedures

Once approval was received from this researcher's dissertation Chair and committee, the correct forms were filed with Liberty University's Institutional Research Board (IRB). This researcher also sought the permission rights to use the instruments for research from the holders of the copyrights. Permission to use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (see Appendix A) was granted through online purchase from Mindgarden.com. Permission to use the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was sought and granted through email from the author, Dr. Paul Spector (see Appendix C). Upon the final approval from the IRB (see Appendix E), the school district was contacted. A letter requesting permission and the correct form were completed and mailed providing an overview of the study, name, copies of the surveys, timeline for collection of data and participants' safeguard information.

Upon approval from the school district's research committee (see Appendix F), this researcher gathered data on each middle school through each school's website, the school district's website, and the Tennessee Department of Education website. The data included principals' contact information, location of the schools, and email addresses.

Each middle school principal was contacted by email to explain the study and to gain support (see Appendix H). Principals were asked the number of years they had served at their current school in order to document which schools qualified for the study.

Only schools with principals serving at least one full year qualified for the study. A packet was sent via school mail to the principal of each qualifying school containing the same information that was provided to the district's research committee, as well as a Principal Consent Form (see Appendix I). Instructions to either fax or send the signed consent form on official school letterhead back to this researcher in the enclosed self-addressed envelope through school mail was provided.

Once the principals' consent forms had been signed, returned, and permission granted to contact each teacher, a list of teachers employed with the principal at their current school for at least one year and the teachers' email addresses from each school was requested. From the list, 393 qualified teachers were sent an email from the researcher explaining the purpose of the research (see Appendix J). Only certified teachers who had served with the principal at their current school for at least the full academic year of 2010-2011 and were currently still employed at the school were included in the study. A question on the demographic survey indicating years of service with the principal at the current school also verified which teachers qualified for the study.

The email provided an explanation of the purpose of the research, a request for the teachers' voluntary participation, a guarantee of each school and each participant's confidentiality, and that all identities of the schools would not be revealed and would be kept secure and safe. Each school was assigned a code to both protect anonymity and identify the school in the data collection process. Coding of the school ensured no information or data were able to be linked back to the school or the teachers. All data coding will remain locked in a storage filing cabinet for three years. The codebook

containing all codes was locked in a separate filing cabinet, also for three years, in a different location to further protect anonymity and provide greater security. At the end of three years, the codebook and all data will be destroyed.

The surveys were not numbered or marked off a list when completed online. The researcher did not number teacher responses or have a record of which teachers responded to the online survey, maintaining the anonymity and confidentiality of the teachers. It was noted that the teachers' relationship with this researcher, their school district, or Liberty University would not be affected by their participation in the research. The researcher's contact information as well as Liberty University's contact information was also provided in the email.

Included in the email was a secure one-time usage survey link for each teacher, ensuring anonymity to all participating teachers. The electronic survey was hosted and administered online by SurveyMonkey.com and connected participants to his or her school with no identifying information. The electronic survey consisted of the teacher consent form, demographic survey, the MLQ Rater Form 5x Short (Bass & Avolio, 2004), the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1994), and the exploratory open-ended survey question.

Once a week for the following three weeks from the initial email to the teachers, a reminder email with the link to the online survey was sent (see Appendix J). This email encouraged teachers who had not yet taken the survey to participate. The email reminded the teachers that the survey was totally anonymous. At the end of the fourth week, survey participation concluded and a follow-up email was sent to all teachers thanking them for their participation in the study.

Eight schools participated out of the 14 middle schools in the district. Five schools declined to participate and one school did not meet the qualifications to participate. Emails were sent to the 393 teachers who qualified to participate from the 8 remaining schools. One hundred sixty-one teachers responded from the 393 invitations to take the survey, for a 41% return rate. One hundred forty-two teachers provided usable data, which provided the sample for this study. Survey data for the sample were exported into Excel spreadsheets for preliminary analysis. Data were further analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 for Mac software program; results are reported in Chapter Four.

Data Analysis

The goal of this study was to examine the correlation between principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy. Teacher responses for the MLQ Form 5x Short (Bass & Avolio, 2004) and Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1994) were downloaded from the SurveyMonkey website and arranged, sorted, and saved in an Excel spreadsheet. Each variable name was used as a label to categorize data from the files downloaded. Data were tested using Excel and the SPSS edition 20. Responses were averaged for the overall job satisfaction score and for each leadership style and leadership style subscale. Descriptive data were used to describe the responses of the participants from the surveys. Measures of central tendency were calculated for each of the variables assessed by the two-implemented instruments.

Initially, Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (Pearson's r) was chosen as the appropriate parametric analysis tool to test the quantitative data for significance. Pearson's correlation is considered one of the most common measures for

examining the degree of correlation between two variables (Price, 2003). Although other parametric methods can be used, the Pearson's correlation is often the preferred parametric analysis by researchers as long as the assumptions to use the test are met and because it is the most precise estimate of correlation (Price, 2003). Assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity, are the primary assumptions for Pearson's r analysis (Szapkiw, n.d).

When preliminary analysis of testing assumptions for Pearson's r were found not to be tenable, the Spearman's rank-order (Spearman's rho), a nonparametric alternative, was chosen (Field, 2009; Szapkiw, n.d). Morgan (2004) recommended the Spearman's rho correlation test as the non-parametric equivalent of the Pearson correlation.

Spearman's rho correlation tests were conducted for each of the study's variables with the assumption that the variables were at least ordinal and the scores of one variable were related monotonically to the other variable (Cooper & Shindler, 2008; Szapkiw, n.d).

A monotonic relationship is one that is continuously rising or continuously falling. The line does not need to be straight; it can go up for a while, level off, and then rise again. It just can't reverse direction and start falling (Howell, 2008, p. 184).

The assumption of a monotonic relationship was confirmed using scatterplots. The assumption addressing ordinal data was met through the type of data gathered from the MLQ and JSS Likert-scale surveys (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

SPSS v. 20 was used to run assumption tests and correlational analyses. These procedures were utilized in order to find correlation coefficients to measure the strength

and direction of the relationship between the variables of principal leadership styles (transformational, transactional, or passive avoidant) to overall teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy (Field, 2009). The researcher tested qualified middle school teacher perceptions rating each variable.

Based on a two-tailed significance test, medium effect size of $r = .30$, and an alpha level set at .05, a sample size of 138 participants was needed for a statistical power of .95 to control for the potential for Type I and Type II errors (Cohen, 1988). This study's sample size consisted of 142 participants, which fell within the required number of participants needed for the desired statistical power level. Sample size was calculated using G-power software version 3.1.3 and Cohen's power table (Cohen, 1988).

Correlation tests were conducted to ascertain the positive or negative relationship between the variables in Research Questions 1 and 2 and test the null hypotheses. The results from the correlation coefficient demonstrated the degree and direction of the relationship between the variables (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). Correlation coefficients (r_s) were also used to demonstrate the effect size or strength of the relationships.

Research Question 1

Is there a statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived leadership style of middle school principals (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to teacher job satisfaction as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district?

Research Question 1 was designed to determine the strength and direction

(positive, negative, or none) of the correlation between teacher perceptions of middle school principal leadership styles to teacher job satisfaction. Teacher perception from the MLQ and JSS data were used to answer this question. Descriptive data indicated subscale scores for the MLQ. The subscale scores provided by teacher responses to the surveys were computed as the average rating of each subscale item. Aggregate transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership scores were derived from the average of the respective subscale scores. The same process was performed for each subscale of the JSS for overall perceived job satisfaction.

To evaluate the strength and the direction of the relationship for Research Question 1, assumption tests were performed on the data for Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (Pearson correlation). Pearson correlation was intended to be used because it can measure the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2008). When assumption tests failed, Spearman rho, a nonparametric correlational test, was run.

Correlation coefficients were determined for the total scores of both the MLQ (measuring principal leadership styles) and the JSS (measuring teacher job satisfaction) for all teachers, as well as for each teacher-perceived principal leadership style subscale. To test the research question hypotheses, the correlation coefficients were analyzed to determine the strength and direction of each correlation between the teacher-perceived middle school principal leadership style and subscales to teacher job satisfaction.

For this study, the principal leadership styles of transformational, transactional, passive avoidant and associated subscales were examined. Transformational leadership has five subscales, including idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence

(behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. Transactional leadership has two subscales, contingent reward, and management by exception (active). The passive avoidant leadership style has two subscales, management by exception (passive) and laissez faire.

Descriptive statistics of central tendency measured the variables of the MLQ and JSS for the cumulative summary and subscales of each leadership style for all schools in the study. Spearman's rho correlation coefficients were computed for the bivariate combination of the MLQ and JSS. The Spearman's rho correlation coefficients determined if a correlation existed, and the strength of the correlation (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006) between each perceived principal leadership style to overall teacher job satisfaction. The farther away from .00 in either a negative or positive direction the correlation coefficient is, the stronger the two variables are related (Huck, 2008). This was the appropriate procedure due to the fact that it tested if and how strong a correlation existed between two variables (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2008).

Along with the Spearman's rho correlation, two-tailed significance tests were run in order to test the significance of each relationship. A sample size of 142 teachers provided a large enough sample to sustain significant statistical power (Ary et al., 2006; Cohen, 1988; Gall, Gall & Borg, 2010; Szapkiw, n.d.). The level of the significance of the relationships was tested at a threshold value (alpha) of $p < .05$. Ary et al. (2006) explained the significance level by stating,

If the data derived from the completed experiment indicate that the probability of the null hypothesis being true is equal to or less than the predetermined acceptable probability, the investigators reject the null hypothesis and declare the

results statistically significant. If the probability is greater than the predetermined acceptable probability, the results are described as non-significant—that is, the null hypothesis is retained (p. 184).

Setting the probability (p value) threshold to an alpha of .05 means that the probability of a Type I error in rejecting the null hypothesis is 1 in 500. However this also means that there is a higher probability that a Type II error exists, declaring there is no relationship when a relationship actually exists (Ary et al., 2006). The alpha level was set at $p < .05$ because it was deemed necessary to take greater precautions against a Type I error in determining if the null hypothesis could be rejected. If the p value was less than the alpha level, the null hypothesis was rejected. If the p value was greater than the threshold (alpha) level, the null hypothesis was not rejected and the difference was not statistically significant.

Research Question 2

Is there a statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teachers-perceived leadership style of middle school principals (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ) in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district?

Research Question 2 was tested using data from the MLQ survey. The MLQ has nine subscales measuring leadership styles and three subscales measuring specific leadership outcomes. Data from the MLQ indicating teacher perception of the principal’s leadership style (transformational, transactional, or passive avoidant) were obtained based on the leadership style subscale scores. Data from the MLQ’s leadership

outcome scores indicating the level of the teacher's willingness to exert extra effort in the workplace were also obtained. These data were identified in this study as teacher efficacy. In order to answer Research Question 2, assumption tests for the Pearson correlation tests were run for principal leadership style and teacher efficacy as measured by the MLQ. Pearson correlation assumption tests failed. Nonparametric Spearman rho correlations were used to test between the principal leadership styles and extra effort (teacher efficacy).

The same procedures testing the null hypotheses for Research Question 1 were used for Research Question 2. Descriptive statistics of central tendency were calculated for the variables of principal leadership style and teacher efficacy (extra effort) from the MLQ for the cumulative summary and each leadership style subscale for all schools. The Spearman's rho determined if a correlation existed, as well as the strength and direction (positive or negative) of the correlation (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006) that existed between the perceived principal leadership style and each subscale and teacher efficacy.

Two-tailed significance tests were run in order to test the significance of each relationship and to test the null hypotheses of Research Question 2. The alpha level was set at $p < .05$. A sample of 142 teachers was large enough to provide significant statistical power of .95 (Szapkiw, n.d.). This was the appropriate procedure because just as in Research Question 1, it tested if, how strong, and the direction of the relationship between principal leadership style and extra effort (teacher efficacy).

The data were tested for violations of Pearson r assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. The Spearman rho nonparametric correlation analysis

replaced the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient because of violations of an assumption (Szapkiw, n.d.).

Exploratory Open-Ended Question

The responses to the exploratory open-ended question, “What could a principal do to promote or strengthen your capacity to be effective in your classroom?” were downloaded from SurveyMonkey and analyzed. Each participant was encouraged to provide detailed responses to this question. In order to provide face validity, the question was created while keeping the information provided in the literature review in mind. Content validity was accomplished by enlisting two certified teachers from two different school districts who were not associated with this study to review the question to verify comprehension. The question did not need revision according to the suggestions from these teachers (see Appendix K and L).

Analysis was conducted to discover and categorize common themes and phrases from the data. Responses from the exploratory question were categorized into common themes, and ranked according to the number of responses in each category. These themes were then associated with the transformational and transactional leadership styles. Passive avoidance is an undesirable style of leadership so there were no associations of themes from the responses to the open-ended question. See appendix M for all responses and their associated scores.

Summary

This study intended to add to the existing body of literature on the correlation between teacher-perceived principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. The study examined 142 teachers in eight middle schools in an East Tennessee

School District. The methods that were used to carry out a quantitative bivariate study were defined, a description of the participants was presented, methods of gathering data were described, instrumentation was discussed, explanation of research procedures was given, and data analysis was explained.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

The purpose of this study sought to determine if there was a statistically significant positive or negative correlation between teacher-perceived middle school principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. The research questions that guided this study were (a) Is there a statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived leadership style of middle school principals (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and teacher job satisfaction as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district? and (b) Is there a statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived leadership style of middle school principals (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ) in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district? An exploratory open-ended question designed to assess teacher-perceived needs of principal leadership behaviors or practices that influence effectiveness in the classroom was also provided.

This chapter provides results for (a) demographic findings, (b) descriptive statistics, (c) assumption test results, and (d) tests of hypotheses. The chapter concludes with a summary of the results. SPSS v. 20 and Microsoft Excel 2008 were used for all descriptive, assumption, and correlational analyses. All correlation analyses were set at a 95% level of significance.

Demographic Statistics

Because this study's focus was on the perceptions of middle school teachers, the participants were asked to indicate their gender, ethnic background, age, total years of teaching experience, and total years at their current school. All demographic data were collected for ancillary purposes and were not used as variables in the data analysis. A summary of the demographic data is provided in Tables 3-7.

Table 3 displays the total number of participating middle school teachers for schools 1-8. The number of participants for each school ranged from 7 to 34 respondents.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of All Middle School Teacher Participants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	34	23.9	23.9	23.9
	2	21	14.8	14.8	38.7
	3	17	12.0	12.0	50.7
	4	29	20.4	20.4	71.1
	5	13	9.2	9.2	80.3
	6	11	7.7	7.7	88.0
	7	7	4.9	4.9	93.0
	8	10	7.0	7.0	100.0
Total		142	100.0	100.0	

Gender

Table 4 notes that a total of 107 females and 34 males completed the survey.

One participant did not provide gender information. The percentage of female participants, 75.4%, drastically outnumbered male participants, 23.9%.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution by Gender of Teacher Participants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	107	75.4	75.9	75.9
	Male	34	23.9	24.1	100.0
	Total	141	99.3	100.0	
Missing System		1	.7		
Total		142	100.0		

Ethnic Background

Table 5 notes that 136 participants, or 95.8%, were Caucasian, two were African-American, two were American Indian, one was other nationalities, and one elected not to respond to this question.

Table 5

Frequency Distribution by Ethnic Background of Teacher Participants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Caucasian	136	95.8	96.5	96.5
	African-American	2	1.4	1.4	97.9
	American Indian	2	1.4	1.4	99.3
	Other	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	141	99.3	100.0	
Missing System		1	.7		
Total		142	100.0		

Age of Teacher

Table 6 displays the number of participants in each age category. The age range of 50-59 had 37 participants, while 70-79 had only one participant.

Table 6

Frequency Distribution by Age of Teacher Participants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20-29	17	12.0	12.0	96.5
	30-39	2 34	23.9	23.9	35.9
	40-49	2 36	25.4	25.4	61.3
	50-59	37	26.1	26.1	87.3
	60-69	17	12.0	12.0	99.3
	70-79	1	.7	.7	100.0
Total		142	100.0	100.0	

Total Years Teaching

Table 7 notes that 26 teachers indicated they had been teaching 6-10 years. There were 21 participants teaching 5 years or less and 21 participants teaching 21-25 years. Only 10 participants had 31-35 total years teaching experience.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Total Years Teaching by Participants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5 or less	21	14.8	14.9	14.9
	6-10	26	18.3	18.4	33.3
	11-15	23	16.2	16.3	49.6
	16-20	16	11.3	11.3	61.0
	21-25	21	14.8	14.9	75.9
	26-30	13	9.2	9.2	85.1
	31-35	10	7.0	7.1	92.2
	36-40	11	7.7	7.8	100.0
	Total	141	99.3	100.0	
Missing System		1	.7		
Total		142	100.0		

Total Years at Current School

Table 8 notes that 126 participants had been at their current school for 1-5 years; nine participants for 16-20 years; one participant for 21-25 years; and one participant had 36-40 total years at their current school. Almost 89% of the participants had only been at their current school for 1 to 5 years. Because there were no participants with total years at current school in the ranges of 26-30 or 31-40, they were deleted from Table 8.

