

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES AND THEIR IMPACT ON TEACHER JOB
SATISFACTION

by

Heidi M. Hahn

B.S., Montana State University, 1993
M.S., Montana State University, 1995

A Doctoral Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of

St. Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Educational Administration and Leadership

St. Cloud, Minnesota

March, 2013

PRINCIPLE PRACTICES AND THEIR IMPACT ON TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

Heidi M. Hahn

The purpose of this study was to identify the key leadership practices which principals use that have the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction as perceived by teachers. The specific research questions were:

- What leadership practices do principals identify as the most important to attempt to develop and improve teacher job satisfaction?
- What do teachers identify as the key practices that principals use that have the most impact on their job satisfaction?
- What are the differences between what principals and teachers identify as the key practices that principals use that have the most impact on teacher job satisfaction?
- What are the differences in principal's perceptions of their teaching staff's overall job satisfaction across the principal's gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level, and building size?
- What are the differences in teacher's reported overall job satisfaction across the teacher's gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level, building size, and subject area?

Many researchers often conclude that the educational leader is essential to achieving higher levels of teacher job satisfaction (Blocker & Richardson, 2002). What research has not clearly distinguished are what practices a principal can utilize to improve teacher job satisfaction and staff morale (Blase & Kirby, 2009; Whitaker et al., 2009).

A quantitative research methodology was used to conduct an in-depth case study of 25 principals and 408 teachers on principal practices and teacher job satisfaction. A quantitative study was chosen to seek "facts and causes of human behavior and to learn a lot about a few variables so differences [could] be identified" (Roberts, 2010, p.142).

The main conclusions from this study support research and the findings that there are specific leadership practices principals can implement that lead to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. This study concluded that there are specific practices in the areas of staff acknowledgement/recognition, shared leadership, professional autonomy, creating staff expectations, leading by

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

standing behind, communication and professional role that lead to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction.

This study of *Leadership Practices and Their Impact on Teacher Job Satisfaction* may provide principals a better understanding of what they can do on a daily basis to improve the levels of teacher job satisfaction within their buildings. Research identifies that teacher satisfaction is a highly significant predictor of effective schools (Zigarelli, 1996; Hattie, 2003).

Month Year

Approved by Research Committee:

John Eller Chairperson

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge and thank my mom, Carol Hahn. My mom has always supported me on this journey, and due to her support, love and encouragement, my doctorate is now a reality. Thank you. To my daughter Kamery, who has endured my class schedule and many late nights spent writing. I thank her for her constant cheery mood, her love for life and her laughter. I am so proud to be your mom.

Completing this study would not have been possible without the support, flexibility and encouragement from my friends and colleagues. I would like to thank Gaynard Brown, a wonderful Director, mentor and friend. Thank you to the colleagues that I work with on a daily basis. Thank you for your support and enthusiasm as I worked these past three years. You all make me love my job and I am ready for our next bus adventure! Thank you to the support of the Brainerd Public Schools. The administration and staff have supported my learning and allowed me to learn from them and their expertise.

Thank you to all the study participants—superintendent, principals and teachers who volunteered for this study. I learned so much from all of you.

And finally, I would like to thank my cohort II, professors and committee at St. Cloud State University. Thank you all for your shared knowledge, your

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

experience and for providing guidance to make my dream of obtaining my doctorate a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	xii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Purpose Statement.....	4
Theoretical Framework and Research Questions.....	4
Study Significance.....	5
Terms and Definitions.....	7
Paper Structure.....	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	11
MOTIVATIONAL THEORIES.....	11
Theory X Theory Y.....	11
Maslow's Theory.....	13
ERG Theory.....	15
Herzberg's Motivational Theory.....	16
JOB SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATION.....	17
Contributing Factors to Teacher Job Satisfaction.....	18
Demographic Variables Influencing Teacher	

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

	Job Satisfaction.....	23
	Implications of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction.....	25
	QUALITIES AND SKILLS OF EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP.....	28
	LEADERSHIP PRACTICES THAT INFLUENCE TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION.....	32
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	55
	Background.....	55
	Purpose.....	56
	Research Methods.....	57
	Theoretical Framework Informing Research Methodology.....	58
	Instrumentation.....	62
	Sample Selection.....	64
	Data Collection Methods.....	65
	Methods of Analysis.....	66
	Assumptions.....	69
	Limitations.....	70
	Delimitations.....	70
	Summary.....	71
IV.	FINDINGS.....	72
	STUDY OVERVIEW.....	72
	Purpose.....	72
	Research Methodology.....	72

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

Analysis.....	73
Sample Demographics.....	76
RESEARCH QUESTIONS ONE, TWO AND THREE: RANKINGS BY CORE PRACTICE AREAS.....	78
Staff Acknowledgement/Recognition.....	79
Shared Leadership.....	82
Professional Autonomy.....	86
Creating Staff Expectation.....	89
Supporting Staff/Leading by Standing Behind.....	90
Communication.....	96
Professional Role.....	98
RESEARCH QUESTION FOUR: DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION.....	102
RESEARCH QUESTION FIVE.....	102
RESEARCH QUESTION SIX.....	106
SUMMARY.....	104
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	108
Summary.....	108
CONCLUSIONS FROM QUESTIONS ONE, TWO AND THREE.....	111
Acknowledgement/Recognition.....	111
Shared Leadership.....	113
Professional Autonomy.....	115
Creating Staff Expectation.....	116
Leading by Standing Behind.....	117

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

Communication.....	119
Professional Role.....	121
CONCLUSIONS FROM RESEARCH QUESTION FOUR.....	122
CONCLUSIONS FROM RESEARCH QUESTION FIVE.....	123
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE.....	125
Staff Acknowledgement/Recognition.....	125
Shared Leadership.....	125
Professional Autonomy.....	126
Creating Staff Expectation.....	126
Supporting Staff/Leading by Standing Behind.....	127
Communication.....	127
Professional Role.....	128
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY.....	129
Sample Size.....	129
Principal vs. Teacher Differences.....	129
Gender Analysis.....	130
Teacher Location Analysis.....	130
REFERENCES.....	131
APPENDICES.....	140
A. Principal Survey.....	141
B. Teacher Survey.....	150
C. Doctoral Study Participation Letter.....	159
D. Superintendent Consent.....	161

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

E. Principal Consent for Study..... 163

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographics of Respondents.....	77
2. Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each Staff Acknowledgement Core Practice Item.....	80
3. Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each Shared Leadership Core Practice Item.....	83
4. Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each Professional Autonomy Core Practice Item.....	86
5. Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each Creating Staff Expectations Core Practice Item.....	90
6. Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each Leading By Standing Behind Core Practice Item.....	93
7. Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each Communication Core Practice Item.....	96
8. Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each Professional Role Core Practice Item.....	99
9. Teacher's Reported Mean Overall Level of Job Satisfaction by Age Group.....	104
10. ANOVA: Teacher's Reported Overall Level of Job Satisfaction by Age Group.....	104
11. Teacher's Reported Overall Level of Job Satisfaction by District Type.....	105
12. ANOVA: Teacher's Reported Overall Level of Job Satisfaction by District Type.....	105

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Teacher job satisfaction is an important issue affecting the climate and culture of learning for students. Given the current emphasis on No Child Left Behind, high-stakes testing, merit pay and limited educational funding, principals as educational leaders may begin to wonder the level of job satisfaction among teachers.