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Total Years Teaching at Current School by Participants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-5	126	88.7	89.4	89.4
	6-10	9	6.3	6.4	95.7
	11-15	3	2.1	2.1	97.9
	16-20	1	.7	.7	98.6
	21-25	1	.7	.7	99.3
	36-40	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	141	99.3	100.0	
Missing System		1	.7		
Total		142	100.0		

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are displayed for respondent ratings from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) for transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership styles, and teacher efficacy. The MLQ is based on a five-point rating scale (0 to 4 points). Descriptive statistics from the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) present an overall job satisfaction rating. The JSS is based on a six-point rating scale (1 to 6 points). In order to distinguish between respondent scores indicating teacher job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, a mean score of 3.2 or above indicated teacher job satisfaction. If the mean score fell below 3.2, teacher job dissatisfaction was indicated.

Descriptive statistics for middle school principal leadership style, teacher job satisfaction, and teacher efficacy can be seen in Table 9. Overall, teachers indicated they were satisfied with their jobs with a mean score of ($M = 3.246$). Teachers scored their efficacy with a mean score of ($M = 2.453$).

Transformational leadership had the highest overall mean score of ($M = 2.545$). The lowest leadership style mean score was passive avoidant with ($M = 1.293$). Table 9 indicates that teachers overall scored their principal lowest in the transformational subscale of individual consideration ($M = 2.167$). The highest subscale scored by teachers in transformational leadership was inspirational motivation ($M = 3.176$). Of the two subscales of transactional leadership, contingent reward scored highest ($M = 2.695$). Laissez faire, a subscale of the passive avoidant leadership style, had the lowest teacher rated mean score of all nine leadership style subscales ($M = 1.151$).

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Principal Leadership Style, Teacher Job Satisfaction, and Efficacy

Variable	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Range	Variance
TF	142	.500	3.900	2.545	.783	3.40	.614
IIA	142	.00	4.00	2.658	1.079	4.00	1.166
IIB	142	.50	4.00	2.383	.593	3.50	.353
IM	142	.25	4.00	3.176	.819	3.75	.672
IS	142	.00	4.00	2.341	1.016	4.00	1.033
IC	142	.00	4.00	2.167	1.037	4.00	1.077
TA	142	.125	3.75	2.215	.669	3.62	.449
CR	142	.00	4.00	2.695	1.056	4.00	1.117
MBEA	142	.00	3.75	1.735	.773	3.75	.598
PA	142	.00	4.00	1.293	.964	4.00	.930
MBEP	142	.00	4.00	1.434	.925	4.00	.856
LF	142	.00	4.00	1.151	1.132	4.00	1.282
JS	142	2.50	4.25	3.246	.336	1.75	.113
EE	142	.000	4.00	2.453	1.236	4.00	1.529

Note. TF=Transformational Leadership & Subscales: IIA=Idealized Influence (Attribute), IIB=Idealized Influence (Behavior), IM=Inspirational Motivation, IS=Intellectual Stimulation, IC=Individual Consideration; TA=Transactional Leadership & Subscales: CR=Contingent Reward, MBEA=Management by Exception (Active); PA=Passive Avoidant Leadership & Subscales: MBEP=Management by Exception (Passive), LF=Laissez Faire; JS=Job Satisfaction; EE=Efficacy.

Assumption Testing

In order to affirm the use of the parametric analysis, Pearson product moment correlation, preliminary assumption tests were conducted. The assumptions tested were for normal distribution, linearity, and homoscedasticity (Szapkiw, n.d.). Visual examination of normality histograms was conducted and determined that the assumption

of normal distribution of the data was not tenable for Pearson's r .

To confirm the visual examination of histograms, the Shapiro-Wilk statistical test of normality was also employed (Szapkiw, n.d.). If the significance value of the Shapiro-Wilk test is greater than 0.05 then the data is normal. If it is below 0.05 then the data significantly deviates from a normal distribution (Field, 2009). For overall transformational and passive avoidant leadership styles, the significance value was found to be .000, indicating a deviation from normal distributions. The transactional leadership significance value was .032, which was not within the acceptable range to be considered normally distributed. Eight of the nine leadership subscale significance values deviated from normality, ranging from .005 to .000. Only the transactional leadership style subscale, management by exception (active), was within the acceptable range of normality with a significance value of .113. The significance value for total job satisfaction was .529, which was within the acceptable range of normality, but efficacy's significance value deviated from normality with a .000.

Because the significance values of transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership, as well as eight of the nine leadership subscales and efficacy deviated from normal distributions, assumption tests of normality failed for Pearson's r correlation coefficient testing. As a result, Spearman's rho was determined to be the nonparametric alternative in order to analyze the correlation between the three leadership styles of transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant and their subscales to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy (Salkind & Green, 2011; Szapkiw, n.d.). See Table 10 for the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality scores.

Table 10

Shapiro-Wilk Test of Normality

	Statistic	df	Sig.
Transformational Leadership Style	.959	142	.000
Idealized Influence (Attribute)	.930	142	.000
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	.972	142	.005
Inspirational Motivation	.865	142	.000
Intellectual Stimulation	.950	142	.000
Individual Consideration	.966	142	.001
Transactional Leadership Style	.980	142	.032
Contingent Reward	.916	142	.000
Management by Exception (Active)	.985	142	.113
Passive Avoidant Leadership Style	.925	142	.000
Management by Exception (Passive)	.955	142	.000
Laissez Faire	.880	142	.000
Teacher Job Satisfaction	.991	142	.529
Teacher Efficacy	.921	142	.000

The assumption of linearity was determined by a visual examination of scatterplots representing the relationships between the variables of leadership styles and leadership style subscales to job satisfaction and efficacy. The data assumed linearity in all but one scatterplot because they did not show a curvilinear relationship (Tabachnik &

Fidell, 2007). Management by exception (active) to total job satisfaction scatterplot failed to show linearity.

Because the assumptions of normality failed, Spearman's rho, a nonparametric test was still considered most appropriate for analysis even though the data with the exception of one scatterplot were assumed linear. Spearman's rho assumes at least a monotonic relationship between variables (Cooper & Shindler, 2008; Szapkiw, n.d). "A monotonic relationship is one that is continuously rising or continuously falling" (Howell, 2008, p.184). A visual evaluation of the scatterplots for all variable relationships fulfilled the assumption of at least a monotonic relationship for Spearman's rho.

Homoscedasticity is the assumption that the data are evenly grouped around the best fit line of the bivariate relationship (Szapkiw, n.d). A visual examination of the scatterplots indicated the data for each relationship were not homoscedastic. Because homoscedasticity was not achieved, Pearson's r could not be used, which further confirmed the use of the nonparametric Spearman's rho to analyze the correlations in this study. Scatterplots were then visually evaluated for Spearman's rho assumption of a monotonic relationship. All scatterplots were assessed as having at least a monotonic relationship.

Data Analysis

Each hypothesis is presented along with the statistical analysis performed using the SPSS statistical software package v. 20. Significance was tested at alpha level = .05. Assumptions were evaluated in order to justify correlation testing. When assumptions were found not to be tenable for normality and homoscedasticity for Pearson r

correlation, the nonparametric Spearman's rho was deemed appropriate for the correlation tests. Correlation testing began after data were assessed to ensure assumptions for Spearman's rho were met, which included testing of ordinal data and a monotonic relationship between the variables (Morgan, 2004). Verification of a monotonic relationship was confirmed through visual examination of scatter plots. The assumption addressing ordinal data was met through the type of data gathered from the MLQ and JSS Likert scale surveys (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Research Hypothesis 1.1a

There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Research Hypothesis 1.1b

There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Null Hypothesis 1.1

There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypotheses 1.1a and 1.1b were tested by conducting a Spearman's rho correlation for teachers' perceptions of the transformational leadership style for middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction. The results indicated that no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation existed between the transformational

leadership style concerning teachers' job satisfaction ($r_s = .093$, $p = .270$).

Further, the probability that the correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of the principal to teacher job satisfaction may have occurred by chance yielded $p > .05$ or ($p = .270$), indicating no statistically significant relationship. Thus, the null hypothesis 1.1 failed to be rejected for transformational leadership style. These data are presented in Table 11. What this seems to indicate is that it is very unlikely the teachers in this study felt there was a relationship between their perceptions of their principals' leadership style as transformational to their own sense of satisfaction with their job.

Spearman's rho correlation was also conducted to test Hypothesis 1.1a and 1.1b for the positive or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived middle school principal transformational leadership style subscales to teacher job satisfaction. All five subscales were not statistically significant and illustrated no positive or negative statistically significant correlation to teacher job satisfaction. Results included idealized influence (attribute) $r_s = .047$, $p = .582$, idealized influence (behavior) $r_s = .003$, $p = .973$, inspirational motivation $r_s = .102$, $p = .225$, intellectual stimulation $r_s = .056$, $p = .510$, and individual consideration $r_s = .124$, $p = .141$.

Further, the probability that the correlation between each principal's transformational leadership style subscale to teacher job satisfaction may have occurred by chance yielded $p > .05$, indicating no statistically significant correlation for each of the five subscales. The null hypothesis 1.1 was not rejected for each of the five transformational leadership style subscales. These data are presented in Table 11. The results suggest that it was very unlikely the teachers in this study felt there was a

relationship between any of their perceived principal's transformational leadership style subscales (idealized influence [attribute], idealized influence [behavior], inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration) to their own sense of satisfaction with their job.

Table 11

Spearman's Rho Correlations of Transformational Leadership Style and Subscales to Teacher Job Satisfaction.

		Total Job Satisfaction	
Spearman's rho	Transformational Leadership Style	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) <i>N</i>	.093 .270 142
	IIA Subscale	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) <i>N</i>	.047 .582 142
	IIB Subscale	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) <i>N</i>	.003 .973 142
	IS Subscale	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) <i>N</i>	.056 .510 142
	IM Subscale	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) <i>N</i>	.102 .225 142
	IC Subscale	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) <i>N</i>	.124 .141 142

Note. TF=Transformational Leadership & Subscales: IIA=Idealized Influence (Attribute), IIB=Idealized Influence (Behavior), IS=Intellectual Stimulation, IM=Inspirational Motivation, IC=Individual Consideration

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Research Hypothesis 1.2a

There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Research Hypothesis 1.2b

There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Null Hypothesis 1.2

There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypotheses 1.2a and 1.2b were tested by conducting a Spearman's rho correlation for the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction. Results indicate no positive or negative statistically significant correlation existed between the principals' transactional leadership style to teacher job satisfaction ($r_s = .101$, $p = .232$). Further, the probability that the correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of the principal to teacher job satisfaction may have occurred by chance yielded $p > .05$ or ($p = .232$), indicating no statistically significant relationship. The null hypothesis 1.2 failed to be rejected for the transactional leadership style. These data are presented in Table 12. The indication is that it was very unlikely the teachers in this study felt there was a relationship between their perceptions of their principals' leadership style as transactional to their own sense of satisfaction with their job.

Spearman's rho correlation was also conducted to test Hypotheses 1.2a and 1.2b for the positive or negative correlation between the teachers' perceptions of middle school principal transactional leadership style subscales to teacher job satisfaction.

Subscales contingent reward and management by exception (active) were not statistically significant in either a positive or negative direction and illustrated no correlation with teacher job satisfaction. Results indicated contingent reward was $r_s = .128, p = .130$ and management by exception (active) was $r_s = -.005, p = .949$.

The probability that the correlation between each principal's transactional leadership style subscale to teacher job satisfaction may have occurred by chance yielded $p > .05$, indicating no statistically significant correlation for contingent reward and management by exception (active). The null hypothesis 1.2 failed to be rejected for both contingent reward and management by exception (active) subscales. These data are presented in Table 12. The results suggest that it was very unlikely the teachers in this study felt there was a relationship between their perceived principal's transactional leadership style subscales of contingent reward and management by exception (active) to their own sense of satisfaction with their job.

Table 12

Spearman's Rho Correlations of Transactional Leadership Style and Subscales to Teacher Job Satisfaction.

			Total Job Satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Transactional Subscale	Correlation Coefficient	.101
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.232
		N	142
	CR Subscale	Correlation Coefficient	.128
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.130
		N	142
	MBEA Subscale	Correlation Coefficient	-.005
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.949
		N	142

Note. TA=Transactional Leadership & Subscales; CR=Contingent Reward, MBEA=Management by Exception (Active)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Research Hypothesis 1.3a

There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Research Hypothesis 1.3b

There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Null Hypothesis 1.3

There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as

measured by the MLQ), to teacher job satisfaction (as measured by the JSS).

Hypotheses 1.3a and 1.3b were tested by conducting a Spearman's rho correlation for the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction. The passive avoidant leadership style had a statistically significant weak negative correlation to teacher job satisfaction ($r_s = -.237$, $p = .004$). Cohen (1988) suggested that correlation coefficients between .10 and .29 have weak effect sizes, between .30 and .49 have moderate effect sizes, and between .50 and 1.0 have strong effect sizes. The direction of the correlation was negative, affirming Hypothesis 1.3b, and means that as the teacher-perceived principal's passive avoidant leadership style increased, the teacher's job satisfaction decreased. Further, the probability that the correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of the principal to teacher job satisfaction may have occurred by chance yielded $p < .05$ or ($p = .004$), indicating a statistically significant relationship. The null hypothesis 1.3 was rejected for passive avoidant leadership. These data are presented in Table 13. The indication is that there was a weak negative relationship between the teacher's perception of their principal's leadership style as passive avoidant to their own sense of satisfaction with their job. Because the relationship was negative and weak, this indicated that as the teacher's perception of their principal's passive avoidant leadership style went up, the teacher's sense of job satisfaction went down slightly.

Spearman's rho correlation was also conducted to test Hypotheses 1.3a and 1.3b for the positive or negative correlation of the teacher-perceived principal's passive avoidant leadership style subscales of management by exception (passive) and laissez faire to teacher job satisfaction. The management by exception (passive) subscale had a

statistically significant moderate negative correlation to teacher job satisfaction ($r_s = -.325, p = .000$). Cohen (1988) suggested that correlation coefficients between .10 and .29 have weak effect sizes, between .30 and .49 have moderate effect sizes, and between .50 and 1.0 have strong effect sizes. The direction of the correlation was negative, which affirms Hypothesis 1.3b, and means that as the passive avoidant leadership style subscale of management by exception (passive) increased, teacher job satisfaction decreased. The laissez faire subscale indicated no statistically significant correlation to teacher job satisfaction ($r_s = -.131, p = .120$). The probability that the correlation between the principal's passive avoidant leadership style subscale of management by exception (passive) to teacher job satisfaction may have occurred by chance yielded $p < .05$, indicating a statistically significant relationship. The laissez faire subscale yielded a $p > .05$, indicating no statistically significant relationship to teacher job satisfaction. The null hypothesis 1.3 was rejected for management by exception (passive) but failed to be rejected for the laissez faire subscale. These data are presented in Table 13. What these results indicate is that there seemed to be a moderately negative relationship between the teachers' perceptions of their principal's passive avoidant leadership style's subscale of management by exception (passive) and their own sense of satisfaction with their job. Because the relationship was negative, this indicated that as the teachers' perceptions of their principal's management by exception (passive) leadership style subscale went up, the teachers' sense of job satisfaction went down moderately. The results also suggest that it was very unlikely the teachers in this study felt there was a relationship between their perceived principal's passive avoidant leadership style subscale of laissez faire to their own sense of satisfaction with their job.

Table 13

Spearman's Rho Correlations of Passive Avoidant Leadership Styles and Subscales to Teacher Job Satisfaction.

			Total Job Satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Passive Avoidant Leadership Style	Correlation Coefficient	-.237**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.004
		N	142
	MBEP Subscale	Correlation Coefficient	-.325**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	142
	LF Subscale	Correlation Coefficient	.131
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.120
		N	142

Note. PA=Passive Avoidant Leadership & Subscales; MBEP=Management by Exception (Passive), LF=Laissez Faire

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Research Hypothesis 2.1a

There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor "extra effort" from the MLQ).

Research Hypothesis 2.1b

There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor "extra effort" from the MLQ).

Null Hypothesis 2.1

There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the

teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypotheses 2.1a and 2.1b were tested by conducting a Spearman’s rho correlation for teachers’ perceptions of the transformational leadership style for middle school principals to teacher efficacy. The transformational leadership style had a statistically significant strong positive correlation to teacher efficacy ($r_s = .862$, $p = .000$). The direction of the correlation was positive, which affirms Hypothesis 2.1a, and means that as the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of the principals increased, teacher efficacy increased. Further, the probability that the correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of the principal to teacher efficacy may have occurred by chance yielded $p < .01$ or ($p = .000$), indicating a statistically significant relationship. The null hypothesis 2.1 was rejected. These data are presented in Table 14. What this indicated is that it was very likely the teachers in this study felt there was a strong relationship between their perceptions of their principal’s leadership style as transformational to their own sense of efficacy in their job. Because the relationship was positive, this suggests that as the teacher’s perception of their principal’s transformational leadership style increased, their own sense of efficacy increased as well.

Spearman’s rho correlation results also revealed a positive correlation between middle school principal transformational leadership style subscales and teacher efficacy. All five of the subscales were statistically significant at the .01 alpha level, and four of the five subscales showed a positive strong correlation with teacher efficacy. Results

include: idealized influence (attribute) ($r_s = .844, p = .000$); intellectual stimulation ($r_s = .819, p = .000$); inspirational motivation ($r_s = .707, p = .000$); and individual consideration ($r_s = .804, p = .000$). Only the subscale, idealized influence (behavior) had a positive, moderate correlation to teacher efficacy ($r_s = .315, p = .000$). The direction of the correlation was positive, which affirms Hypothesis 2.1a, meaning that, as the transformational leadership style subscales of the principals increased, teacher efficacy increased. Further, the probability that the correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style subscales of the principal to teacher efficacy may have occurred by chance yielded $p < .01$ or ($p = .000$), indicating a statistically significant relationship for all five subscales. The null hypothesis 2.1 was rejected for all transformational leadership style subscales. These data are presented in Table 14. The results suggest that it was very likely the teachers in this study felt there was a strong relationship between their perception of their principal's transformational leadership style subscales (idealized influence [attribute], inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration) to their own sense of efficacy in their job. It also seems likely the teachers in this study felt there was a moderate relationship between their perceptions of their principal's transformational leadership style subscale, idealized influence (behavior) to their own sense of efficacy in their job. Because all of these results were positive, there is an indication that as the teachers' perceptions of these transformational leadership style subscales increased, the teachers' feelings of efficacy in their job increased as well.

Table 14

Spearman's Rho Correlations of Transformational Leadership Style and Subscales to Teacher Efficacy.

			Efficacy
Spearman's rho	Transformational Leadership Style	Correlation Coefficient	.862**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	142
	IIA Subscale	Correlation Coefficient	.844**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	142
	IIB Subscale	Correlation Coefficient	.315**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	142
	IS Subscale	Correlation Coefficient	.819**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	142
	IM Subscale	Correlation Coefficient	.707**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	142
	IC Subscale	Correlation Coefficient	.804**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	142

Note. TF=Transformational Leadership & Subscales: IIA=Idealized Influence (Attribute), IIB=Idealized Influence (Behavior), IS=Intellectual Stimulation, IM=Inspirational Motivation, IC=Individual Consideration

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Research Hypothesis 2.2a

There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher- perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Research Hypothesis 2.2a

There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Null Hypothesis 2.2

There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypotheses 2.2a and 2.2b were tested by conducting a Spearman’s rho correlation for the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style for middle school principals to teacher efficacy. The transactional leadership style had a statistically significant strong positive correlation to teacher efficacy ($r_s = .650$, $p = .000$). The direction of the correlation was positive, affirming Hypothesis 2.2a, meaning that as the teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s transactional leadership style increased, teacher efficacy increased. Further, the probability that the correlation between the transactional leadership style of the principal to teacher efficacy may have occurred by chance yielded $p < .01$ or ($p = .000$), indicating a statistically significant relationship. The null hypothesis 2.2 was rejected. These data are presented in Table 15. The results indicate it was very likely the teachers in this study felt there was a strong relationship between their perceptions of their principal’s leadership style as transactional to their own sense of efficacy in their job. Because the relationship was positive, this means that as the teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s transactional leadership style increased, their

own sense of efficacy increased as well.

Spearman's rho correlation was also conducted to test Hypothesis 2.2a and 2.2b for the correlation of the teacher-perceived middle school principal transactional leadership style subscales of management by exception (active) and contingent reward to teacher efficacy. Contingent reward had a statistically significant strong positive correlation to teacher efficacy ($r_s = .830, p = .000$). The direction of the correlation was positive, affirming Hypothesis 2.2a, meaning that, as the contingent reward increased, teacher efficacy increased. The probability that the correlation between the transactional leadership style of the principal to teacher efficacy may have occurred by chance yielded $p < .01$ or ($p = .000$), indicating a statistically significant relationship. Therefore, the null hypothesis 2.2 was rejected for contingent reward. Management by exception (active) was not statistically significant and illustrated no statistically significant correlation with teacher efficacy. The correlation coefficient for management by exception (active) was $r_s = .020, p = .817$. The null hypothesis 2.2 was not rejected for the management by exception (active). These data are presented in Table 15. The results indicate it was very likely the teachers in this study felt there was a strong relationship between their perceptions of their principal's transactional leadership style subscale of contingent reward to their own sense of efficacy in their job. Because all of these results were positive there was an indication that as the teachers' perceptions of these transformational leadership style subscales increased, the teachers' feelings of efficacy in their job increased as well. The results also suggested that it was very unlikely the teachers in this study felt there was a relationship between their perceived principal's transactional leadership style subscale of management by exception (active)

to their own sense of efficacy in their job.

Table 15

Spearman's Rho Correlations of Transactional, Leadership Style and Subscales to Teacher Efficacy.

			Efficacy
Spearman's rho	Transactional Subscale	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) <i>N</i>	.650** .000 142
	CR Subscale	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) <i>N</i>	.830** .000 142
	MBEA Subscale	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) <i>N</i>	.020 .817 142

Note. TA=Transactional Leadership & Subscales: CR=Contingent Reward, MBEA=Management by Exception (Active)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis 2.3a

There is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypothesis 2.3b

There is a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Null Hypothesis 2.3

There is no statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of middle school principals (as measured by the MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor “extra effort” from the MLQ).

Hypotheses 2.3a and 2.3b were tested by conducting a Spearman’s rho correlation for the teacher-perceived middle school principal passive avoidant leadership style to perceived teacher efficacy. The passive avoidant leadership style had a statistically significant strong negative correlation to teacher efficacy ($r_s = -.658$, $p = .000$). The direction of the correlation was negative, affirming Hypothesis 2.3b, meaning that as the teacher-perceived principal’s passive avoidant leadership style increased, teacher efficacy decreased. The probability that the correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style of the principal to teacher efficacy may have occurred by chance yielded $p < .01$ or ($p = .000$), indicating a statistically significant relationship. The null hypothesis 2.3 was rejected. These data are presented in Table 16. What this indicates is that it was very likely the teachers in this study felt there was a strong negative relationship between their perceptions of their principal’s leadership style as passive avoidant to their own sense of efficacy in their job. This means that as strongly as the teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s passive avoidant leadership style increased, just as strongly their own sense of efficacy decreased. When efficacy decreases, the teacher’s willingness to exert extra effort in the classroom diminishes accordingly.

Spearman’s rho correlation was also conducted to test Hypotheses 2.3a and 2.3b

for the correlation of the teacher-perceived middle school principal passive avoidant leadership style subscales of management by exception (passive) and laissez faire to their efficacy. Both management by exception (passive) and laissez faire had a statistically significant strong negative correlation to teacher efficacy (management by exception [passive] $r_s = -.541, p = .000$ and laissez faire $r_s = -.682, p = .000$). The direction for both correlations was negative, affirming Hypothesis 2.3b, meaning that as the passive avoidant leadership style subscale of management by exception (passive) and laissez faire increased, teacher efficacy decreased. The probability that the correlation between the principal passive avoidant leadership style subscales of management by exception (passive) and laissez faire to teacher efficacy may have occurred by chance yielded $p < .01$ or ($p = .000$), indicating a statistically significant relationship. The null hypothesis 2.3 was rejected for management by exception (passive) and laissez faire. These data are presented in Table 16. What this seems to indicate is that it was very likely the teachers in this study felt there was a strong negative relationship between their perceptions of their principal's passive avoidant leadership subscales of management by exception (passive) and laissez faire to their own sense of efficacy in their job. This means that as strongly as the teacher's perception of their principal's management by exception (passive) and laissez faire leadership increased, just as strongly their own sense of efficacy decreased. When efficacy decreases, the teacher's willingness to exert extra effort in the classroom diminishes accordingly.

Table 16

Spearman's Rho Correlations of Passive Avoidant Leadership Style and Subscales to Teacher Efficacy.

			Efficacy
Spearman's rho	Passive Avoidant Leadership Style	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) N	-.658** .000 142
	MBEP Subscale	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) N	-.541** .000 142
	LF Subscale	Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) N	-.682** .000 142

Note. PA=Passive Avoidant Leadership & Subscales; MBEP=Management by Exception (Passive), LF=Laissez Faire

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Exploratory Open-Ended Question

The exploratory open-ended question at the end of the surveys was designed to assess teacher-perceived needs of principal leadership behaviors or practices that influence effectiveness in the classroom. Participants were encouraged to provide detailed responses to the question, "What could a principal do to promote or strengthen your capacity to be effective in your classroom?" Each participant could answer with up to five different responses to the question. Out of 142 participants, 117 answered the question with a total of 315 responses. The responses were coded by themes and then categorized into 16 categories. Table 17 shows the categories, ranking, and the number of responses from respondents. The five most common categories from teacher responses to the open-ended question were provides support, shows respect, provides training and resources, available, and provides authority/assertiveness.

Categories for the needs of teachers from their principals are associated with the transformational, transactional leadership styles. Support, respect, availability, communication, encouragement, caring, shares leadership, shows fairness, promotes a sense of community, and honesty are components of transformational leadership. Provides training and resources, provides authority/assertiveness, provides structures, feedback, consistency, being knowledgeable and organized are all components of transactional leadership. See Appendix M for respondent comments and associated scores.

Table 17

Exploratory Open-Ended Question Ranking

Rank	Category	Responses	Leadership Style
1.	Provides Support	47	TF
2.	Shows Respect	39	TF
3.	Provides Training and resources	35	TA
4.	Available	33	TF
5.	Provides Authority/Assertiveness	26	TA
6.	Provides Structure	25	TA
7.	Communicates /Feedback	20	TF
8.	Encouragement	18	TF
9.	Caring	15	TF
10.	Consistent	12	TA
11.	Knowledgeable	11	TA
12.	Shares Leadership	10	TF
13.	Shows Fairness	9	TF
14.	Organized	7	TA
15.	Promotes a Sense of Community	5	TF
16.	Honest	3	TF

Total Responses 315

**Note.* TF=Transformational, TA=Transactional

Summary

Chapter Four presented the results of the research surveys, descriptive statistics, assumption tests, and data analysis utilizing Spearman's rho to measure the relationships between the variables of teacher-perceived principal leadership styles and subscales to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. Chapter Four also presented the findings and analysis of the exploratory open-ended question.

All demographic data were collected for ancillary purposes and were not used as variables in the data analysis. Assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity, were tested for Pearson's r analysis (Szapkiw, n.d). When preliminary analyses of testing assumptions for Pearson's r were found not to be tenable, the Spearman's rho, a nonparametric alternative, was chosen to conduct testing for statistically significant relationships between variables. Findings from the tests suggest that middle school teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership did not show a statistically significant relationship to teacher job satisfaction. Furthermore, findings from this study suggest that middle school teacher perceptions of their principal's leadership style (transformational and transactional) overall, had a statistically significant positive relationship to teacher efficacy. Teacher responses to the exploratory question at the end of the surveys further validated these findings by indicating teachers perceived their need for principal leadership to help them become more effective in the classroom by incorporating elements of both transformational and transactional leadership.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Chapter Five includes a statement of the problem, review of methodology, summary of the findings, a discussion of the findings in relation to prior research, theoretical implications, and implications for practice, limitations, and recommendations for future research, a summary, and conclusions of the study.

Problem Statement

The problem addressed in this study involved the effects of principal leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy. Research indicates that a principal's leadership style can influence job satisfaction and teaching efforts among school teachers (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Hulpia, Devos, & Rosseel, 2009; Ross & Gray, 2006). It is imperative that principals exhibit strong educational leadership within the school in order to provide the support teachers need to be a success in the classroom.

When workers feel their needs are being met and have a sense of satisfaction in their job, they experience a stronger motivation to exert extra effort to accomplish organizational goals (Mackenzie, 2007). When employees feel overwhelmed with their job and have little support from their leader, they experience low levels of job satisfaction (Fuming & Jiliang, 2008).

Some studies have suggested that a principal's influence on a teacher's job satisfaction and efficacy may have a direct bearing on student achievement (Nguni et al., 2006). Research has also shown that principal leadership can have a correlation to job satisfaction and efficacy among teachers, which can also lead to increasing their effectiveness in the classroom (Printy & Marks, 2006; Ross & Gray, 2006; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). The current study sought to ascertain if the leadership style of the

middle school principal perceived by teachers had a significant relationship to teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy.

Review of Methodology

A quantitative bivariate correlational study was conducted to determine the strength and direction (positive or negative) of the relationships between teacher-perceived middle school principal leadership styles and subscales to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district. Because the study was correlational in design, it sought to determine the direction and magnitude of the relationship between the variables rather than seeking to discover causation of any variables upon the other. An exploratory open-ended question at the end of the survey engaged teacher perceptions concerning principal leadership practices that influence teacher effectiveness in the classroom. The use of the exploratory component in this study provided further insight into the perceptions of teachers concerning principal leadership practices contributing to the current research. The sample for the study consisted of 142 qualified middle school teachers representing 8 middle schools. The results of this study contribute extensively to existing literature providing valuable information for schools, school districts, and organizations. The information from this research can be used to enhance principal leadership training efforts designed to increase teacher efficacy and job satisfaction, which could have an impact on teacher effectiveness in the middle school classroom.

There were very few research studies specifically investigating the correlation between middle school administrative leadership styles to teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy within the same study. Results of this study will aid in filling that gap

by researching the correlation of teacher-perceived principal leadership styles to both teacher job satisfaction and teacher efficacy in middle schools.

The design included establishing the variables and research questions that guided the study, selecting and enlisting procedures of schools and participants included in the sample, collecting the data, and analyzing the data. Participants completed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), which provided the measureable data. Spearman's rho was conducted to evaluate the strength and direction of the correlation of principal leadership styles and subscales to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. Data were also collected and analyzed through an exploratory open-ended question at the conclusion of the surveys.

Summary of the Findings

Research Hypotheses 1.1a and 1.1b

Research Question 1 asked if there was a statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived leadership style of middle school principals (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to teacher job satisfaction as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district.

Hypothesis 1.1a stated that there would be a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style and subscales of middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction. Hypothesis 1.1b stated that there would be a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style and subscales of middle school principals to

teacher job satisfaction. The Spearman's rho correlation statistics showed that Hypotheses 1.1a and 1.1b were not correct for the transformational leadership style and for each of the five transformational leadership style subscales (idealized influence [attribute] $r_s = .047, p = .582$; idealized influence [behavior] $r_s = .003, p = .973$; inspirational motivation $r_s = .102, p = .225$; intellectual stimulation $r_s = .056, p = .510$; and individual consideration $r_s = .124, p = .141$), because the correlations to teacher job satisfaction were not statistically significant ($p > .05$). The null hypothesis 1.1 failed to be rejected for transformational leadership style and all five subscales.

Research Hypotheses 1.2a and 1.2b

Hypothesis 1.2a stated that there would be a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style and subscales of middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction. Hypothesis 1.2b stated that there would be a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style and subscales of middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction. The Spearman's rho correlation statistics showed that Hypotheses 1.2a and 1.2b were not correct because there was not a statistically significant relationship between teacher-perceived principal transactional leadership style and the subscales of contingent reward and management by exception (active) to teacher job satisfaction ($p > .05$). The null hypothesis 1.2 failed to be rejected for transactional leadership style and subscales.

Research Hypothesis 1.3

Hypothesis 1.3a stated that there would be a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style and

subscales of middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction. Hypothesis 1.3b stated that there would be a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style and subscales of middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction. The Spearman's rho correlation statistics showed that Hypothesis 1.3b was correct for the passive avoidant leadership style and for the management by exception (passive) subscale. The passive avoidant leadership style had a statistically significant weak negative correlation to teacher job satisfaction ($r_s = -.237$, $p = .004$). The management by exception (passive) subscale had a statistically significant moderate negative correlation to teacher job satisfaction ($r_s = -.325$, $p = .000$). Laissez faire was not statistically significant and illustrated no statistically significant correlation to teacher job satisfaction. The null hypothesis 1.3 failed to be rejected for the laissez faire subscale but was rejected for the passive avoidant leadership style and the subscale management by exception (passive).

Research Hypothesis 2.1

Research Question 2 asked if there was a statistically significant, positive, or negative correlation between the teacher-perceived leadership style of middle school principals (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to teacher efficacy (as measured by the leader outcome factor "extra effort" from the MLQ) in selected middle schools of an East Tennessee school district.