Research leaves no doubt that the single greatest factor influencing student achievement and student outcomes is the teacher. A study conducted by Zigarelli (1996) concluded that the single, general measure of teacher satisfaction is a highly significant predictor of effective schools. Hattie's (2003) meta-analysis of studies on teacher efficacy found that teachers' responses about their job satisfaction made up 30% of the variance in determining what influenced learning the most (Hemric, Eury, & Shellman, 2008). The knowledge the teacher possesses and their level of job satisfaction are the keys to quality teaching (Bolin, 2008). "Many studies indicate that social factors such as group interaction, supportive relationships, skills, high performance goals, and above all, morale (job satisfaction), are the most important determinants of productivity

and success in human enterprises” (Bhella, 2001, p. 369). Multiple studies have found that teachers of scholastically high achieving students have higher levels of job satisfaction (Anderson, 1953; Bhella, 2001; Koura, 1963). These studies conclude that students’ achievement increases under teachers with high levels of job satisfaction, and it decreases under teachers with low levels of job satisfaction. In addition, a critical review of twenty-five years of morale/job satisfaction research conducted by Blocker and Richardson (2002) concluded that the keys to teacher morale and job satisfaction are the principal and the leadership that the building principal provides. With these facts in mind, it would seem imperative that principals understand how to increase the level of teacher job satisfaction and overall staff morale because these have a direct impact on student achievement and school effectiveness (Bhella 2001; Blocker & Richardson, 2002; Whitaker, Whitaker & Lumpa, 2009; Zigarelli, 1996).

Researchers have identified many qualities and skills an effective educational leader must possess. Marzano et al. (2005), through a meta-analysis, identified twenty-one leadership responsibilities for educational leaders. Some of these responsibilities include: affirmation, communication, visibility, flexibility, outreach and relationships. Marzano and his co-authors state that the more effective the educational leader is at each of these responsibilities, the greater the function and operation of the educational institution. All of the leadership responsibilities identified by Marzano have some connection with the relationships the educational leader develops and maintains throughout the organization.

Langley and Jacobs (2006) identify five essential skills that all principals must possess if they want their educational institution to move from good to great. These five essential skills are: (1) the ability to be insightful (2) positive, strong interpersonal skills (3) self-growth (4) flexibility and (5) keeping in touch with the community. Both Marzano (2005) and Fullen (2008) describe how educational leaders need to be change agents in order to help their organizations survive during difficult times, and flourish in order to ensure students and staff have optimal opportunities.

Leaders that build their organizations by focusing only on their customers and stakeholders and forget to make the same commitment to their employees typically do not succeed (George, 2007). The quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its employees (Fullen, 2008). In Fullen's (2008) book, *The Six Secrets of Change: What the Best Leaders do to Help Their Organizations Survive and Thrive* the first and most important secret is to "Love Your Employees." According to Fullen, loving your employees means to help employees find meaning in their work, help them to increase their skills and help them to find personal satisfaction in ways that fulfill their own, and the organization's, goals. When employees feel "loved" they are proud of their organization, they take pride in their work, they feel part of a valued effort, they have a high level of job satisfaction, and according to Fullen (2008) they create an organizational morale that others envy.

Purpose Statement

Research, over several decades, has found that the level of teacher job satisfaction has a direct impact on student achievement and school effectiveness (Anderson, 1953; Bhella 2001; Blocker & Richardson, 2002; Whitaker, Whitaker & Lumpa, 2009; Zigarelli, 1996). Research reveals the qualities of an effective educational leader (Fullen, 2008; Langley & Jacobs, 2006; Marzano et al., 2005). Many researchers conclude that the educational leader is essential to achieving higher levels of teacher job satisfaction (Blocker & Richardson, 2002). What research has not clearly distinguished are what practices a principal can utilize to improve teacher job satisfaction and staff morale (Blase & Kirby, 2009; Whitaker et al., 2009). It is the purpose of this study to identify which practices principals use to improve teacher job satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework and Research Questions

Whitaker (2009) in the preface of the book, *Motivating and Inspiring Teachers: The Educational Leader's Guide for Building Staff Morale* stated, "Interestingly, because we believe high staff morale is so critical, and because it applies to every school, we assumed that there were many books on building staff morale for educators. Surprisingly, such books are almost non-existent" (p. xvii). Similarly, the book *Bringing Out the Best in Teachers: What Effective Principals Do* (Blase & Kirby, 2009), posits that school principals impact every aspect of school life, and that research has failed to demonstrate an understanding of leadership from the perspective of the teacher. Embracing the theoretical framework of both Whitaker et al. (2009) and Blase & Kirby (2009),

the overall purpose of the study is two-fold: (1) to identify what leadership practices principals identify as having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction; (2) to identify what leadership practices teachers identify as having the greatest impact on their job satisfaction. The specific research questions are:

- What leadership practices do principals identify as the most important to attempt to develop and improve teacher job satisfaction?
- What do teachers identify as the key practices that principals use that have the most impact on their job satisfaction?
- What are the differences between what the principals identify for practices having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction, compared to what teachers identify as the key practices that principals use that have the most impact on teacher job satisfaction?

Study Significance

In Blocker and Richardson's (1963) critical review of 25 years of research in education literature, the researchers conclude "the administrator appears in study after study as the key person in respect to morale and teacher job satisfaction. With virtually the same environmental factors operating, high or low levels of teacher job satisfactions can be induced depending upon the behavior of the chief administrator" (p. 208). "Principal's actions create distinct working environments within schools that are highly predictive of teacher satisfaction and commitment" (Shann, 1998, p.67). Principals' leadership behavior is significantly related to teacher job satisfaction and job related stress (Evans et al., 1990).