Hypothesis 2.1a stated that there was a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style and subscales of middle school principals to teacher efficacy. Hypothesis 2.1b stated that

there was a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style and subscales of middle school principals to teacher efficacy. The Spearman's rho correlation statistics showed that Hypothesis 2.1a was correct for the transformational leadership style and for each subscale because the relationships to teacher efficacy were statistically significant. The direction of the correlation was positive meaning that as the teacher-perceived transformational leadership style of the principals increased, teacher efficacy increased. Four of the five subscales showed a positive strong correlation with teacher efficacy. The direction of the correlation was positive, which means that as the transformational leadership style subscales of the principals increased, teacher efficacy increased. The null hypothesis 2.1 was rejected for transformational leadership style and all five subscales.

Research Hypothesis 2.2

Hypothesis 2.2a stated that there was a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style and subscales of middle school principals to teacher efficacy. Hypothesis 2.2b stated that there was a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived transactional leadership style and subscales of middle school principals to teacher efficacy. The Spearman's rho correlation statistics showed that Hypothesis 2.2a was correct for the relationship between teacher-perceived principal transactional leadership style and the subscale of contingent reward to teacher efficacy. Hypothesis 2.2a and 2.2b were not correct for management by exception (active) to teacher efficacy because there was no statistically significant relationship. The transactional leadership style had a statistically significant strong direct positive correlation to teacher efficacy. The direction of the

correlation was positive, affirming Hypothesis 2.2a, meaning that as the teachers' perceptions of the principal's transactional leadership style increased, teacher efficacy increased. Contingent reward had a statistically significant strong positive correlation to teacher efficacy. The direction of the correlation was positive, affirming Hypothesis 2.2a, meaning that as the contingent reward increased, teacher efficacy increased. Management by exception (active) was not statistically significant and illustrated no statistically significant correlation with teacher efficacy. The null hypothesis 2.2 was rejected for transactional leadership style and contingent reward and failed to be rejected for management by exception (active).

Research Hypothesis 2.3

Hypothesis 2.3a stated that there was a statistically significant, positive correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style, and subscales of middle school principals to teacher efficacy. Hypothesis 2.3b stated that there was a statistically significant, negative correlation between the teacher-perceived passive avoidant leadership style, and subscales of middle school principals to teacher efficacy. The Spearman's rho correlation statistics showed that Hypothesis 2.3b was correct for the passive avoidant leadership style, indicating a statistically significant strong negative correlation to teacher efficacy. The direction of the correlation was negative, affirming hypothesis 2.3b, meaning that as the teacher-perceived principal's passive avoidant leadership style increased, teacher efficacy decreased. The subscales management by exception (passive) and laissez faire both indicated statistically significant strong negative correlations to teacher efficacy. The direction for both subscale correlations was negative, meaning that as the passive avoidant leadership style

subscale management by exception (passive) and laissez faire increased, teacher efficacy decreased. The null hypothesis 2.3 was rejected for the passive avoidant leadership style and the subscales management by exception (passive) and laissez faire.

Relationship to Prior Research

Principal Leadership Style to Teacher Job Satisfaction

Prior studies have shown that a principal's leadership style can have an effect on the satisfaction of school teachers (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Hulpia et al., 2009; Shatzer, 2009; Tillman & Tillman, 2008), yet based on the findings of Research Hypotheses 1.1a and 1.1b, results were not in alignment with prior research. The current study showed no significant correlations between the principal's transformational leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Neither were results of the current study in alignment with results of prior research, because significant correlations were not found between the five transformational leadership style subscales of idealized influence (attribute), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration, and teacher job satisfaction. Research has indicated a positive correlation exists between teacher-perceived principal transformational leadership and teacher job satisfaction (Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1994; Masood, Dani, Burns & Blackhouse, 2006; Nguni et al., 2006). Mulford (2008) suggested that the confluence of the transformational leadership style on teacher job satisfaction shows potential for providing a more satisfied and committed staff of teachers within the school. The results of the current study did not agree because no correlation was found between the measures of job satisfaction and the transformational leadership style.

Barnet, Marsh and Craven (2003) purported that when teachers perceived their principal as caring about them as individuals, and were present when key issues arose, higher levels of job satisfaction were evident. The current study results did not agree with this finding given that there was no correlation found between both the idealized influence (behavior) and idealized influence (attribute) subscales and teacher job satisfaction. Podsakoff, Makenzie and Bommer (1996) indicated that leaders who are inspirational will motivate teachers to work harder, which in turn influences teachers' job satisfaction. The results of this study did not agree, as there was no correlation to the inspirational motivation subscale.

Based on the findings of Research Hypotheses 1.2a and 1.2b from this research study, results were not in alignment with most of the results of prior research in terms of not finding significant correlation between the transactional leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. According to other past research, teacher satisfaction was significantly correlated with principal transactional leadership (Bogler, 2001; Nguni et al., 2006). Pepper (2010) suggested that the transactional leadership applied to the educational environment should provide a positive environment for effective teaching. One study conducted by Korkmaz, (2007) on factors influencing school organizational health, indicated that the less the principal's leadership style was transactional, the better the organizational health of the school became. The assumption can be made that the less teachers perceive the principal as a transactional leader, the more teacher job satisfaction will increase. The results from the current study indicate there is no statistically significant correlation between principal transactional leadership and teacher job satisfaction, which would indicate agreement with Korkmaz's (2007) findings.

A study by Byer & Gray (2006) defined contingent reward, a subscale of the transactional leadership style, as an exchange between the follower and the leader that is both active and positive based on reward. The study suggested that as long as both leader and follower were happy with the agreed upon arrangement the relationship would continue. This also indicates that this leadership style can have a positive effect on teacher job satisfaction. However, the results from the current study indicate that there was no relationship between contingent reward and teacher job satisfaction.

Management by exception (active) occurs when a leader gives the followers clear standards, expectations, and measures for monitoring and assessment at the start of the task or work (Byer & Gray, 2006). Rafferty's (2002) research indicated that management by exception (active) leadership lowered teacher job satisfaction, influencing teachers to resist change and exhibit more job absences. The results of the current study are more closely aligned with Rafferty's findings than with those of Byer & Gray, as no significant statistical correlation between management by exception (active) subscale leadership and teacher job satisfaction was found.

Based on the findings of Research Hypothesis 1.3b from this research study, results were aligned with prior research in terms of finding significant correlations between the passive avoidant leadership style and teacher job satisfaction and for the management by exception (passive) subscale. Laissez faire was not statistically significant and illustrated no correlation with teacher job satisfaction. Bass & Avolio (2004) explained that the passive avoidant style of leadership "has a negative effect on desired outcomes – opposite to what is intended by the leader-manager. In this regard it is similar to laissez faire styles – or 'no leadership.'" Both types of behavior have

negative impacts on followers and associates” (p. 96). The passive avoidant leadership style had a weak negative correlation to teacher job satisfaction, which meant the higher teachers scored principals in passive avoidant leadership, the lower their job satisfaction was. The results of the current study would indicate agreement with Bass & Avolio’s (2004) findings.

Korkmaz’s (2007) analysis showed management by exception (passive) had a weak positive correlation to teacher job satisfaction. Both Rafferty (2002) and Barnet et al. (2003) presented negative correlation results between management by exception (passive) and teacher job satisfaction. The current study’s results presented management by exception (passive) with a moderate negative correlation to teacher job satisfaction, which would indicate agreement with Rafferty and Barnet et al.’s research.

As stated earlier, Bass & Avolio (2004) explained that laissez faire leadership had a negative impact on followers and associates. Barnet et al. (2003) and Korkmaz (2007) indicated a negative correlation between the laissez faire leadership and teacher job satisfaction. Though the current study’s findings did not agree statistically, and presented no statistically significant correlation, it must be pointed out that the analysis did agree with the direction, by showing a negative finding ($r_s = -.131, p = .120$) between the laissez faire leadership style subscale and teacher job satisfaction.

Principal Leadership Style to Teacher Efficacy

Past empirical research has shown that a positive relationship exists between transformational leadership and transactional leadership and follower extra effort (efficacy) (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1995; Philbin, 1997; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993). Based on the findings of Research Hypothesis 2.1, results were in alignment

with prior research. The current study found significant positive correlations between the principal's transformational leadership styles and teacher efficacy. Results of the current study were also in alignment with results of prior research because significant correlations were found between the transformational leadership subscales of idealized influence (attribute), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration and teacher efficacy.

One of the first studies by Bass (1985) researching the transformational and transactional leadership styles and subscales showed a significant relationship to follower extra effort (efficacy). Bass studied 45 New Zealand employees and managers by having the employees complete the MLQ rating their manager's leadership. The results indicated that the employees exhibited higher efficacy when their managers displayed higher idealized influence ($r = .50, p < .01$), intellectual stimulation ($r = .49, p < .01$), and contingent reward ($r = .38, p < .01$) leadership attributes.

Several educational researchers have found that transformational leadership has a positive effect on teacher extra effort in public school settings (Binkowski, Cordeiro, Iwanicki, 1995; Leithwood, Jantzi, Silins, & Dart, 1993; Silin, 1994). Leithwood & Jantzi, (2006) pointed out that research examining the relationship between the multifactor leadership model and education is not substantial and therefore much of the literature dates to the late 1980s and 1990s when the transformational and transactional leadership models were developed. Bass (1985) studied 23 educational administrators in New Zealand by researching teacher perceptions of their principal's leadership style in relation to teacher efficacy, leader effectiveness, and satisfaction through administering the MLQ. Once again, the transformational leadership subscales of idealized influence,

intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration were positively correlated to teacher efficacy (willingness to exert extra effort).

Another study investigated the perceived teacher efficacy, satisfaction, and effectiveness in relation to principal transformational and transactional leadership in U.S. private secondary schools (Hoover, 1987). One hundred fifty-one teachers participated in the MLQ questionnaire and rated 45 principals. The results indicated a positive relationship between the transformational leadership style and subscales and teacher efficacy, as well as with the other leadership outcome factors.

The results of this study agreed with both of Bass' (1985) New Zealand studies and Hoover's (1987) work by actually producing statistically significant correlations with the transformational leadership style, as well as with all five subscales at $p < .01$ to teacher efficacy. Four of the five subscales from the current study had strong positive correlations, including idealized influence (attribute) $r_s = .844$, intellectual stimulation $r_s = .819$, inspirational motivation $r_s = .707$, and individual consideration $r_s = .804$. Idealized influence (behavior) had a moderate positive correlation to teacher efficacy ($r_s = .315$). See Table 14 for results.

Based on the findings of Research Hypothesis 2.2a from the current study, results were in alignment with the results of prior research in terms of finding statistically significant positive correlations between the transactional leadership styles along with the subscale contingent reward and teacher efficacy. The same studies by Bass (1985) cited in previous research indicating a positive correlation of transformational leadership to teacher efficacy, also indicated positive correlations of transactional leadership and the subscale contingent reward to teacher efficacy (Bass

1985). Bass' (1985) New Zealand study of managers and employees indicated managers exhibiting contingent reward had a positive correlation to teacher efficacy ($r = .38, p < .01$). Bass (1985), in his study of New Zealand principals and teachers' perceptions of their principal leadership style's relationship to efficacy, indicated a positive relationship existed between the transactional leadership and subscale contingent reward and teacher efficacy.

The transactional leadership subscale management by exception (active) was not indicated in the previous research reviewed as having a significant relationship to teacher efficacy. Likewise, in the current research, management by exception (active) indicated no statistically significant correlation to teacher efficacy ($r_s = .020, p > .05$).

Prior research investigating teacher efficacy as it related to principal passive avoidant leadership style and subscales was very limited. Because passive avoidant leadership is considered a negative form of leadership often labeled "non-leadership" (Bass & Avolio, 2004), most research focused on transformational and transactional leadership styles, which are both considered positive forms of leadership. One study that researched which leadership style of the principal, as perceived by the teacher, impacted teacher efficacy indicated the laissez faire leadership style as influencing teachers to be less efficacious as it related to classroom management (Griffin, 2009).

Based on the findings of Research Hypothesis 2.3b from the current research study, results were in alignment with the results of prior research in terms of finding statistically significant negative correlations between the passive avoidant leadership style along with the subscales management by exception (passive) and laissez faire and teacher efficacy. Results revealed a negative correlation, indicating that as the teacher-

perceived principal's passive avoidant leadership style increased, teacher efficacy decreased ($r_s = -.658$). The directions for both subscale correlations were negative, meaning that as the passive avoidant leadership style subscale management by exception (passive) increased ($r_s = -.541$) and laissez faire increased ($r_s = -.682$), teacher efficacy decreased. The results are consistent with prior research and indicate principals with passive avoidant leadership and subscales influence teacher efficacy negatively.

Theoretical Implications

The results of this research support the Transformational-Transactional Leadership Theory. Transformational leadership is based on the five components of idealized influence (behavior and attributed), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Burns (1978) explained that transformational leadership is “when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p.20). The transactional leadership style is often termed a traditional form of leadership, which follows a structure of leader-follower relationship based on the fulfillment of contractual obligations (Brymer & Gray, 2006; Kurland et al., 2010). The two components of transactional leadership are contingent reward and management by exception (active). The passive avoidant leadership style discussed in the review of literature theorized by Burns (1978) is considered a non-leadership style (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The two components of passive avoidant leadership are management by exception (passive) and laissez faire. Because the current study involved the examination of principal leadership, the theories of transactional and transformational leadership provided a theoretical underpinning for this research based

on the work of Burns, Bass, Avolio and others. Since passive avoidant was considered a non-leadership style (Bass & Avolio, 2004), it was not considered part of the theoretical underpinning for this study.

A substantial amount of prior research indicates a statistically significant relationship between principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Hulpia et al., 2009; Shatzer, 2009; Tillman & Tillman, 2008). The transformational leadership style and subscales in particular are significantly correlated to teacher job satisfaction (Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1994; Masood, Dani, Burns & Blackhouse, 2006; Nguni et al., 2006). According to other past research, teacher satisfaction was significantly correlated with principal transactional leadership (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006). The current study did not agree with prior research findings. The transformational leadership style and subscales, as well as the transactional leadership style and subscales of the principals were not statistically significant in their relationship to teacher job satisfaction. The findings of this study lead this researcher to question if there were other variables that influenced the teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style in relation to teacher job satisfaction. Prior research, as well as findings from the current study leaves questions regarding the transformational-transactional leadership theory's influence on a principal's leadership style as it relates to teacher job satisfaction. The results of this study indicate that teachers may have perceived their job satisfaction as influenced more from other intrinsic and extrinsic factors. According to Herzberg's hygiene-motivation theory, factors leading to teacher job satisfaction are the motivator intrinsic factors such as achievement, responsibility, growth, advancement, and recognition, as well as hygiene

extrinsic factors such as supervision, interpersonal relationships, salary, job security, and working conditions, lead to job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1974, 1987; Jones, 1997).

Teachers in the current study may have experienced their job satisfaction not as much from their perception of the principal's leadership style, but more from intrinsic motivator and extrinsic hygiene factors.

While the results of the current study did not agree with prior findings concerning the teacher-perceived principal leadership style's relationship to teacher job satisfaction, there was an overwhelming agreement in the results concerning principal leadership styles and how they relate to teacher efficacy. The transformational leadership style and subscales' relationships to teacher efficacy agreed with prior research, indicating positive statistically significant relationships (Bass, 1985). The same was true for transactional leadership and the subscale of contingent reward, indicating positive statistically significant relationships. Management by exception (active) also agreed with previous literature's findings, indicating no statistically significant correlation to teacher efficacy (Bass, 1985). Findings from prior research, as well as findings from the current study substantiate the transformational-transactional leadership theory's influence on a principal leadership style as it relates to teacher efficacy.

Implications for Practice

One of the problems principals face in achieving the school's goal of academic success is that the principal cannot be in every classroom every day in order to personally affect student performance (Gentilucci & Muto, 2007). Research suggests that a possible way principals can indirectly affect student learning is by providing

leadership for teachers (Ross & Gray, 2006). A study conducted by Ross and Gray, (2006) suggested that a principal's leadership style and behavior may have an impact on teacher effectiveness in the classroom, ultimately indirectly affecting student learning.

The current study addressed the idea that a principal could possibly impact teacher effectiveness in the classroom through the relationship influence of the teacher-perceived leadership style of the principal to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. Therefore, the researcher investigated the correlation between teacher-perceived middle school principal leadership styles to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. The exploratory open-ended question answered by teachers also provided an indication of what teachers perceived was needed from their principal's leadership in order to help them be more effective in the classroom.

Several implications for practice may be drawn from the results of this research. Based on the findings of this study, a teacher's job satisfaction does not necessarily rely on the principal's leadership style. The transformational and transactional leadership styles, as well as the subscales associated with each leadership style, indicated no statistically significant correlation to teacher job satisfaction. The passive avoidant leadership style and management by exception (passive) subscale showed negative statistically significant correlations to teacher job satisfaction. The laissez faire subscale did not indicate a statistically significant correlation to teacher job satisfaction.

The implications of these results might indicate that teachers may rely more on other factors for job satisfaction than the principal's leadership style. Spector (1994) developed the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), which was used to indicate overall job satisfaction level of teachers in this study. The survey consists of 36 questions covering

9 areas of pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operation procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication. Spector developed the survey for additional variables other than supervision that may influence a person's job satisfaction.

It was of interest to this researcher that teachers in this study indicated a total mean job satisfaction score of ($M = 3.246$), which according to the research indicated teachers overall were satisfied with their jobs. Yet when correlational tests were conducted, there were no statistically significant positive relationships between the perceived leadership styles and subscales of the principals to teacher job satisfaction.

Another possible implication may be revealed through Herzberg's hygiene-motivation theory of job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1974). According to the hygiene-motivation theory, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate dimensions of work experiences. One is not affected by the other. The motivator factors producing satisfaction operate independently of the hygiene factors producing dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1959, 1974, 1987; Jones, 1997; Schmidt, 1976; Sergiovanni, 1966; Williams & Lankford, 2003). The implication is that leaders of organizations and principals of schools must focus on the variables that influence greater levels of job satisfaction.

It is possible that the job satisfaction the teachers in this study perceived was more intrinsically motivated. This may introduce a new understanding that even if teachers may not perceive their principal's leadership as directly influencing their job satisfaction, principals must be aware of the other factors that could raise their teachers' job satisfaction level. A principal may be able to lead in such a way as to build the satisfaction level of teachers by providing for the intrinsic (motivator) needs that

promote job satisfaction.

The practical implication is that even if the teacher does not perceive the principal's leadership as influencing their job satisfaction, it does not mean that the principal has no impact. In reality, the principal can lead beyond the teachers' perceptions to address the real needs of the teachers that promote and encourage higher levels of job satisfaction.

Though this study indicated no statistically significant relationship between teacher-perceived transformational or transactional principal leadership styles to teacher job satisfaction, there is evidence in other research that a relationship exists (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Hulpia et al., 2009; Shatzer, 2009; Tillman & Tillman, 2008). Principals who are concerned with teacher job satisfaction would be prudent to not only be aware of the other variables influencing job satisfaction, but must be aware of their own leadership style's relationship to their teachers' job satisfaction.

It must be noted that this study did indicate passive avoidant leadership style and the management by exception (passive) subscale as having negative statistically significant relationships to teacher job satisfaction. The direction of the correlation was negative, which meant that as the teacher-perceived principal's passive avoidant leadership style increased, the teacher job satisfaction decreased. As presented in prior literature, passive avoidant leadership is considered a non-leadership style and therefore the results of this study affirm that the passive avoidant leadership of a principal will have a negative effect on teacher job satisfaction (Barnet et al., 2003; Bass & Avolio, 2004; Korkmaz, 2007; Rafferty, 2002). The implication is that in order to raise teacher job satisfaction, principals should attempt to improve their leadership style if there is an

indication of passive avoidant traits.

Printy and Marks (2006) defined teacher self-efficacy as the hard work and commitment of a teacher who continually strives to help students learn. Based on the findings of this study, the teacher-perceived transformational and transactional leadership styles and subscales, except for management by exception (active), showed positive statistically significant relationships to teacher efficacy. The transformational leadership subscale of idealized influence indicated a moderate positive relationship to teacher efficacy. Management by exception (active) did not have a statistically significant correlation to teacher efficacy. The other subscales for transformational and transactional leadership indicated a strong positive relationship to teacher efficacy. This means that as the principal's transformational and transactional leadership styles with their subscales increased, teacher efficacy increased.

Principals must be mindful of how they lead their teachers in order to influence higher levels of efficacy. Prior research indicates that a principal's leadership style must incorporate the goal of helping teachers to obtain and sustain feelings of efficacy (Rossmiller, 1992, as cited by Hipp, 1997).

Research has also indicated that the passive avoidant leadership style, including laissez faire, has a negative effect on teacher efficacy. One study researching which leadership style of the principal as perceived by the teacher impacts teacher efficacy indicated the laissez faire leadership style as influencing teachers to be less efficacious as it related to classroom management (Griffin, 2009). The implication is that principals must guard their leadership from slipping into a passive avoidant style of leading. If principals are to be effective in increasing the efficacy of their teachers, they must

implement more of the transformational and transactional styles of leadership.

The exploratory open-ended question at the end of the surveys was designed to assess teacher-perceived needs of principal leadership behaviors or practices that influenced effectiveness in the classroom. Categories for the needs of teachers from their principals were associated with the transformational and transactional leadership styles. Support, respect, availability, communication, encouragement, caring, sharing leadership, showing fairness, promoting a sense of community, and honesty are categorical components of transformational leadership. Provides training and resources, provides authority/assertiveness, provides structure and feedback, provides consistency, is knowledgeable and organized, are all categorical components of transactional leadership. According to the exploratory open-ended question findings, it was apparent that teachers perceived their need for principal leadership to help them become more effective in the classroom by incorporating elements of both transformational and transactional leadership. Teachers did not perceive any needs incorporating passive avoidant leadership. The implication for principals is that there must be efforts to improve leadership with transformational and transactional traits, while taking care to not lead in such a way to be perceived as passive avoidant. As indicated by the teachers in this study, teachers perceive that they can be helped to be more effective in the classroom through the influence of their principal's leadership.

Limitations

There are limitations in this study that need to be acknowledged. The sample for this study was not random. A convenience sampling of participants was chosen based on availability and qualifications for completing the survey. This researcher also

believed a large enough sample was not possible to obtain statistical power if random sampling was employed. The researcher believed that convenience sampling was the most appropriate choice to obtain a large enough sample to reach the sample size needed, thereby inadvertently causing bias in the research design. To attempt to control in the sampling, participation in the study consisted of certain criteria, including the qualification of certified middle school teacher who had served with the principal at their current school for at least the last full academic year of 2010-2011 and were currently still employed at the school.

Another limitation to this study is that participating teachers may have provided different responses as compared to teachers in other schools or districts. No control was implemented to address this limitation so caution should be used when generalizing the study's findings to other principals and teachers within other districts or in other states.

The limitation of a bivariate correlation study is that it indicates if and how strong one variable relates to another. A bivariate correlation does not indicate causation (Ary et al., 2006; Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). No control was needed because causation was not the intent of this study.

Another limitation is that 75.0% of the participants were female and 95.8% of the participants were Caucasian. Gender and race may be considered confounding variables and therefore could have imposed limitations to the study. Though gender and race were not considered variables of interest in this study, in the researcher's estimations these confounding variables could influence those who desire to generalize the results to both gender and race. The researcher believes; however, that the results are applicable to most applications for gender because most teachers in middle school

are female. It must be recognized that the race of the majority of the participants is limited to geographical areas. In some areas there would not be as large of a percentage of Caucasian teachers as in the area of East Tennessee where this study occurred. Other confounding variables include school demographics, which varied from school to school and were reported but not considered in the study. They are recognized as limitations and could have influenced teacher perceptions of the principal's leadership style, teacher job satisfaction, and efficacy, but were not controlled.

Recommendations for Future Research

According to the findings of this research, the teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership style was not statistically significant in relation to teacher job satisfaction, but was statistically significant in relation to teacher efficacy. Prior research has indicated some disagreement with this study's results (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Hulpia et al., 2009; Masood et al, 2006; Nguni et al., 2006; Shatzer, 2009; Tillman & Tillman, 2008).

More research regarding teacher-perceived principal leadership styles and their relationship to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy is recommended. Recommendations for further study are as follows:

1. This study would have benefited from having a larger sample size including middle schools from other school districts. This study could be replicated in multiple states in multiple school districts.
2. This study could be replicated in more socio-economically diverse school districts instead of an urban district similar to the one used in this study.
3. A study would be beneficial in examining demographic factors such as gender,

age, race, education, and teaching experience and their effects on the relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction and efficacy.

4. A casual comparative study could be beneficial in examining whether a principal's leadership style has a direct or indirect influence on student achievement based on the relationship a principal's leadership style has to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy.

5. A qualitative study would help to bring a deeper understanding of the opinions and feelings from participating teachers about their perceptions of the influence their principals have on teacher job satisfaction and efficacy.

6. A study comparing the Herzberg hygiene-motivation factors of job satisfaction of teachers to principal leadership styles and subscales would be very beneficial.

Conclusion

This study addressed the idea that a middle school principal could possibly influence teacher effectiveness in the classroom through the relationship of the teacher-perceived leadership style of the principal to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. Indicated in prior literature was the idea that principals can possibly indirectly affect student learning by providing leadership for teachers (Ross & Gray, 2006).

Findings from this study suggest that middle school teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership did not show a statistically significant relationship to teacher job satisfaction. This is pertinent information for principals who must seek to discover other influences such as Herzberg's motivation factors that impact job satisfaction, possibly helping teachers to feel more motivated to be more effective in the classroom. Principals must understand that teachers may not perceive principal leadership as

influencing teacher job satisfaction. The principal must realize that s/he can lead beyond teacher perceptions to address the real needs of the teachers in order to promote and encourage higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. This new idea may improve principal leadership training efforts to not only be aware of the factors leading to teacher-perceived job satisfaction but to also engage in active leadership that will increase job satisfaction even if the principal is not perceived as doing so.

Furthermore, findings from this study suggest that middle school teacherperceptions of their principal's leadership style (transformational and transactional) overall had a statistically significant positive relationship to teacher efficacy. Research suggests teacher efficacy is critical to student achievement and therefore it is important to investigate the relationship that school leadership has to teacher efficacy (Anderman et al., 2004; Hipp & Bredeson, 1995). It is important for principals to know that their leadership style can possibly influence teachers in such a way that they are willing to exert extra effort in their classroom, which ultimately could lead to teacher effectiveness impacting student achievement.

The findings of this study significantly add to the existing body of literature regarding teacher perceptions of middle school principal leadership styles relating to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. Teachers, principals, school districts, and state educational systems can use these findings to increase training initiatives and programs that can improve principal leadership and teacher effectiveness, which in turn could lead to increased student achievement.

REFERENCES

- Amoroso, P. F. (2002). *The impact of principals' transformational leadership behaviors on teacher commitment and teacher job satisfaction*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Anderman, E. M., Noar, S., Zimmerman, R., & Donohew, L. (2004). The need for sensation as a prerequisite for motivation to engage in academic tasks. In M. L. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.). *Advances in motivation and achievement, Volume 13: Motivating students, improving schools: The legacy of Carol Midgley* (pp. 1-26). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411-423. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411
- Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A.T., & Sternberg, R. J. (2004). *The nature of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Astor, D., Rand Corp., S. A., & And, O. (1976). *Analysis of the school preferred reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools*. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., Sorensen, C. (2006). *Introduction to research in education* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 25-33. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.25
- Bagozzi, R. P., Yi, Y., & Phillips, L. W. (1991). Assessing construct validity in organizational research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3), 421-458.

Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393203>

- Barnett, A. M., Marsh, H. W., & Craven, R. G. (2003). *What type of school leadership satisfied teachers? A mixed method approach to teachers' perceptions of satisfaction*. Self Research Center, University of Western Sydney, Australia.
- Barnett, K., McCormick, J., & Connors, R. (2001). Transformational leadership in schools-Panacea, placebo or problem? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(1), 24-46. Retrieved from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 115722163).
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stodgill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries. *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.52.2.130
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership, industry, military, and educational impact*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *The multifactor leadership questionnaire form 5X*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *MLQ multifactor leadership questionnaire* (2nd ed.). Redwood, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.

- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *The multifactor leadership questionnaire: Third edition manual and sampler set*. Retrieved from <http://www.mindgarden.com>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1998). *Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies, School of Management, Binghamton University.
- Biggerstaff, J. K. (2012). *The relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/diss/22>
- Billingsley, B. S., & Cross, L. H. (1992). Predictors of commitment, job satisfaction, and intent to stay in teaching: A comparison of general and special educators. *Journal of Special Education*, 25(4), 453. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 662-683.
- Bolin, F. (2007). A study of teacher job satisfaction and factors that influence it. *Chinese Education and Society*, 40(5), 47-64. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Bragg, D. (2008). *The application of transformational leadership among Christian school leaders in the southeast and mid Atlantic north regions*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Education, Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia.
- Brooks, J. S., & Miles, M. (2006). From scientific management to social justice...and back again? Pedagogical shifts in the study and practice of educational leadership. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning* 10(21).

- Retrieved from <http://www.ucalgary.ca/iejll/vol10/miles>
- Brown, K. A. (2009). *Educators jump ship: A study of leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305161400?accountid=12101>
- Brymer, E., & Gray, T. (2006). Effective leadership: Transformational or transactional? *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 10(2), 13-19. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/232847118?accountid=12101>
- Bucic, T., Robinson, L., & Ramburuth, P. (2010). Effects of leadership style on team learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 22(4), 228-248.
doi:10.1108/13665621011040680
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Butz, R. L. (2010). *The relationship between teacher perceptions of principal leadership style and student achievement during a time of leadership change* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/839797076?accountid=12101>
- Carifio, J., & Perla, R. (2008). Resolving the 50-year debate around using and misusing Likert scales. *Medical Education*, 42(12), 1150-1152. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2008.03172.x
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. (2nd ed.). New York: Psychology Press.
- Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2008). *Business research methods* (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Creighton, T. (2005). *Leading from below the surface. A non-traditional approach to school Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 6-13. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Davis, J., & Wilson, S. M. (2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *Clearing House*, 73(6), 349-353. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Denton, E. M. (2009). *Teachers' perceptions of how leadership styles and practices of principals influence their job satisfaction and retention* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305139241?accountid=12101>
- Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet survey: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fink, A., (1995). *How to sample in surveys*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. London: The Falmer Press.

- Fullan, M. (2007). *Jossey Bass reader on educational leadership*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Fullan, M. (2010). The awesome power of the principal. *Principal*, 89(4), 10-12.
Retrieved from <http://www.naesp.org/principal-archives>
- Fuming, X., & Jiliang, S. (2007). Research on job satisfaction of elementary and high school teachers and strategies to increase job satisfaction. *Chinese Education and Society*, 40(5), 86-96. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. doi: 10.2753/CED1061-1932400509
- Gabriel, R. (2011). *Tennessee teacher evaluation policies under race to the top: A discursive investigation of teacher effectiveness*. Retrieved from:
http://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2141&context=utk_graddiss
- Gaither, J. (2008). *Differences between principals' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in selected middle schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304418017?accountid=12101>
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2010). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gallos, J. (ED.), (2008). *Business leadership*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (8th ed.). Ohio: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (9th ed.). Ohio: Pearson Prentice Hall.

- Gentilucci, J. L., & Muto, C. C. (2007). Principals' influence on academic achievement: The student perspective. *National Association of Secondary School Principals. NASSP Bulletin*, 91(3), 219-236. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/216027227?accountid=12101>
- Gersten, R., Keating, T., Yovanoff, P., & Harniss, M. K. (2001). Working in special education: Factors that enhance special educators' intent to stay. *Exceptional Children*, 67(4), 549-567. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Gravetter, F., & Walnau, L. (2008). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Learning Inc.
- Grayson, J. L., & Alvarez, H. K. (2008). School climate factors relating to teacher burnout: A mediator model. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 24(5), 1349-1363. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.06.005
- Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2011). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Griffin, K. L. (2009). *The relationship between self-efficacy of teachers and their perception of the school principal's leadership style* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305157061?accountid=12085>. (305157061)
- Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 173-208. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. doi: 10.3102/00346543076002173
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of

- instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-352. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.
- Hart, J. L. (2006). *A cross-cultural study of principals' leadership behaviors according to teachers' perceptions*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304965636?accountid=12101>
- Hay, L. (2006). Leadership of stability and leadership of volatility: Transactional and transformational leaderships compared. *Academic Leadership Online Journal*, 4(4), Retrieved from http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical_research/Leadership_of_Stability_and_Leadership_of_volatility_Transactional_and_Transformational_Leaderships_Compared.shtml
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1976). *Situational leadership*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Center for Leadership Studies.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
- Herzberg, F. (1974). Motivation-hygiene profiles: Pinpointing what ails the organization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 3(2), 18-29. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 65(5), 109-120. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Hipp, K. A. (1997). Documenting the effects of transformational leadership behavior on teacher efficacy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American

- Educational Research Association*, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Hipp, K. A., & Bredeson, P. V. (1995). Exploring connections between teacher efficacy and principals' leadership behaviors. *Journal of School Leadership*, 5(2), 136-50.
- Hoover, N. R. (1987). Transformational and transactional leadership: A test of the model. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 48 (UMI No. AAT 3020). Retrieved from Dissertations and Theses database.
- Howard, B., Sr. (2007). *A study of teacher-perceived differences in the leadership styles of African-American and Caucasian principals*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304722168?accountid=12085>. (304722168)
- Howell, B. (2001). Profile of the principal ship. *Educational Leadership*, 38, 333-336.
- Howell, D. C. (2008). *Fundamental statistics for the behavioral sciences* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Horn-Turpin, F. (2009). *A study examining the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on the factors of teaching efficacy, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as perceived by special education teachers*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-02152009-080918>
- Huck, S. W., (2008). *Reading statistics and research* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). The relationship between the perception of distributed leadership in secondary schools and teachers' and teacher leaders' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 20(3), 291-317. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. doi: 10.1080/092434