A study conducted by Zigarelli (1996) concluded that a single, general measure of teacher satisfaction is a highly significant predictor of effective schools. In Hattie's (2003) meta-analysis of studies regarding teacher efficacy found that "teachers' responses made up 30% of the variance of determining what influenced learning the most" (Hemric et al., 2008). "Many studies indicate that social factors such as group interaction, supportive relationships, skills, high performance goals, and above all morale are the most important determinants of productivity and success in human enterprises" (Bhella, 2001, p. 369). "Research on the workplace of teachers continues to demonstrate that in some schools effective leadership produces higher learning than in other schools. It is the appropriate leader behavior that enhances student achievement" (Hunter-Boykin et al., 1995, p. 942).

When teachers express that morale is low or that they are experiencing high levels of job dissatisfaction, a plethora of issues arise for teachers and their administrators. Teachers who express high levels of job dissatisfaction are more likely to engage in "backbiting, bickering, communicating resentments, forming cliques, and generally showing lack of consideration for others" (Briggs & Richardson, 1992, p. 89). Those teachers who identify higher levels of job dissatisfaction are absent from school more often, have a lower commitment to the job, and report that they are less likely to make a career out of teaching (Borg & Riding, 1991).

Many argue that school principals can affect virtually all aspects of school life. Yet empirical research provides few detailed pictures of the everyday social and behavioral dynamics of effective school-based leadership. This is especially true with regard to understanding leadership from the

perspective of teachers, and in particular, how school leadership enhances teachers and their overall performance. (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 2)

Understanding what leadership practices improve teacher job satisfaction, from a teacher's perspective, is imperative to developing effective leadership skills. Principals need to know how to increase the level of teacher job satisfaction, as doing so has a direct impact on student achievement and school effectiveness (Bhella, 2001; Blocker & Richardson, 2002; Whitaker et al., 2009; Zigarelli, 1996).

Terms and Definitions

Building leader: Most often is identified as the building principal; has the assigned role of leading and running the daily operations of the educational institution.

Case study: An intensive study of a single unit with an aim to generalize across a larger set of units (Gerring, 2004).

Certified teacher: Teacher with a current licensure or certification.

Theoretical/Conceptual framework: "The conceptual or theoretical framework provides the boundaries, or scaffolding, for your study" (Roberts, 2010, p. 129).

Contractual approach: A leadership approach/practice where "institutional and departmental leaders setting out expectations of teachers but also the nature of the managerial and leadership service that they would be prepared to provide" (Evans, 2001, p. 303).

Effective schools: Schools that are correlated with student success. Effective schools often possess the similar characteristics that include a clear school mission, high expectations for student success, instructional leadership,

opportunity to learn and an on-task, safe and orderly environment, positive home-school relations and frequent monitoring of student progress (Pearson, 2004).

Extrinsic variable: A variable or variation that occurs due to external forces or influences (Kirk & Chipunza, 2009).

Instructional leader: An educational leader that is intensively involved in curricular and instructional issues that directly impact student achievement (Colton, 2003).

Intrinsic variables: A variable or variation that is driven from something internally or from something that exists within the individual (Kirk & Chipunza, 2009).

Leadership: The influence of others towards a common goal (Mumford, 2007).

Motivation: Relates to a range of psychological processes that guide an individual toward a goal and cause that person to keep pursuing that goal.

“Motivation often is described in terms of a direction (the choice of one activity over another), intensity (how hard an employee tries) and persistence (how long an employee continues with a behavior, even in the face of obstacles and adverse circumstances)” (Sandri & Bowen, 1978, p. 45).

Principal: Administrative leader of a school or educational program.

Professional autonomy: “Refers to the degree of freedom (i.e. professional discretion) that individuals have in determining the work process” (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 58).

Staff morale: The fusing of wishes and attitudes into dominant group attitudes, making it possible for the school population to act with unity in certain areas (Dictionary of Education).

Student achievement: Measure of a student's growth, often associated with state assessments and standardized testing.

Teacher-centered leadership: "Predicated upon acceptance that leaders and managers have as much responsibility towards the staff whom they lead and manage as they do towards the pupils and students within their institution, and that this responsibility extends as far as endeavoring to meet as many individual needs as possible, within the confines imposed by having to consider more corporate needs" (Evans, 2001, p. 303).

Teacher efficacy: A teacher's ability or capacity for producing a desired result such as increased student achievement or strong home-school connections (Ashton, 1984).

Teacher job satisfaction: The feelings that a teacher holds towards his or her job (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995).

Transactional leader: The transactional leader "uses incentives to secure employee compliance" (Fiore, 2004, p. 9).

Transformational leader: The transformational leader "concern(s) themselves with the needs of their employees and places those needs above their own" (Fiore, 2004, p.9). The transformational leader builds and strengthens employee commitment to the organization's norms, values and goals (Fiore, 2004). The transformational principal is one who motivates his/her "followers to accomplish goals that represent shared values and beliefs" (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p.4).

Paper Structure

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter one consists of the introduction, the problem statement, and the purpose of the study. The chapter contains the research questions that serve as the focus of the study. A brief explanation of the theoretical framework is provided and definitions to be used throughout the study are listed. Chapter two, literature review, contains a summary of the research pertaining to leadership and its influence on teacher job satisfaction. The review of literature incorporates summaries of theoretical and empirical research related to teacher job satisfaction, qualities of effective educational leaders, the impact of leadership on teacher job satisfaction, and theoretical and conceptual frameworks for influencing teacher job satisfaction and teacher effectiveness. Chapter three, methodology, details a description of the qualitative methodology to be used in the study. The population and sample for the study are specified and the instrumentation and data collection methods are discussed, as well as a discussion of the manner in which the data will be analyzed, and an outline of limitations of that analysis. Chapter four, results/data analysis, describes the results of the data analysis and reports findings from the survey and open box comments data on what leadership practices (independent variable) teachers perceived as the most influential in impacting teacher job satisfaction (dependent variable). Chapter 5, conclusions, findings, limitations and recommendations for future research are reported and discussed. This chapter will serve as a summary of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

MOTIVATIONAL THEORIES

Employers and business owners continuously look for strategies to increase the efficiency and productivity of their company. This industrial focus has caused numerous researchers to study how motivation can increase job satisfaction and the productivity level of an employee (Hofstede, G., 1994). “Motivated employees work harder, produce higher quality and greater quantities of work, are more likely to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors, and are less likely to leave the organization in search of more fulfilling opportunities” (Sandri & Bowen, 2011, p. 45).

Theory X Theory Y

In 1960, Douglas McGregor introduced Theory X Theory Y. It was McGregor’s theory that people come to work with certain inherent characteristics and based on these characteristics a leader can determine what type of leadership influence could be utilized to create a more productive and satisfied employee (Berry & Seltman, 2008). Theory X leaders make the following general assumptions about employees: (a) the average employee inherently does not like

work and will avoid it if he can; (b) because of the employee's dislike of work, the employee must be coerced, controlled, directed and/or threatened with punishment to get them to accomplish their work task; and (c) the average employee prefers to be directed and prefers not to have responsibility, this employee's overall goal is job security (Hendel, M. J., 2003). Theory X is typically applied to large scale operations such as factories and assembly lines and encourages a leader to assume an authoritarian, hard management style.