50902909840

Hunter-Boykin, H. S., & Evans, V. (1995). The relationship between high school principals' leadership and teachers' morale. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 22(2), 152. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. doi: 10.3102/00028312038003499

Johnson, S. (2004). *Finders & keepers: Helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Johnson, T. L. (2007). *The impact of principal leadership styles on teacher motivation and job satisfaction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304712894?accountid=12101>

Jones, D. (2003, June 3). Autocratic leadership works – until it fails. *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-06-05-raines-usat_x.htm

Jones, R. E. (1997). Teacher participation in decision making – its relationship. *Education*, 118(1), 76. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755-768. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Kahan, E. H., Byrd, T., & Drew, L. (2008). When hearts meet minds. *Journal of Staff Development*, 29(2), 17-20, 66. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/211508235?accountid=12101>

- Kenny, D. A., & Kashy, D. A. (1992). Analysis of the multitrait-multimethod matrix by confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 165. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.165
- Korkmaz, M. (2007). The effects of leadership styles on organizational health. *Education Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 22-54. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier.
- Kouzes, M., & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Kurland, H., Peretz, H., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2010). Leadership style and organizational learning: The mediate effect of school vision. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(1), 7-30. doi:10.1108/09578231011015395
- Kythreotis, A., Pashiardis, P., & Kyriakides, L. (2010). The influence of school leadership styles and culture on students' achievement in Cyprus primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(2), 218-240. doi:10.1108/09578231011027860
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement*, 17(2), 201-227.
- Leithwood, K. A., Jantzi, D., Silins, H., & Dart, B. (1993). Using the appraisal of school leaders as an instrument for school restructuring. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68, 85-109.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R. & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-

- Mackenzie, N. (2007). Teacher morale: More complex than we think? *Australian Educational Researcher*, 34(1), 89-104. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. doi: 10.1007/BF03216852
- MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12(1), 73-84. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A., (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Masood, S. A, Dani, S. S., Burns, N. D., & Blackhouse, C. J. (2006). Transformational leadership and organizational culture: The situational strength perspective. *Journal of Engineering Manufacture*, 220, 941-949.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2005). *The 360 degree leader: Developing your influence from anywhere in the organization*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2007). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership* (Rev. ed.). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Morgan, G. A. (2004). *SPSS for introductory statistics: Use and interpretation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mulford, B. (2008). The leadership challenge: Improving learning in schools. *Australian Education Review*,53, 1-72. Retrieved from http://www.acer.edu.au/documents/AER_53-TheLeadershipChallenge.pdf
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and

- organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 145-177. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Nir, A. E., & Kranot, N. (2006). School principal's leadership style and teachers' self-efficacy. *Planning and Changing*, 37(3-4), 205-218. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2008).
- Norman, G. (2010). Likert scales, levels of measurement and the "laws" of statistics. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 15(5), 625-632. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Nur, Y. (1998). Charisma and managerial leadership: The gift that never was. *Business Horizons*, 41(4), 19. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Orr, M., & Orphanos, S. (2007). Learning leadership matters: Teachers' experiences of innovatively and conventionally prepared principals. Paper prepared for annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association*, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from http://seli.stanford.edu/research/sls_papers.htm
- Osborn, R. N., & Marion, R. (2009). Contextual leadership, transformational leadership and the performance of international innovation seeking alliances. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 191-206. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.01.010
- Ouyang, M., & Paprock, K. (2006). Teacher job satisfaction and retention: A comparison study between the U.S. and China. *Online Submission*, Retrieved

from EBSCOhost.

- Padsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259. Retrieved from <http://jom.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/22/2/259> doi: 10.1177/014920639602200204
- Patton, D. (2008). The effect of school size on the utilization of educational technologies. (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/127/>
- Pepper, K. (2010). Effective principals skillfully balance leadership styles to facilitate student success: A focus for the reauthorization of ESAE. *Planning & Changing*, 41(1/2), 42-56. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Perry, R. W., & Mankin, L. D. (2007). Organizational trust, trust in the Chief Executive and work satisfaction. *Public Personnel Management*, 36(2), 165-179. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Philbin, L. P. (1997). *Transformational leadership and the secondary school principal* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Purdue University, Lafayette, IN.
- Price, T. (2003). The ethics of authentic transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(1), 67-81. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00187-X
- Printy, S. M., & Marks, H. M. (2006). Shared leadership for teacher and student learning. *Theory into Practice*, 45(2), 125-132. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4502_4

- Rafferty, M. (2002). The effects of teacher morale on teacher turnover rate. Retrieved from <http://webb.nmu.edu/Webb/ArchivedHTML/UPCED/mentoring/docs/TeacherMorale.pdf>
- Richards, J. (2005). Principal behaviors that encourage teachers: Perceptions of teachers at three career stages. *Online Submission*, Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Ross, J., & Gray, P. (2006). School leadership and student achievement: The mediating effects of teacher beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(3), 798-822. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/pss/20054196>
- Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80(1), 1-28. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Rowland, K. A. (2008). *The relationship of principal leadership and teacher morale*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304801369?accountid=12101>
- Russell, D. (2008, January). *Transactional leadership: Are your people motivated?* Retrieved from <http://daiv.wrytestuff.com/swa290326.htm>
- Sarros, A. M., & Sarros, J. C. (2007). The first 100 days. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(3), 349-371. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. doi: 10.1177/1741143207078179
- Schmidt, G. L. (1976). Job satisfaction among secondary school administrators. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 12(2), 68-86. doi: 10.1177/0013131x7601200206
- Schumacher, S., & McMillan, J. H. (1993). *Research in education: A conceptual*

- introduction*. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1966). *Investigation of factors which affect job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of teachers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Rochester, Rochester, NY.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). *The principalship. A reflective practice perspective* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2007). *Rethinking leadership: A collection of articles* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Shatzer, R. H. (2009). *A comparison study between instructional and transformational leadership theories: Effects on student achievement and teacher job satisfaction*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304833274?accountid=12101>
- Shumate, R. L. (2011). *Transformational versus transactional leadership: Which perceived leadership style has the stronger relationship between teacher efficacy and student achievement?* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/877976459?accountid=12101>
- Silins, H. C. (1994). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and school improvement outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5, 272-298.
- Simon, M. K. (2006). *Dissertation & scholarly research: A practical guide to start & complete your dissertation, thesis, or formal research project*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M., & Hetland, H. (2007). The

- destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(1), 80-92. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80
- Spector, P. E. (1994). *Job satisfaction survey*. Retrieved from <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jsspag.html>
- Staker, D (n.d.). *Transactional leadership*. Retrieved from http://changingminds.org/disciplines/leadership/styles/transactional_leadership.htm
- Stewart, J. (2006). Transformational leadership: An evolving concept examined through the works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 54, 1-29. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (1957). *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, Ohio State University, 15, 168.
- Stroh, L (Ed.). (2007). *Trust rules how to tell the good guys from the bad guys in work and life*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Szapkiw, A. (n.d.) *Statistics guide*. Retrieved from http://bb7.liberty.edu/bbcswebdav/pid-10041362-dt-content-rid-11986478_1/courses/EDUC989_B37_201120/EDUC989_B37_201120_ImportedContent_20101223091453/Quick%20Link_%20Resources/Course%20Materials/Statistics/Statistics%20Guide/StatisticsGuide.pdf
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Thomas, V. (1997). What research says about administrators' management style, effectiveness, and teacher morale, n.p.: ERIC, EBSCOhost

- Tillman, W. R., & Tillman, C. J. (2008). And you thought it was the apple: A study of job satisfaction among teachers. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 12(3), 41-50.
- United States Census Bureau. (2010, April 1). *United States Census Bureau fact finder*. Retrieved from: http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_DP_DPDP1&prodType=table
- U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *Race to the top program executive summary*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *A blueprint for reform: The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Valentine, J. W., & Prater, M. (2011). Instructional, transformational, and managerial leadership and student achievement: High school principals make a difference. *National Association of Secondary School Principals. NASSP Bulletin*, 95(1), 5-30. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/873775045?accountid=12101>
- Waggoner, F. I. (2009). *A study on the factor structure of the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ): Is the factor structure of the MLQ the same for males and females?* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305152459?accountid=12101>
- Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 458-495. Retrieved from

EBSCOhost. doi: 10.1177/0013161X08321502

- Walker, J., & Slear, S. (2011). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and experienced middle school teachers. *National Association of Secondary School Principals. NASSP Bulletin*, 95(1), 46-64. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/873775232?accountid=12101>
- William, A., & Lankford, S. (2003). Evaluating esprit de corps. *Parks & Recreation*, 38(1), 20. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Williams, M. D. (2009). *The relationship of principal leadership behaviors with school climate, teacher job satisfaction, and student achievement*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305001472?accountid=12101>
- Yammarino, F. J., Spangler, W. D., & Bass, B. M. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 41, 81-102.
- Youngs, P., & King, M. (2002). Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 643. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. doi: 10.1177/0013161X02239642

Appendix A

Permission to Use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, MLQ

For use by Jack Dale only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on January 26, 2012



www.mindgarden.com

To whom it may concern,

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

Instrument: *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*

Authors: *Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

Copyright: *1995 by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

for his/her thesis research.

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Appendix B

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Sample Rater Form

This questionnaire is used to describe the leadership style of your principal as you perceive it. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.

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

Not at all always	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

The Person I Am Rating. . .

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts.....01234
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.....01234
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious.....01234
4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from s..01234
5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise.....01234

Copyright © 1995 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio. All rights reserved.
It is your legal responsibility to compensate the copyright holder of this work for any reproduction in any medium. If you need to reproduce the MLQ, please contact Mind Garden www.mindgarden.com. Mind Garden is a registered trademark of Mind Garden, Inc

Appendix C

Permission to Use the Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS

Subject: RE: Permission to use your Job Satisfaction Survey
From: "Spector, Paul" <pspector@usf.edu>
Date: Wed, November 10, 2010 12:22 pm
To: "'Jack Dale'" <dalej@k12tn.net>

Dear Jack:

You have my permission to use the JSS in your research. You can find details about the scale in the Scales section of my website. I allow free use for noncommercial research and teaching purposes in return for sharing of results. This includes student theses and dissertations, as well as other student research projects. Copies of the scale can be reproduced in a thesis or dissertation as long as the copyright notice is included, "Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved." Results can be shared by providing an e-copy of a published or unpublished research report (e.g., a dissertation).

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

Best,

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

Appendix D

Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS Sample

	JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY Paul E. Spector Department of Psychology, University of South Florida Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.	
	PLEASE PICK THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.	Disagree very much Disagree moderately Disagree slightly Agree slightly
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

Appendix E

Liberty University IRB Approval Letter



The Graduate School at Liberty University

February 28, 2012

Jack Dale

IRB Exemption 1239.022812: The Correlation of the Perceived Leadership Style of Middle School Principals to Teacher Job Satisfaction and Efficacy

Dear Jack,

The Liberty University Institutional Review Board has reviewed your application in accordance with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations and finds your study to be exempt from further IRB review. This means you may begin your research with the data safeguarding methods mentioned in your approved application, and that no further IRB oversight is required.

Your study falls under exemption category 46.101 (b)(2), which identifies specific situations in which human participants research is exempt from the policy set forth in 45 CFR 46:

- (2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), **survey procedures**, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
 - (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
 - (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation

Please note that this exemption only applies to your current research application, and that any changes to your protocol must be reported to the Liberty IRB for verification of continued exemption status. You may report these changes by submitting a new application to the IRB and referencing the above IRB Exemption number.

If you have any questions about this exemption, or need assistance in determining whether possible changes to your protocol would change your exemption status, please email us at irb@liberty.edu.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Fernando Garzon".

Fernando Garzon, Psy.D.
IRB Chair, Associate Professor
Center for Counseling & Family Studies

(434) 592-5054



40 Years of Training Champions for Christ: 1971-2011

Appendix F

Permission to Conduct Research in the East Tennessee School District

January 18, 2012

Mr. Jack Dale

Mr. Dale:

You are granted permission to contact appropriate building-level administrators concerning the conduct of your proposed research study: *The Correlation of the Perceived Leadership Style of Middle School Principals to Teacher Job Satisfaction and Efficacy*. Final approval of any research study taking place within the _____ County School system is contingent upon acceptance by the principal(s) at the site(s) where the study will be conducted. Include a copy of this permission form when seeking approval from the principal(s).

In all research studies names of individuals, groups, or schools may not appear in the text of the study unless specific permission has been granted through this office. The principal researcher is required to furnish this office with one copy of the completed research document.

Good luck with your studies. Do not hesitate to contact me at _____ if you need further assistance or clarification of the research policies of _____ County Schools.

Yours truly,



Supervisor
Research and Evaluation

Project Number: 1112016

/pl

Appendix G

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

The Correlation of the Perceived Leadership Style of
Middle School Principals to Teacher Job Satisfaction and Efficacy

Jack C. Dale, Jr.
Liberty University
School of Education

You are invited to be in a research study that is examining the relationship between the teacher's perception of their principal's leadership style to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. You were selected as a possible participant because you may fit the criteria for the study (i.e. a certified teacher who has served with the current principal of the school for the last full school year of 2010-2011 to the present). The definition of "last full school year" is the full nine month academic school year of 2010-2011. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by: Jack C. Dale, Jr., a Doctoral Candidate at Liberty University in the School of Education.

Background Information

The purpose of this study is to ascertain whether a relationship exists between teacher perceptions of principal leadership styles to teachers' levels of job satisfaction and efficacy (willingness to exert extra effort). This study also seeks to explore teacher perceptions of principal leadership practices influencing teacher effectiveness in the classroom.

Procedures

If you agree to participate in this study, you are being asked to complete two surveys including questions about demographics and an open-ended question. The first survey measures your perception of your principal's leadership practices and your efficacy level. The second survey measures your job satisfaction. The open-ended question asks for your perceptions of what principal leadership behaviors would help teachers be more effective in the classroom. The length of time to complete the online assessments is estimated at 30 minutes. The instruments will be completed online and located on SurveyMonkey.com. Participation is voluntary. The researcher will take precautions to make sure participation is anonymous. Your name will not be linked to the survey in any way.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study

Participants in this study may experience feelings of discomfort and unpleasant thoughts associated with expressing perceptions about the principal's leadership practices, the

participant's job satisfaction, and efficacy level. The participants may feel some anxiety over concerns about confidentiality. The study may involve additional risks to the participant which are currently unforeseeable.

Participants may benefit from increased understanding of what principal leadership behaviors influence their level of job satisfaction and efficacy. Participants may also gain valuable understanding of what principal leadership practices can possibly help teachers to become more effective in the classroom. Participants may gain practical information of how the influence of the principal can contribute to student achievement through providing effective leadership to the teachers.

Confidentiality

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records.

Each school will be assigned a code and will be used to identify the schools in the data collection process. Coding of the school will insure no information or data will be able to be linked back to the school, principal or the teachers.

The survey will be located on SurveyMonkey.com. Data stored by Survey Monkey is in a secure location protected by password. The researcher will also store all research data and documentation on a password-protected computer database.

The survey will not be numbered or marked off a list when returned. The researcher will not number teacher responses or have a record of which teachers respond to the online assessments. Personal information or the survey will not be linked to the personal identity of the participant. The assessment will be totally anonymous.

Data will be stored for the duration of three years and then deleted. Hard copies of the data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet and shredded at the end of three years. The researcher will not collect or use the names of participants in any writing or publication. The researcher will use information for dissertation and presentation purposes only.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the researcher or with Liberty University. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions

The researcher conducting this study is Jack Dale. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, **you are encouraged** to contact him at xxxx Middle School, (xxx) xxx-xxxx, jack.dale@xxxx.org or via cell at (xxx) xxx-xxxx.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, **you are encouraged** to contact the Institutional Review Board, Dr. Fernando Garzon, Chair, 1971 University Blvd, Suite 1582, Lynchburg, VA 24502 or email at fgarzon@liberty.edu.

Statement of Consent

Clicking below I acknowledge the following:

I have read and understand the description of the study and contents of this document. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for participation in this study. I understand I must be 18 years or older and a *certified teacher who has served with the current principal in my current school for the last full school year of 2010-2011* to consent to participate in this study.

Click “yes” to indicate that you are a certified teacher, has served in your current school with your principal for at least the last full academic school year of 2010-2011 until the present, you have read the description of the study, and that you agree to voluntarily participate.

Appendix H

Principal Letter

xxxx Middle School

Dear Ms. xxxx,

My name is Jack Dale; I am a teacher at xxxx Middle School here in xxxx County and a Doctoral Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education at Liberty University. I have been approved by xxxx County School District to conduct research in our middle schools for my dissertation. I am writing you to ask permission to enlist the certified teachers who have served with you for at least the last full academic school year of 2010-2011 until the present in your current school, to participate in this study. The title of my dissertation is, *The Correlation of the Perceived Leadership Style of Middle School Principals to Teacher Job Satisfaction and Efficacy*.

The purpose of this study is to ascertain whether a relationship exists between teacher perceptions of principal leadership styles to teacher's levels of job satisfaction and efficacy (willingness to exert extra effort). This study also seeks to explore teacher perceptions of principal leadership practices influencing teacher effectiveness in the classroom.

Teachers will complete two surveys including questions about demographics and an open-ended question. The first survey measures teacher perception of the principal's leadership practices and teacher efficacy level. The second survey measures teacher job satisfaction. The open-ended question asks for the teacher's perceptions of what principal leadership behaviors would help teachers be more effective in the classroom. The length of time to complete the online assessments is estimated at 30 minutes. The instruments will be completed online and located on SurveyMonkey.com. Participation is voluntary. The researcher will take precautions to make sure participation is anonymous.

Each school will be assigned a code to protect anonymity and will be used to identify the schools in the data collection process. Coding of the school will insure no information or data will be able to be linked back to the district, school, principal, or the teachers. All data coding will be locked in a storage filing cabinet for three years. The codebook containing all codes will be locked in a separate filing cabinet in a different location to further protect anonymity and provide greater security.

The surveys will not be numbered or marked off a list when returned. The researcher will not number teacher responses or have a record of which teachers respond to the online survey. As such, there will be nothing that links the surveys to the identity of the participant. All data will be kept confidential and all principals, teachers, schools, and the system will be kept anonymous in any publication. At the end of the required time, all data will be destroyed.

I am formally requesting your approval to ask for your teachers' voluntary participation that qualifies for the study. I am enclosing copies of the principal consent form, teacher consent form, and copies of all surveys for you to review. If you have questions, please

feel free to contact me at xxxx Middle School (xxx) xxx-xxxx or my cell phone is (xxx) xxx-xxxx, or jack.dale@xxxx.org

Thank you in advance for your consideration. If you have served at your current location for the 2010-2011 school year until the present, would you kindly sign and date the enclosed “Principal Consent Form” and provide on official school letterhead a statement of your approval for this study with the date and your signature. Please send at your earliest convenience via xxxxx County School mail to xxxx Middle School c/o Jack Dale, , fax them to xxxxx Middle School at xxx-xxx-xxxx, or if you prefer, you can attach them in an email to me jack.dale@xxxx.org as pdf files...I need your handwritten signature and date. I would be very appreciative.

If you agree to provide permission allowing me to enlist teachers to participate in this research study, would you be so kind as to provide me with a list of email addresses of your certified teachers who have served with you for at least the last full academic school year of 2010-2011 and are currently still serving with you? You can send the list to jack.dale@xxxx.org. Thank you again.

Warmly,

Jack C. Dale, Jr., Doctoral Candidate, Liberty University
xxxx Middle School

Appendix I

Principal Consent Form

I, _____, (Principal name) have served as principal of this current school for at least the full academic year of 2010-2011 until the present and I agree to allow Jack C. Dale, Jr. (Site Researcher's name) to gather data about the perceived leadership styles of the principal and teacher job satisfaction and efficacy from certified teachers. The use of a demographic survey, Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Job Satisfaction Survey, and an open-ended question will be used to gather the needed information. The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject or location. Research records will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the records.

(Principal Signature)

(Date)

☐ Check the box if you **HAVE NOT** served as principal of this current school for at least the full academic year of 2010-2011 until the present.

Appendix J

Email Contact Letters to Teachers

Teacher Email 1

To: [Email] From: "jack.dale@xxxx.org via surveymonkey.com"
<member@surveymonkey.com>

Subject: Please Help A Fellow xxxx County Teacher Body: Dear Teacher,
As a fellow xxxx County School teacher, I am asking for your help. I know this year has been crazy and your time is extremely valuable. This survey should take less than 20 minutes to complete.

I am a doctoral candidate at Liberty University and I am conducting research in order to complete my dissertation. Feedback from you the teacher, about your experiences is pertinent to discovering if there is a significant relationship between a principal's leadership style and practices to the level of job satisfaction and efficacy among teachers.

By completing the survey, you have an opportunity to contribute to groundbreaking research that could contribute to the improvement of principal leadership practices, teacher job satisfaction, efficacy, and classroom effectiveness especially among the middle school grades.

If you are a certified teacher who has served in your current school with the principal for at least the last full academic school year of 2010-2011 until the present, and are willing to participate, would you take a few minutes to provide your responses to the surveys?

Clicking on the link below will take you to the informed consent. Remember that your responses are totally anonymous.

Here is the link to the online survey.
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

Thank you for your support in this research study!

Warmly,
Jack C. Dale, Jr., Ed. D. student, Liberty University
xxxx Middle School

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx>

Teacher Email 2

To: [Email] From: "jack.dale@xxxx.org via surveymonkey.com"
<member@surveymonkey.com>

Subject: Friendly Reminder for the Survey Body: Dear Valued Teacher,
This is a friendly reminder to encourage you to take the survey I sent to you last week. Your responses are valuable and will be deeply appreciated. I understand how busy you are as a teacher but completing the survey should take less than 20 minutes.

The survey has been designed to discover through teacher perception if there is a principal leadership style that relates to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction and efficacy.

If you are a certified teacher who has served in your current school with the principal for at least the last full academic school year of 2010-2011 until the present, and are willing to participate, would you take a few minutes to provide your responses to the surveys?

Remember that your responses are totally anonymous. The researcher will not be able to directly or through identifiers link the participants to their survey responses.

Here is the link to the online survey.

If you agree to the informed consent by clicking "yes" you will be redirected to the survey.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

Thank you for your support in this research study!

Warmly,

Jack C. Dale, Jr., Ed. D. Candidate, Liberty University
xxxx Middle School

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx>

Teacher Email 3

To: [Email]

From: jdale3@liberty.edu via surveymonkey.com" <member@surveymonkey.com>

Subject: Your Opinion Matters – Last Survey Reminder from Jack Dale

There has been some response to my request for teacher participation in my research; however, you still have not responded. Please realize how extremely important your perceptions and opinions are to this study. Completing the survey is totally anonymous and should take only 15 to 20 minutes. The researcher will not be able to directly or through identifiers link the participants to their survey responses.

A benefit to you is that by providing your perceptions on the survey, you will be contributing to groundbreaking research that could benefit teachers in their job satisfaction and efficacy as well as possibly improving principal leadership.

The survey has been designed to discover through teacher perception if there is a principal leadership style that relates to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. This study will also seek to discover what teacher perceived principal leadership practices best influence teacher classroom effectiveness.

Clicking on the link below will take you to the informed consent. If you agree to the informed consent by clicking “yes” you will be redirected to the survey.

This survey will conclude by the end of this week. Please take a few minutes right now and complete the survey.

Here is the link to the online survey.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

Thank you for your support in this research study!

Warmly,

Jack C. Dale, Jr., Ed. D. student, Liberty University
xxxx Middle School

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx>

Teacher Email 4

To: [Email] From: "jack.dale@XXXX.org via surveymonkey.com"
<member@surveymonkey.com>

Subject: One Last Encouragement To Take The Principal Leadership Style, Teacher Job Satisfaction and Efficacy Survey. Body: Good Morning,
We are coming to the end of the 4th week of making this survey available to you. I am encouraging you to take the survey before it ends. I have had approximately 33% of the teachers complete the survey and it would be great if that percentage was closer to 50%. Would you please take a few moments and provide your perceptions?

Remember this survey is totally anonymous and is approved by xxxx County Schools.
Here is the link:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

Thank you for your support in this study.

Warmly,
Jack Dale, Ed. D. Student, Liberty University
xxxx Middle School

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx>

Teacher Email 5

To: [Email] From: "jack.dale@xxxx.org via surveymonkey.com"
<member@surveymonkey.com>

Subject: Thank you for your support if you took the Principal Leadership Styles, Teacher Job Satisfaction, and Efficacy Survey. Body: Dear Teacher, I want to thank you who responded to my request for participation in this research study. I believe the effort you put forth to complete the survey will provide valuable data in determining if there is a principal leadership style that relates to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction and efficacy. Your responses to the open-ended question will provide insight into what teachers perceive principal leadership practices best influence teacher classroom effectiveness. This knowledge can benefit the future generation of educators and assist future training efforts of principals in leadership practices.

Remember that your responses are totally anonymous. The researcher will not be able to directly or through identifiers link the participants to their survey responses. Thank you for your support in this research study!

Warmly,
Jack C. Dale, Jr., Ed. D. Candidate, Liberty University
xxxx Middle School

The Survey is now closed.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx>

Appendix K

OPEN-ENDED QUESTION VALIDATION #1

As you know, I am in the dissertation process of my doctorate at Liberty University. The majority of my research is based on quantitative survey data. At the end of the surveys I will be providing an open-ended question seeking the perceptions of teachers about what principal leadership behaviors would influence teacher effectiveness in the classroom.

The responses to the open ended question will be categorized into common themes. These common themes will give validity to the quantitative portion of my research. I am asking that you take a critical look at the question to see if in your opinion it is worded in such a way that will be easy for the reader to understand and will lead the reader to respond appropriately.

The question is as follows:

“What could a principal do to promote or strengthen your capacity to be effective in your classroom?”

If you feel this question should be revised in some way, please provide your comments. If you feel the question is appropriate, just indicate that. Please reply through return email your response. Just re-attach this document with your information. Also please provide your official title, and educational level.

May I please have your permission to provide your response as evidence that I sought validation of the question. I will not use your name or school but I will use your title (i.e. math teacher, master teacher...) and your education level (i.e. Ed.S., Ed. D.).

Warmly,
Jack Dale
Doctoral Candidate
Liberty University

If you would electronically date and type your name as proof of your permission to use your information, I would be most appreciative.

I give my permission to allow Jack Dale to use my response to validate the open-ended question for his dissertation research.

Printed Name Kim Hawkins
Coordinator

Signature Kim Hawkins, Ed. D., AYP

Date 01/13/2012

My suggestions to improve the open-ended question:

None needed.

Appendix L

OPEN-ENDED QUESTION VALIDATION #2

As you know, I am in the dissertation process of my doctorate at Liberty University. The majority of my research is based on quantitative survey data. At the end of the surveys I will be providing an open-ended question seeking the perceptions of teachers about what principal leadership behaviors would influence teacher effectiveness in the classroom.

The responses to the open ended question will be categorized into common themes. These common themes will give validity to the quantitative portion of my research. I am asking that you take a critical look at the question to see if in your opinion it is worded in such a way that will be easy for the reader to understand and will lead the reader to respond appropriately.

The question is as follows:

“What could a principal do to promote or strengthen your capacity to be effective in your classroom?”

If you feel this question should be revised in some way, please provide your comments. If you feel the question is appropriate, just indicate that. Please reply through return email your response. Just re-attach this document with your information. Also please provide your official title, and educational level.

May I please have your permission to provide your response as evidence that I sought validation of the question. I will not use your name or school but I will use your title (i.e. math teacher, master teacher...) and your education level (i.e. Ed.S., Ed. D.).

Warmly,
Jack Dale
Doctoral Candidate
Liberty University

If you would electronically date and type your name as proof of your permission to use your information, I would be most appreciative.

I give my permission to allow Jack Dale to use my response to validate the open-ended question for his dissertation research.

Printed Name Calvin Cupp Signature Calvin Cupp Ed.S.

Date 01/14/2012

My suggestions to improve the open-ended question:

The question is fine as it is.

Appendix M

What could a principal do to promote or strengthen your capacity to be effective in your classroom?

SCHOOL 1

	Responses	Scoring
1.	1 - Stay on top of discipline problems. 2 - Continue to help with evaluation procedures.	10 4
2.	1 - Continue to support and encourage me. 2 - Provide additional training for teaching strategies.	1 3
3.	No Response	
4.	1 - Be encouraging/supportive of test data 2 - Support/back with parents 3 - Be available to talk/answer questions in general	8 1 4
5.	No Response	
6.	1 - Harsher punishment for students 2 - Back teacher's actions to parents 3 - Be reasonable about off clock duties 4 - Stand up to rogue teachers	5 1 13 5
7.	1 - more positive feedback for everyone 2 - spread leadership more evenly 3 - not make it obvious when favors others 4 - be in classroom as often as possible 5 - not make me feel like a number	8 12 13 4 9
8.	1 - more professional development on strategies	3
9.	1 - Be interactive with students in my class. 2 - Be visible to my students.	4 4
10.	1 - Readjust planning times for true planning rather than as many meetings, conferences, etc.	2
11.	No Response	
12.	1 - Help teachers to have more time for preparation	2

13.	1 - Positive feedback by personal text	8
	2 - Teacher support vs. students	1
	3 - Teacher support vs. parents	1
14.	1 - Offer rewards or encouragement to staff members who are going above and beyond expectations.	8
	2 - Allow staff to help in decision making.	12
	3 - Get to know staff on a personal level to show you care.	9
15.	No Response	
16.	1 - Remove disruptive students.	5
	2 - Change leadership roles among the staff more often.	12
17.	1 - Provide resources	3
	2 - Assist with student attitudes	5
	3 - Give timely accurate feed back on all aspects of job.	7
18.	1 - Treat me with respect in front of the children	2
	2 - Let me know when I am doing a good job	8
	3 - Be willing to provide resources needed at a reasonable amount of time	3
19.	1 - Since TEAM began, I see less of him in my classroom than I did before. TEAM monopolizes the admin's time. This will hopefully improve next year!	-
	2 - More direction for PLCs. Get together with Dept. Chairs and gather data to define goals which can then be tackled in PLCs. I think there should be regular scheduled meetings with chairpersons to identify problems and solutions in content areas.	6
	3 - The leadership team should be changed once in awhile. Ours has had mostly the same people for at least 3 years. It's a good idea to get new people with new ideas and viewpoints. We have a lot of under-utilized talent at this school.	12
	4 - Bring back the other committees (ex: technology); that way, committees can help come up with solutions in different areas. This will also add to professionalism of the staff and more people will be heard.	12
20.	1 - Don' t take away any of my plan time.	2
	2 - Don't interrupt my class time.	2
21.	No Response	
22.	1 - Provide time to observe other highly effective teachers.	3
	2 - Provide time to research effective methods for new	3

	teaching strategies.	
	3 - Effective training provided for the use of technology to use with students.	3
	4 - Provide more training on how to use data to increase student effectiveness.	3
23.	No Response	
24.	1 - talk publicly about my program in a positive light	2
	1 - recognize extra/exceptional efforts of my students and of me & share this info w/ school on announcements, etc.	
	2 - go to bat for me with school leadership for my scheduling & budget needs	8
	3 - seek to understand the unique needs, values, and benefits of my subject area without associating it with test scores or a lack thereof.	1
	4 - Seek to understand the importance of the arts and their lifelong, life-changing value that cannot be measured on tests	9
25.	1 – Suggestions	3
	2 – Materials	3
	3 – Training	1
	4 - Support with parents	1
	5 - Support with kids	1
26.	No Response	
27.	1 - Be visible in the classroom	4
28.	1 - I think he could continue to be an advocate for a teacher's plan time. We do not have enough time to do what is asked of us.	2
	2 - The principal could continue to advocate meaningful professional development time.	3
29.	1 - Make me feel I am worthy	2
	2 - Visit more often	4
	3 - Treat all teachers the same instead of having favorites	13
30.	No Response	
31.	1 - Answer questions honestly.	16
	2 - Trust teachers.	2
	3 - Support teachers.	1
	4 - Remember what the classroom is like.	9
	5 - Provide as much time as possible for teaching.	2

32.	1 - protect plan time for cooperating with other subject area teachers.	2
	2 - encourage book studies or other on-site professional development opportunities	3
	3 - continue to minimize classroom interruptions	2
	4 - provide more technology training on-site and more technology support people with access to help do simple tasks	3
	5 - provide more training on how to use data to improve student learning	3
33.	1 - consistent leadership	10
	2 - direct confrontation with people instead of group lashing- - causes undue worry and stress	2
34.	1 - Have more time to frequently visit my classroom.	4

SCHOOL 2

1.	No Responses	
2.	1 - Encourage me and my coworkers when moral is low by giving us specific and measureable ways to change or make better the situation.	8
	2 - Give my coworkers and I recognition when we are doing a good job or when we have successes within the classroom/school environment.	8
	3 - Visit the classroom on a regular (weekly to biweekly) basis to acknowledge my efforts in the classroom and to see the students.	4
	4 - Respond to e-mails within a 24 hour time period, the same amount of time we are required to respond to parents.	14
	5 - Schedule the classes for equal ability level representation, class size, gender balance, etc and provide time enough to teach and be effective teachers.	6
3.	1 - support me with the parents	1
	2 - make sure I have the supplies/equipment I need	3
	3 - spread out responsibility instead of giving it to the person who does everything and will not say "no".	13
	4 - be available, even after school	4
	5 - protect instruction time (avoid too many activities that takes students away from the class)	2
4.	1 - Provide needed materials	3
	2 - Stand up to parents	5
	3 - Provide/Encourage community involvement	5
	4 - Provide opportunities to lead	12