Theory Y leaders make the following assumptions about employees: (a) the employee expends the same amount of physical and mental energy within their work day, as they do outside of the work day; (b) if the employee is motivated, he/she will be self-directed in working towards the good or goal of the organization (punishment typically does not motivate this employee, the intrinsic value of the work does); (c) the employee will learn and seek out responsibility within their employment duties; (d) employees are creative and possess ingenuity and their skills enhance the function of the organization; and (e) job satisfaction is the key to engaging these employees and ensuring their commitment to work (Berry & Seltman, 2008; Hendel, 2003).

Theory Y is typically applied to professional organizations and encourages a leader to assume a participative, soft management style (Blase & Kirby, 2009; Hanson, 1989; Whitaker, Whitaker, & Lumpa, 2009). Theory Y is more applicable to the field of education than Theory X because principals and school leaders assume that teachers have chosen the field of education because they want to make a difference in the lives of young people. "Administrators who hold

Theory X assumptions about workers (i.e. that they dislike work, lack initiative, and resist change) tend to be directive and authoritarian leaders. It is important to remember that formal authority is limited in scope in educational organizations” (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 93).

In the book, *5 Essential Skills for School Leaders: Moving from Good to Great*, Langley and Jacobs (2006) describe a leader with “strong, positive interpersonal skills as displaying more of the Theory Y personality with just a tad of Theory X lingering in the background. A little X is good, but knowing how to balance the two is best” (p. 29).

Maslow's Theory

Another theory that has had an impact on how to improve job satisfaction and employee productivity is Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. Abraham Maslow introduced this framework in his 1954 book, *Motivation and Personality*. Maslow proposed that people are motivated by their unsatisfied needs. He theorized that there are needs all humans seek to satisfy, and that higher levels of need cannot be satisfied until lower levels of needs are met. Maslow's hierarchal needs from low to high are: (1) Physiological needs such as food, water and shelter; (2) Safety needs such as stability, free from the threat of physical and emotional harm; (3) Social needs such as a feeling of belonging and feeling loved (4) Esteem needs such as recognition, accomplishment, attention and self-respect, and (5) Self-actualization, which is seeking self-fulfillment and/or becoming the person that one has the potential to become (Marsh, 1978).

Based upon Maslow's hierarchy of needs, in order for a leader to motivate his/her employees in the workplace, the leader must understand the active needs for his/her individual employees (Sandri & Bowen, 2003). Applying Maslow's hierarchy of needs to build or create higher levels of staff morale is something an educational leader may want to consider. Educational leaders must ensure that teachers and staff members have their safety needs met so that the daily demands of the job and daily routines can occur. After the shootings at Columbine High School, there were numerous articles and studies that focused on the safety needs of students and staff, and Maslow's hierarchy of needs was frequently related to the educational setting. Safety is considered one of the most basic needs, second only to physiological needs such as: food, water, shelter and air. The most common needs, as identified by Maslow, are self-esteem and the need to belong. "As educational leaders work to enhance morale in their organizations, one of the aspects of Maslow's hierarchy that may come into play more than any other is the social needs of teachers" (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 5). Whitaker explains that teachers often seek a sense of belonging and that this can occur in both positive and negative ways. Whitaker encourages educational leaders to find opportunities for staff to connect in meaningful and positive ways knowing that the need to "fit in" and connect is a social need for many. "Esteem is a teacher's greatest need, and in order for teachers to achieve higher levels of motivation, they must achieve feelings of professional self-worth, competence and respect; to be seen as people of achievement, professionals who are influential in their workplaces, growing persons with opportunities ahead to

develop even greater competence and a sense of accomplishment” (Owens & Valesky, 2007, p. 388).

ERG Theory

In 1969, Clayton P. Alderfer introduced the ERG Theory of Motivation as a revision to Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. The ERG Theory (Existence, Relatedness, Growth) was designed to align Maslow’s theory more closely with empirical research (Alderfer & Guzzo, 1979). According to Aldefer, studies showed that the middle levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs overlapped, and Alderfer’s theory helped to address this overlap by reducing the number of levels to three. The three levels from lowest to highest are (1) Existence – concern with basic existence motivators; (2) Relatedness – motivation to develop and maintain interpersonal relationships, and (3) Growth – intrinsic desire for personal development (Aderfer & Guzzo, 1979). Alderfer’s theory demonstrates that more than one need can be present at the same time. It also demonstrates that when a higher need is frustrated or not met, individuals may regress or revert back to a lower level need in order to increase their levels of satisfaction; this is known as the *frustration-regression principle* (“Envision ERG theory of motivation,” 2012).

In applying this theory to leadership, this theory demonstrates that if leaders only focus on one area of need, they will not be able to motivate a group of people effectively. Using the *frustration-regression principle* (“Envision ERG theory of motivation,” 2012), if a leader sees that his/her employees are reverting back to old practices, or participating in undesired work activities, the leader would need to question and reflect upon what possible need is not being satisfied

to cause the employee to revert back to a lower level of need.

Herzberg's Motivational Theory

A different motivation theory to consider when reviewing job satisfaction is the Two Factor or Motivational Theory of Frederick Herzberg. Frederick Herzberg published his findings in "*The Motivation to Work*" in 1959. Herzberg (Peknik, 2010) proposed that there are factors that lead to job satisfaction, and those that lead to job dissatisfaction and that these factors are independent of one another. He identified one set of factors as Hygiene Factors: these factors impact an employee's level of dissatisfaction, but rarely influence an employee's level of job satisfaction. These factors include: supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions and salary. The second set that Herzberg identified is called Motivation Factors and, when present, these factors motivate an employee. Job dissatisfaction is not usually blamed on motivation factors, but several factors are identified as present when job satisfaction is also present. These factors include: achievement, advancement, recognition and responsibility ("Envision - motivational theory," 2012). Based on Herzberg's theory, a leader would need to be conscious that a shortage of the factors that positively encourage employees (the motivating factors) will cause employees to focus on other, non-job related hygienic factors (Petty, 2007; "Envision - motivational theory," 2012).

Herzberg explains that motivational factors are recognition, acknowledgement, responsibility, and things of a more intrinsic nature. Praise, acknowledgement, and positive reinforcement fit into this category. Herzberg's theory is an important one for educational leaders because the essential items such as complimenting someone, allowing someone

autonomy in their duties, and providing recognition are things that school leaders do have control over. If money and benefits were the only incentives, then principals, department chairs, and grade-level leaders would not have much to go on. Understanding that we can provide the interpersonal things that affect morale is very reinforcing to the educational leader (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 9).

JOB SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATION

Based upon the aforementioned motivational theories, industries and corporations have honed their recruiting efforts and resources to attract high quality individuals that “fit” their model of business, knowing that the “right fit” leads to a more, happy, more committed and more productive employee. “Motivated employees work harder, produce higher quality and greater quantities of work, are more likely to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors, and are less likely to leave the organization in search of more fulfilling opportunities” (Sandri & Bowen, 2011, p. 45). Researchers and educational leaders could question whether there are certain factors or practices that could be identified in education that would lead to more satisfied and more productive teachers. Blocker and Richardson (1963) noted that educational institutions lag far behind industries in studying staff morale. In reviewing the literature on teacher job satisfaction, there is evidence that there are certain factors that influence a teachers level of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and that a teacher’s level of job satisfaction and a teaching staff’s overall level of morale have a direct impact on student achievement and building outcomes. There is an extensive amount of research in the literature related to the topic of teacher job satisfaction.

Contributing Factors to Teacher Job Satisfaction

There are a myriad of factors and influences that impact the level of job satisfaction experienced by teachers; depending on the study, those influences vary in their order of rank. For the purpose of this literature review, the definition of teacher job satisfaction will be, “the feelings that a teacher holds toward his or her job” (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995). The definition of staff morale will reflect the *Dictionary of Education’s* definition of school morale as “the fusing of wishes and attitudes into dominant group attitudes, making it possible for the school population to act with unity in certain areas” (Good, 1973 p. 373).

In a critical review of 25 years of research in educational staff morale/job satisfaction, researchers (Blocker & Richardson, 1963) identified that teachers reported higher levels of job satisfaction when they experienced freedom in planning work, received an adequate salary, participated in policy development and believed they had a supportive and quality leader. In addition, this review of research identified that teachers who felt that they belonged, that they were getting adequate help from their supervisors and that their workload was equitable, also reported higher levels of job satisfaction. This same critical review identified teachers as dissatisfied with their jobs when they perceived that they had no participation in policy decisions, too heavy of workloads, unfair criticism, arbitrary reassignments and lack of supervision.

A study by Petty (2007) builds upon these findings. Petty’s study concluded that teachers expressed higher levels of job satisfaction when they were recognized for their accomplishments, had autonomy, more control over

their schedule, more planning time, administrative support with parents, information about the students in their classrooms, less standardized testing and more efficient meetings. When teachers were lacking or missing one of the above-mentioned areas, they expressed higher levels of job dissatisfaction.

In a study that solely focused on the causes and effects of low teacher job satisfaction/morale, researchers (Briggs & Richardson, 1993) identified nine causes to lower morale: no recognition given, overload of extra duties, criticisms, being ignored, impeded communication, large class sizes, autocratic administration, lack of support for good discipline and inspectional (only coming to look for something – usually negative) supervision. The reported internal reactions to these causes of lower job satisfaction/morale included: frustration, fear of supervision, feelings of insecurity, confusion, attitude of futility, lack of confidence, resistance to change, and excessive teacher absences.

Further adding to the research was a study by Kim and Loadman (1994) in which they sampled 2,054 teachers to identify variables that impacted teacher job satisfaction. Kim and Loadman identified three significant intrinsic variables and two extrinsic variables in their study. The intrinsic variables included professional autonomy and professional challenge. “A teacher with a high sense of autonomy and challenge uses his or her own judgments to guide instructional work with students” (p. 8). The second intrinsic variable identified was interaction with colleagues. “Relationships with colleagues, a sense of collaboration and community among faculty, and recognition from other teachers” (p. 9) all lead to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. The third intrinsic variable was the

teacher's interaction with students. When a teacher feels that they are "helping students learn, seeing them achieve, and building relationships with students" (p. 9) they report higher levels of job satisfaction. The extrinsic variables that impacted teachers' level of job satisfaction were working conditions and salary. The study found that if the conditions inhibit a teacher's ability to do what they need to do, they were likely to experience higher levels of job dissatisfaction. These working conditions included: poor building conditions, large class sizes, and lack of needed educational resources such as materials and supports. The second extrinsic variable was salary. This particular study found that "job satisfaction and pay satisfaction" (p. 9) were significantly related.

In a similar study conducted by researchers Perrachoine, Rosser and Peterson, (2008) the relationship between job satisfaction and intrinsic and extrinsic values for K-5 elementary school teachers was examined. The study concluded that intrinsic variables have the most significant impact on teacher job satisfaction. These factors included working with students and personal teaching efficacy. "The higher the teachers intrinsic motivation (impact, competence, meaningfulness, and choice), the more satisfied they were with their jobs and the less stress they experience" (Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 352). Shann's study (1998) concluded that teachers felt that the most satisfying and important part of their jobs were their relationship with their pupils. Spear (2000) concluded that the main contributor to high levels of teacher job satisfaction is working with children. There were also extrinsic variables that lead to job satisfaction: good students, teacher support, positive school environment and small class size.

This same study examined and found that extrinsic variables were only found to impact teacher job dissatisfaction. These variables included role overload, low salary, parent support (or lack thereof), student behavior and large class size.

Evans (1997) found their research on teacher morale and job satisfaction that there is differentiation among the categories of factors that influence a teacher's level of job satisfaction and overall morale. Evans challenges (Evans, 1992, 1997, 2001) that many studies struggle to define and/or differentiate between job satisfaction and morale; moreover, many studies use these two words interchangeably, which often blurs the research conclusions. Evans also denotes in the research that there are levels of school-specific factors and issues that influence teacher job satisfaction. These school specific issues can include things such as an introduction of a new curriculum or other "centrally-imposed" reforms. In addition, leadership and collegiality greatly influence a teacher's level of overall job satisfaction and staff morale (Evans, 1997). Evans concludes in multiple research studies (Evans, 1992, 1997, 2001) that it is the school specific issues that have the greatest influence on teacher job satisfaction.

Marston's (2009) study expands upon Evan's research regarding collegial relationships. Marston's study focused on why elementary, high school and college teachers teach. The study found that teachers across all levels teach to make a difference and that teachers feel a higher sense of purpose or calling to teach. The results of the study showed that faculty-colleague relationships were of high importance across all educational levels. In addition, the study noted that

having a good principal or leader was more important to elementary and high school teachers, compared to that of college professors (Martson, 2009).