	5 - Deal with disciple problems fairly and immediately	5
5.	No Response	
6.	1 - provide all requested equipment and materials	3
	2 - make sure that my class is clean	1
	3 - if there are weaknesses in my performance suggest ways to improve	7
	4 - model a lesson if my lessons are not meeting standards	11
7.	1 - Communication! Communication! Communication!	7
	2 - Make decisions that are right, not popular.	5
	3 - Give full attention to whomever is talking to him.	2
	4 - Answer emails and phone calls in a timely manner.	7
8.	1 - Let teachers teach their strength	11
	2 - let us be creative instead of teaching to the test	11
9.	1 - Give direct and valuable feedback to me after 'popping in'.	7
	2 - 'Prizes' for teachers to earn (incentives) for going above and beyond expectations	8
10.	No Response	
11.	1 - Come to work and work an entire week.	10
	2 - Actually set up the master schedule.	6
	3 - Attend IEP/parent meetings when he is scheduled to.	10
	4 - Know his teachers/students.	9
	5 - Make a decision (instead of deferring to everyone else).	5
12.	No Response	
13.	1 - reduce the class size in related arts classes	6
	2 - reduce number of sp-ed students in year-long courses	6
	3 - reduce number of after-school meetings	6
	4 - provide adequate plan time for related arts teacher, an hour long plan is recommended (as opposed to two thirty minute plans and a twenty minute plan.	2
14.	1 - Less "red tape"	6
	2 - Less paperwork	6
	3 - Stronger sense of community	15
	4 - Better pay and benefits	-
	5 - Have a more visible presence	4
15.	1 - Be engaged	1

	2 - Be pro-active	5
	3 - Be truthful	16
16.	1 - Quit moving teachers around to different positions	1
	2 - Give us more time in the classroom during workdays	2
	3 - Be a model of professionalism	4
	4 - Don't give in to every whim of a parent	5
	5 - Get rid of the "teach to the test" mentality as the #1 goal	6
17.	1 - Just do his job and quit worrying whether people like him or not.	5
18.	No Response	
19.	1 - Spend money on supplies	3
	2 - let teachers do their job	2
	3 - walk the walk	1
	4 - be more sincere	16
	5 - help when needed	1
20.	1 - Speak to me or ask me a question about my classroom – show some interest	9
	2 - Visit my classroom other than evaluation days to show the kids that he cares	4
	3 - Talk to the students & parents about what an important class it is	1
	4 - Reduce the obsession with TCAP scores	11
21.	No Response	
22.	1 - The front office should do the secretarial work that I do so I have more time to teach	-
	2 - Counselors should do more so that I can teach	-
	3 - Enforce the rules for everyone	10
	4 - Follow through with discipline	5
	5 - Upper management lets parents run our schools. Principals must do as they are told.	-
23.	No Response	
24.	No Response	
25.	1 - Provide support for discipline	1
	2 - Back your position with parents	1
	3 - Be available and visible	4
	4 - Support and encourage	1, 8
	5 - Facilitate parent meetings	1

26.	No Response	
27.	1 – Communicate	7
	2 - Be supportive with discipline	1
	3 - Use me in the decision process	12
	4 - Allow teacher to observe others teaching	3
	5 - Listen to complaints and try to fix them	1
28.	1 - clear expectations	6
	2 - strong support system	1

SCHOOL 3

1.	No Response	
2.	1 - Be more visible in the school amongst the students	4
	2 - Find ways to strengthen the discipline policy	6
3.	No Response	
4.	No Response	
5.	1 - professional development	3
	2 – opportunities	12
	3 – technology	3
6.	No Response	
7.	No Response	
8.	1 - More available plan time	2
	2 - Less meetings	6
9.	1 - Handle chronic discipline issues more effectively	5
	2 - Have higher expectations for children's behavior school wide	6
10.	1 - Focus on discipline in the school.	5
11.	1 - Hire classroom assistants to aid in paperwork	1
	2 - Have TA's actually help in the classroom, not just sleep in the back row	1
	3 - Copy machines more easily accessible	3
	4 - More evenly distribute special ed students among regular ed classrooms	13
	5 - Provide "drop in" feedback on semi-regular basis, instead of formal observations	7

12.	1 - Help me to clearly identify weaknesses, and set up professional development to address them.	3, 7
	2 - Support my endeavors make the class creative and fun.	1
	3 - Think about the consequences before "shooting from the hip" on school wide decisions.	14
	4 - My principal already does these things!	-
13.	No Response	
14.	No Response	
15.	1 - Provide more classroom management workshops.	3
	2 - A consistent school wide discipline plan.	10
	3 - Find a way to cut down on special education meetings, IEP'S etc...	14
	4 - Those are the only things I can think of at the moment, our principal does a great job.	-
16.	No Response	
17.	No Response	
18.	1 - Support alternative teaching methods	7
	2 - Work within the classroom to make themselves visible	4
	3 - Provide positive feedback on creativity	7
	4 - Continue supporting teachers as she is	1
	5 - Work on developing a positive image in the community	5
19.	1 - Inform the teacher when they have received good comments from parents about the teacher.	7
	2 - Praise teachers who are following-through on expectations, etc.	8
20.	1 - Minimize behavioral concerns in particular classroom settings.	6
	2 - Minimize attendance issues with students.	6
	3 - Greater accountability for teachers who come in at 8 and leave at 3:45 empty handed.	5
21.	1 - The principal's hands are tied by the red tape. SHE is fine!!	-

SCHOOL 4

1.	1 - no "pop-ins", schedule before you come in to observe us... I just feel so nervous walking into my classroom everyday	16
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

knowing that I may be "watched" that day...

	2 - take more off of our plate... we are given SOOOOO much to do and it's hard to balance it all	14
	3 - get special ed students out of our classrooms! they are behavior problems and don't do their work!	6
	4 - lower the class sizes... especially if it isn't an honors class	6
	5 - explain to parents that we ARE doing our job and doing it very WELL.... There has been a shift in society where parents are blaming teachers for their son or daughter's poor grades, laziness, horrible behavior, etc. They need to explain to parents that they are NOT to be disrespectful or criticizing in their calls, meetings, or emails... parents now-a-days are just horrible and the principals need to step in and explain this to parents!! It simply can NOT be allowed!!	1
2.	1 - Show appreciation by words	8
	2 - Understanding the strengths of different teachers	9
	3 - Listening to teachers thoughts on students	9
	4 - Standing up to parents in conferences/phone calls	5
3.	No Response	
4.	1 - Strategies for management	6
	2 - Strategies for hands on activities	11
	3 - Sit in on PLC's – advise	4
	4 - Provide speakers/workshops	3
	5 - Promote PLC's among different teachers	14
5.	1 - More Technology	3
	2 - Less Distractions(Assemblies, Fundraisers, Etc.)	2
6.	1 - make sure the classroom is adequate	1
	2 - tell me what a good job I'm doing	8
7.	1 - Show more empathy	9
	2 - Not have favorites	13
	3 - not consider feelings	9
	4 - move people around with no thought of feelings	9
8.	1 - Allow me to teach and not load me with additional work.	2
	2 - Help assist with interference in the classroom from both students and parents.	1
9.	1 - Backing me up on discipline	1

	2 - setting a culture of high expectations	6
	3 - limiting interruptions in the classroom	2
	4 - improved communication	7
10.	1 - Provide support for all school staff	1
11.	1 - Support Discipline Procedures	1
	2 - Actively engage in classroom activities	4
	3 - Staff functions to build relationships	15
12.	No Response	
13.	1 - Maintain a safe, clean, and organized environment.	14
	2 - Establish general expectations for all.(teachers & students)	6
	3 - Maintain personal confidentiality.	2
	4 - Allow for teacher differentiation/capitalize on individual strengths.	9
	5 - Provide release time for professional growth.	3
14.	1 - Truly listen to the concerns of the teachers - not just pay lip service	9
	2 - Promote the best education for ALL students instead of focusing on TCAP scores to make our school look better	6
15.	1 – Leadership	5
	2 - Making sure you have what you need to get the job done.	3
	3 - Good Communication	7
16.	1 - Positive attitude	1
	2 - Support Music Program	1
	3 - Attend performances	4
	4 - Material needs met in the classroom	3
	5 - Encourage teachers	8
17.	1 - Protect class schedule	2
	2 - Take more time to work on evaluations	14
18.	1 - Let me teach.	2
	2 - Ask more questions like, "why?" instead of assuming.	2
19.	No Response	
20.	1 - Be at school more often	4
	2 - Visit my room at least once per semester	4
	3 - Give me praise and encouragement at least once per year	8
	4 - Be more aware of work of assistant principals or	1

	lack thereof	
	5 - Stop showing blatant favoritism	13
21.	No Response	
22.	1 - consult us when making decisions that affect our ability to be effective in classroom	12
	2 – communicate	7
23.	1 - more technology	3
	2 - more school based tech training	3
24.	1 - should have my back in parent conferences	1
	2 - consider the workload when asked to do extra tasks and or paperwork	9
	3 - be visible for students at class changes to help in disciplining smoother changes	12
	4 - Understand all the ed. programs being used in the schools and their value to the ed process.	11
	5 - should not make decisions for the whole school based upon one or two teachers who do something the wrong way. Those teachers should be reprimanded not the whole faculty.	13
25.	1 - making brief appearances in the classroom	4
	2 - provide technology support—hardware	3
26.	1 - keep on being an encouragement	8
	2 - keep on being a good listener	9
	3 - keep on being a confident leader	10
	4 - keep on handling my problems immediately	10
27.	1 - Ask for our suggestions for in-service.	12
	2 - Provide help in areas that we deem necessary	1
28.	1 - Give more positive feedback because I need it.	8
	2 - That's what works for me.	-
29.	1 - Better Communication.	7
	2 - Be present in the classroom, other than observations.	4
	3 - Treat all teachers fairly. No favorites.	13
	4 - Stand up to parents threats.	5
	5 - Moral boosters for teachers.	8

SCHOOL 5

1.	1 - Fewer lesson preps in schedule	6
----	------------------------------------	---

	2 - Limited plan time interruptions	2
	3 - limited intercom interruptions during class	2
2.	1 - If I know I'll be supported in front of downtown and parents.	1
	2 - Suggest improvements constructively.	7
3.	1 - Protect classroom instruction time	2
	2 - Provide meaningful professional development for our specific needs as a school	3
	3 - Be encouraging	8
	4 - Explain data more and how to use it for my own instruction	11
	5 - Protect plan time for teachers who really use it to plan excellent lessons daily	2
4.	1 - Feedback ~ clear understanding of where I stand in the principal's opinion	7
	2 - Dedicate at least one plan a week for collaboration that cannot be interrupted or changed	15
	3 - Effective and meaningful professional development meetings	3
5.	No Response	
6.	1 - Timely evaluations/ feedback	7
	2 - positive reinforcement regarding TVAAS etc	8
	3 - Speak positively about other co-workers when discussing them	2
	4 - Give confidence about the future	6
	5 - Actively involved in student discipline/teacher support	1
7.	1 - More "drop ins"	4
	2 - observations	4
8.	1 - Take away some duties to give more time to plan	2
9.	No Response	
10.	1 - Show respect and fairness when dealing with teachers.	2
	2 - Offer support and make suggestions if/when teachers have issues.	1
	3 - Refrain from speaking negatively about teachers to OTHER teachers. Act professionally.	2
	4 - Refrain from intimidation and bullying.	9
11.	1 - same planning period for the team	2
	2 - more time to catch up and plan on building inservice days	3
12.	No Response	

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 13. | 1 - treat all employees fairly instead of picking favorites | 13 |
| | 2 - visit classrooms on a regular basis to show involvement | 4 |
| | 3 - show teachers respect instead of sarcasm | 2 |
| | 4 - strong discipline for students who continually disrupt class | 5 |
| | 5 - recognize good work and praise me for it | 8 |
| 14. | No Response | |
| 15. | No Response | |
| 16. | No Response | |

SCHOOL 6

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1. | 1 - enforce school rules | 10 |
| | 2 - promptly punish behavior problems | 5 |
| | 3 - be a visible presence | 4 |
| | 4 - comment positively | 8 |
| | 5 - comment constructively | 7 |
| 2. | No Response | |
| 3. | 1 - Be more available to deal with discipline issues as they arise. | 4 |
| | 2 - Deliver effective punishments to show support for the teacher. | 1 |
| 4. | No Response | |
| 5. | 1 - TEACH MY CLASSES | 11 |
| 6. | No Response | |
| 7. | 1 - Support teachers when a parent lodges a nonsensical complaint! | 1 |
| | 2 - Deal with discipline issues with consistency and firmness. | 10 |
| | 3 - Establish a firm, fair, and consistent set of rules and expectations for staff and faculty to adhere to. Effectively implement a policy and procedure to deal with those teachers who don't carry their fair share of responsibility for effectively doing their job.. | 5, 13 |
| | 4 - Insist on a professional dress code for all staff members and enforce it! Teachers should dress professionally and not like the homeless!!! | 5 |
| | 5 - Issue a pat on the back when earned or a kick in the derriere when appropriate. The job that I do in the classroom is definitely under appreciated!!! | 8 |

8.	1 - Support more expensive professional development such as attendance at NSTA conventions.	3
	2 - Provide more and better technology.	3
	3 - Deal more sternly with discipline issues with students	5
9.	1 - COMMUNICATE	7
	2 - COMMUNICATE	
	3 - COMMUNICATE	
	4 - COMMUNICATE	
	5 - COMMUNICATE	
10.	1 - Speak with teachers prior to talking with parents about complaints.	1
	2 - Emphasize rigor and quality instruction and group students in classes based on ability.	6
	3 - Spend time in the classroom co-teaching with teachers to understand teaching demands.	4,11
11.	1 - be supportive	1
	2 - communication	7
	3 - visit the classroom	4
	4 - be less selective of certain staff members	13
	5 - Be a part of the whole school and not just discipline	4
12.	1 - Let me teach only one subject	2
	2 - Continue to send me to PD for continued growth	3
	3 - Have a student teacher to help with the work load	1
	4 - A shared common vision that all staff know and are working towards	6
	5 - Ensure that only the competent people are kept	1

SCHOOL 7

1.	1 - Show more of an interest in what I do (come visit)	9
	2 - Give me more class time than DUTY time during the day	2
	3 - Let me work to my capacity and do what I do best with students	1
2.	No Response	
3.	1 - By backing up the teacher when students get out of hand	1
	2 - By promoting good deeds done by the teachers	8
	3 - Communicating-big deal/sometimes not done	7
	4 - By giving teachers time to teach and not be in meetings	2
4.	No Response	
5.	1 - good communication	7

	2 - consistent discipline	10
	3 - actually caring about the teachers.... not just the students	9
6.	1 - Provide opportunities for the teachers to discuss issues as a group	15
7.	No Response	
8.	No Response	
9.	1 - TEACH A CLASS	11
10.	1 - Handle discipline issues in a timely manner.	14
	2 - Treat me as a professional and let me do my job.	2
	3 - Ensure that instructional supplies are available.	3
	4 - Communicate effectively.	7
	5 - Protect teacher planning time from unnecessary meetings.	2

SCHOOL 8

1.	1 - Handle discipline problems consistently	10
	2 - Handle discipline problems quickly	14
	3 - Be more present in and around the building	4
	4 - Stop scheduling so many meetings	2
2.	1 - More needs to be done with students who do not follow rules and continually disrupt in class.	5
	2 - There needs to be a place for students who refuse to work.	-
3.	1 - Support my decisions in regards to discipline and grades (when the decisions are based on school policy).	1
	2 - Reduce the number of meetings that take up our plan time and do not provide meaningful learning.	2
	3 - Be more present in a positive way so that students feel that the principal cares about the good things that they do as well as the bad.	4
	4 - Demand that all staff behave professionally towards students and one another.	5
	5 - Provide sincere praise ONLY when it is deserved! When praise is truly deserved, make the praise specific and meaningful (this is for staff and students).	8
4.	1 - Support discipline decisions	1
	2 - Be more involved in department	4
	3 - help acquire needed materials	3
5.	1 - Stand by your teachers in discipline issues!	1
	2 - Recognize teachers that are going above and beyond, but are a 3 on the new teacher evaluation.	9
	3 - Make sure technology is distributed in a fair manner.	3

	4 - Treat related arts as equal partners in educating the WHOLE CHILD.	2
6.	1 - Avoid scheduling parent conferences more than twice per week.	6
	2 - Provide time for me to go to other's effective classrooms to observe.	3
7.	1 - Strong leadership of school community teachers, parents, students..	15
	2 - Support teachers with a consistent and strong discipline policy.	1
	3 - Effectively manage leadership with the school by listening.	12
8.	1 - better discipline plan	6
	2 - visit classroom informally	4
	3 - consistency in school wide discipline	10
9.	1 - Less meetings	6
	2 - Greater chance to collaborate with grade level/subject area teachers	3
10.	1 - speak up about unfunded mandates that put ridiculous pressure on teachers	5
	2 - assign leadership positions in the school based on ability and performance not length of tenure	13
	3 - protect teacher plan time	2
	4 - take a firm stance on discipline issues	5
	5 - build a sense of community within the school	15
11.	No Response	