One of the largest studies reviewed was the *Teacher Job Satisfaction: Lessons from the TSW Pathfinder Project* (Butt et al., 2005). This study included 32 schools in England that covered all sectors of the state schools in education. Eighty-nine percent (666 teachers) responded to the job satisfaction survey. The break down of their responses for *personal* job satisfaction is below:

88.6%	Report they were satisfied with the job itself
90.0%	Feel motivated by their job
79.6%	Feel satisfied with the kind of work they performed
80.0%	Feel they could personally grow and develop in their job
80.0%	Feel the job taps the range of skills they possess
80.0%	Feel extended or challenged by their job

The break down to their responses for *organizational* satisfaction is below:

54.0%	Feel satisfied with the communication and its flow
67.0%	Feel satisfied with the style of supervision their supervisor uses
57.6%	Feel satisfied with the way change is implemented
62.0%	Feel satisfied with the way in which conflicts are resolved
71.0%	Feel satisfied with the psychological “feel” or climate that dominates
69.3%	Feel satisfied with the shape or design of the organization’s structure

Teacher job satisfaction has been studied for the past half century, and there is only one study that looked at how teacher job satisfaction has changed over time. A study conducted by Klassen and Anderson (2009) examined and compared the levels of teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in 1962 and 2007. The study found that teachers in 1962 were most concerned about salary, conditions of buildings, equipment and poor human relations. In 2007, teachers expressed more concerns about teaching itself, rating time demands and pupil’s

behavior as the most concerning. In both studies, 1962 and 2007, there were no significant differences for job satisfaction between males and females.

Demographic Variables Influencing Teacher Job Satisfaction

Gender. There are some consistent demographic variables that emerge in the varying levels of teacher job satisfaction. Females tend to demonstrate higher levels of job satisfaction than do male teachers (Blocker & Richardson, 1963; Borg & Riding, 1991; Chapman & Lowther, 1982; Schultz, 1952). In a similar variation of this demographic, married female teachers tend to have higher levels of job satisfaction than married male teachers (Blocker & Richardson, 1963). When male and female teachers were asked if they would choose the same career if they had to do it all over again, females were more certain that they would choose to teach again than their male counterparts (Chapman & Lowther, 1982). In Borg and Riding's (1991) study, which included 545 respondents, 75% of males, and 79% of females reported they would likely choose teaching as a career again.

Male and female teachers differ in how they attach value to a variety of teaching aspects. A study conducted by Tuettemann (1991) examined how teachers differ in the importance that they attach to the rewards of teaching. In the study it was found that male and female teachers placed similar emphasis on the recognition they received from students and from their ability to help students. In addition, male and female teachers reported similar levels of distress and frustration when they were unable to handle severely disruptive

students. Females differed significantly and reported higher levels of distress than their male counterparts, when (a) they felt they were not getting the recognition from their superiors that they deserved, (b) they struggled to connect with a student, and (c) students who were in need of help did not seek them out. Male teachers also reported levels of distress in these areas, but not nearly as high as reported by female counterparts. The overall job satisfaction level for secondary teachers seems to be similar between both male and females.

“Gender differences relating to teachers’ job satisfaction and dissatisfaction has largely disappeared in 45 years between 1962 and 2007, with virtually the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction for contemporary male and female secondary school teachers” (Klassen & Anderson, 2009, p. 753).

Special education. A study conducted by Echinger (2000) noted that special education teachers have a higher attrition rate than their general education counterparts; however, the special education teachers that remain in the field express higher levels of job satisfaction than their general education peers. The special education teachers in Echinger’s (2000) study reported, according to the *Special Education Stress Index* (Heifetz & Coleman, 1984), that too much paperwork, feedback from parents, and unproductive staff meetings were their sources of stress.

Size, age, experience. Other demographics to consider in job satisfaction are (a) the size of the school a teacher is teaching in; (b) the age of the teacher and (c) the teacher’s years of teaching experience. In a study of secondary

physical education instructors, it was reported that teachers teaching in schools of 1500 students or more reported higher levels of job stress and teacher dissatisfaction compared to teachers working in schools of less than 1500 students. This same study also found age of a teacher and the years of teaching experience were not significant to levels of perceived stress and overall job satisfaction unless, the teacher was within their first five years of teaching (Greene-Reese, Johnson, & Campbell, 1991).

Implications of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

Student achievement. In examining multiple factors influencing teacher job satisfaction, there are many implications associated with varying levels of both teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Teacher job satisfaction is linked to many positive outcomes for schools and school districts. The converse of this is also true; teacher job dissatisfaction has many negative outcomes for schools and districts.

One positive outcome for having higher levels of teacher job satisfaction/staff morale is positive impact on student achievement. There have been several studies that have tried to link student achievement to teacher job satisfaction/staff morale. In a study conducted by Anderson (1953), 20 secondary schools were surveyed, and found schools with higher achievement levels had higher levels of teacher job satisfaction/staff morale compared to schools where students were achieving relatively lower. Anderson assumed that the job satisfaction level of teachers made a significant difference in the

academic achievement of their students. There does appear to be consistency across research studies linking student achievement and teacher job satisfaction/staff morale. In a study that investigated the relationship between high school principal's leadership and teachers' job satisfaction/morale (Hunter-Boykin, Evans, & Virden, 1995), the review of literature completed for the study concluded that "research on the workplace of teachers continues to demonstrate that in some schools effective leadership produces higher learning than in other schools. It is the appropriate leader behavior that enhances student achievement" (p. 942).

Productivity. Teacher job dissatisfaction leads to a plethora of issues for teachers and their administrators. Teachers that express high levels of dissatisfaction are more likely to engage in "backbiting, bickering, communicating resentments, forming cliques, and generally showing lack of consideration for others," (Briggs & Richardson, 1992). According to a study conducted by Hunter-Boykin, Evans & Virden (1995) summarized that "High morale in a school does not always contribute to high productivity. It may not sound logical, but it's true. Happy teachers are not necessarily the most productive teachers. The advantage of high morale includes low turnover, less absenteeism, and a better academic environment for instruction. The primary responsibility for motivating the teachers toward organizational goals lies with the principal" (p. 951).

Teachers that identify higher levels of job dissatisfaction are absent from school more often, have a lower commitment to the job, and report they are less likely to make a career out of teaching (Borg & Riding, 1991). "According to the National

Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), teacher attrition problems cost the nation in excess of \$7 billion annually for recruitment, administrative processing and hiring, and professional development and training of replacement teachers (NCTAF, 2007)"(Perrachione, Rosser, & Petersen, 2008, p. 1). A study conducted in Ireland in 2007 surveyed 749 newly hired primary teachers. This study strongly suggested that "the absence of positive experiences undermines commitment and efficacy rather than the occurrence of negative events" (Morgan, Ludlow, Kitching, O'Leary, & Clarke, 2010, p. 191). This same study found teachers' perceptions at the micro-level, or building level, have the greatest impact on teacher retention and teacher job satisfaction.

QUALITIES AND SKILLS OF EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

Staff describe many effective educational leaders as being authentic and “made for the job.” They say effective leaders seem “...called to leadership” and claim those leaders are “following their ‘True North.’”

True North is the internal compass that guides you successfully through life. It represents who you are as a human being at your deepest level. It is your orienting point – your fixed point in a spinning world – that helps you stay on track as a leader. Your True North is based on what is most important to you, your cherished values, your passions and motivations, the sources of satisfaction in your life. Just as a compass points toward a magnetic pole, your True North pulls you toward the purpose of your leadership. When you follow your internal compass, your leadership will be authentic, and people will naturally want to associate with you. Although others may guide or influence you, your truth is derived from your life story, and only you can determine what it should be. (George, 2007)

Leadership is defined as the influence of others towards a common goal (Mumford, 2007). In Mumford’s book, *Leadership 101*, important traits for successful leaders are categorized and described. The important traits are categorized as cognitive traits, personality traits, and interpersonal traits. Cognitive traits identified as essential for successful leaders to possess include intelligence, wisdom and expertise. The personality traits include openness, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, self-confident, emotionally mature, and having a strong sense of locus of control. The interpersonal traits include integrity, motivation and how a leader utilizes their power to work with and for other people.

In the book, *5 Essential Skills for School Leaders – Moving from Good to Great*, Langley and Jacobs (2006) describe the skills necessary for all effective

educational leaders. The first skill described is the ability to be insightful. “An effective leader should be someone who can recognize future trends and their possible impact on current strategies” (p. 19). In today’s educational environment, this would be the leader that can analyze data and make data driven decisions regarding curriculum, behavior, budget and staffing. The second skill described is positive, strong interpersonal skills. The “use of strong interpersonal skills will allow an effective leader to gain the trust of his or her staff by interacting in an optimistic way, even when at times it appears that it is impossible to do so” (p. 31). The third skill described is self-growth.

Successful leaders need to examine all components of promoting programs of self-growth (such as their availability to personnel) and, using strong, positive interpersonal skills, create an atmosphere where staff members are enthusiastic about continuing to better themselves. A well-oiled machine is the best-working mechanism only when all the parts are greased. Therefore, for a district, school, or department to strive to go from good to great, everyone should remain current with laws, trends and methods. (p. 37)

The fourth skill described is flexibility. “New state mandates and government, community and parental pressures require constant change in direction and action/reaction to today’s changing climate. A successful leader must be resilient to meet those demands” (p. 45). The fifth and final skill described in the book is keeping in touch with the community. “Successful leaders in education must also be attuned to the needs of the community and maintain an ever present yet always positive place” (p. 51). A successful educational leader also realizes that there is a community within the school walls consisting of students and staff; a community within the school community, which consists of parents/guardians and

alumni, and a surrounding community consisting of businesses, homeowners and other stakeholders.

In the book, *School Leadership that Works: From Research to Results*, Marzano et al. (2005) identified, through a meta-analysis of research, 21 responsibilities of the school leader.

1. *Affirmation*: Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failure
2. *Change Agent*: Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo
3. *Contingent Rewards*: Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments
4. *Communication*: Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students
5. *Culture*: Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation
6. *Discipline*: Protects teachers from the issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time and focus
7. *Flexibility*: Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent
8. *Focus*: Establishes clear goals and keeps those in the forefront of the school's attention
9. *Ideals/Beliefs*: Communicates and operates from strong ideals/beliefs about schooling

10. *Input*: Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies
11. *Intellectual Stimulation*: Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture
12. *Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment*: Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction and assessment practices
13. *Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment*: Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction and assessment practices
14. *Monitoring/Evaluating*: Monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning
15. *Optimizer*: Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations
16. *Order*: Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines
17. *Outreach*: Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders
18. *Relationships*: Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff
19. *Resources*: provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for successful execution of their jobs

20. *Situational Awareness*: Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems

21. *Visibility*: Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES THAT INFLUENCE JOB SATISFACTION

In Blocker and Richardson's (1963) critical review of 25 years of research in education literature, the researchers conclude "the administrator appears in study after study as the key person in respect to morale. With virtually the same environmental factors operating, high or low morale can be induced depending upon the behavior of the chief administrator" (p. 208). In this same critical review of research, one study (Bidwell, 1955) reported that teachers who perceived administrative behavior as consistent with their expectations led to higher levels of teacher satisfaction. In this same review, another study (Linder, 1955) found that lack of leadership, failure for an administrator to evaluate work, implement or follow through on policy and poorly run/developed/facilitated faculty meetings led to higher levels of job dissatisfaction.

"Principal's actions create distinct working environments within schools that are highly predictive of teacher satisfaction and commitment" (Shann, 1998, p. 67). In one study that examined the relationship of principals' leadership behavior and teachers' job satisfaction (Evans, Virden, Johnson, & Dewayne, 1990), the results indicated that principals' leadership behavior was significantly

related to teacher job satisfaction and job related stress. The study found that teachers “who worked under high-consideration, high-structure principals experienced lower role stress, higher job satisfaction, and higher job performance than teachers under other leadership styles. Additionally, teachers who worked under low-consideration, low-structure principals experienced higher role stress, higher absenteeism, lower job satisfaction and lower job performance than teachers under other leadership styles” (p. 942). In a similar study conducted by Bhella (2001), teachers expressed higher levels of job satisfaction when they had good rapport with their administrators and they felt they were involved in the curriculum and had input into school policy and other matters pertaining to their school environment. This same study also found that “teachers’ satisfaction with teaching may be affected most centrally by their experience with pupils and the activities that take place inside the classroom over which the principals may have very little control” (p. 375).

In a unique study focusing on principals’ gender and motivational style (Burkhardt, 1993), it was concluded that principals who were task-oriented (versus relationship-oriented) generated higher levels of school effectiveness and higher teacher job satisfaction with supervisors and co-workers. In addition, this same study investigated principals’ behavior and effectiveness across a variety of conditions within schools. When a school was in a moderately favorable situation or an unfavorable situation, female relationship-oriented principals generated higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than male relationship-oriented or task-oriented principals. In a more unique study, Hurren (2006)

examined the effects of principals' humor on teachers' job satisfaction. Hurren's study concluded that principals that shared their humor in the workplace had teachers with higher levels of job satisfaction than principals who shared very little or no humor in the workplace.

Chapman's and Lowther's (1982) study investigated teachers' satisfaction with teaching. The study found a strong positive relationship with the recognition the teacher received from his/her building administrator and overall career satisfaction. Davis and Wilson studied (2000), the impact of principal empowerment behaviors (PEB) on teacher motivation, teacher job satisfaction and job stress. The study found that there was a significant relationship between the PEB score and teachers' overall motivation. "More specifically, the more principals participate in empowering behaviors, the greater the impact teachers feel they are able to make by fulfilling work-related tasks and the more likely they are to see that they have choices in selecting actions that will lead toward positive outcomes" (Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 352).

Specific leadership practices that enhance teacher job satisfaction and staff morale are difficult to find in the review of literature. In a study that examined cause and effect of low morale among secondary teachers (Briggs & Richardson, 1993), the researchers made the following suggestions for secondary principals to develop high morale:

- Develop channels of communication that will keep teachers informed of progress toward mutually arrived at goals

- Involve teachers in planning the curriculum changes that will directly affect them
- Develop a team concept by assigning each professional member a role and responsibility in the development of the education program
- Develop a forum for the discussion of problems confronting teachers, supervisors, and administrators: i.e., a Theory Y approach

In a master's thesis completed by Hanson (1989, p.36), the researcher concluded with the following recommendations for administrators to develop staff satisfaction and morale in their schools:

- Attempt on a regular basis to obtain systematic feedback from the staff as individuals and as a group, on the perceptions of their problems, concerns, and issues which they feel affect them personally or the school generally.
- Exert a major effort toward improving the satisfaction that staff derives from their work.
- Strive to improve the operation of the school and the overall quality of the educational program of the school. People feel pleased and proud to work in a school that is efficiently administered and that offers a quality educational program.
- Try to be sensitive to problems of an interpersonal nature between and among teachers, students and parents, and try to mediate these problems when appropriate.

- Provide meaningful participation for teachers in the decision-making process of the school.
- Practice good human relations in your interactions with the faculty as a whole and with individual faculty members.

Evans (1992, 1997 & 2001) is a leading researcher in the area of teacher morale, job satisfaction and motivation. "Understanding what matters to people, and in particular, knowing precisely what are the key issues upon which the acceptability of an individual's work context depends are crucial to effective leadership" (Evans, 2001, p. 305). In the research article, *Delving Deeper into Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation Among Education Professionals: Re-examining the Leadership Dimension*, (2001), Evans suggests two types of leadership practices that lead to improving morale, job-satisfaction and motivation among teachers. The first recommended leadership practice is teacher-centered leadership. Teacher-centered leadership is "predicated upon acceptance that leaders and managers have as much responsibility towards the staff whom they lead and manage as they do towards the pupils and students within their institution, and that this responsibility extends as far as endeavoring to meet as many individual needs as possible, within the confines imposed by having to consider more corporate needs" (p. 303). This type of leadership demands a very visible, intuitive leader that makes an effort to demonstrate on a daily basis that they care for and support their staff. The second recommended leadership practice is called the contractual approach. This approach includes clearly defined lines of communication, more defined roles and how those roles

ultimately fit into the building and organization's chain of command. Evans describes this contractual approach as "institutional and departmental leaders setting out expectations of teachers but also the nature of the managerial and leadership service that they would be prepared to provide" (p. 303). Evans concludes that by implementing these two leadership practices, principals and building leaders have a higher likelihood of improving morale, job satisfaction and motivation because the degree of match between teachers and the contexts in which they work will be more congruent.

Another strategy identified in enhancing a leader's practice is the use of 360-degree feedback. In Alimo-Metcalfe's (1998) study, the benefits of utilizing 360-degree feedback and leadership development were identified. 360-degree feedback is an evaluation tool where their staff and other administrators evaluate administrators. The administrator also reviews himself or herself. The premise behind this practice is that the more in-tune a leader is with his/her own perceptions of personal leadership abilities and how those perceptions match up with the staff they are leading, the more effective the leader will be. "The stronger the relationship between a manager's self-perceptions with that of their staff, the more likely they are to be perceived by their staff as transformational" (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1998, p. 36).

In reviewing the book, *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*, (Bass & Avolio, 1994) transformational leadership is significantly related to objective outcome measures. When applying these objective measures to the field of public education, "these include: high levels of

commitment, motivation, job satisfaction, and performance of staff; employee innovation, harmony and good citizenship” (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1998, p. 37). Bass (1994) describes four main qualities of a transformational leader: (1) charisma or idealized influence – embodying role models that followers strive to emulate and align around a vision, common purpose and mission (2) inspirational motivation – providing meaning and optimism about the mission and its attainability, (3) intellectual stimulation – ensuring that the charisma is grounded in reality, and (4) individual consideration – a fundamental belief in the value of others in the organization.

In the book, *Bringing Out the Best in Teachers: What Effective Principals Do – 3rd Edition* (Blase & Kirby, 2009) key strategies are identified to help educational leaders influence teachers and their performance. Blase and Kirby identify eight key elements regarding effective principals and they identify a list of strategies that are associated with each of these elements. The basis or foundation for the book was based upon the open responses that were collected during their research study which included over 1200 teachers responding to the *Inventory of Strategies Used by Principals to Influence Teachers (ISUPIT)* survey. Blase and Kirby (2009) were similar in their premise to that of Alimo-Metcalfe's (1998) research; both sets of researchers believed that the more in-tune a leader is with his/her own perceptions of leadership practices, and how those perceptions match-up with the staff they are leading, the more effective the leader will be. Blase and Kirby (2009) identified strategies utilized by principals and had teachers evaluate the effectiveness of those strategies in relation to their

own personal job satisfaction and their overall level of morale. Through this study, the eight key elements and associated strategies included:

1. *The Power of Praise*: “Praise was the most frequently reported and was perceived as one of the most effective by teachers in our study” (Blase & Kirby, 2009 p.10). Praise impacts a teacher’s self-esteem and provides recognition. Teachers suggestions for how principals should praise include: praise sincerely, maximize the use of non-verbal communication (smiles, nods, touches to communicate approval), schedule time for teacher recognition, write brief personal notes or e-mails to compliment individuals, show pride by boasting, praise briefly and target praise to teachers’ work.

2. *Influence by Expecting*: “The expectations of students, parents, teachers and administrators are all positively related to student outcomes” (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 22). The strategies to influence by expecting include: expect, communicate what is expected, communicate consistently, repeat-restate-clarify, seize and create opportunities, generalize expectations – personalize feedback and provide appropriate models.

3. *Influencing by Involving*: This means creating a shared decision-making process that capitalizes on the expertise of the staff within the school building. Strategies to influence by involving include: manage agreement, involve individuals, use every opportunity to involve informally, encourage formal mechanisms for involvement, know when not to involve, respect the

decisions of the team, emphasize continuous school improvement and emphasize the use of data for school improvement.

4. *Influence by Granting Professional Autonomy*: “Autonomy refers to the degree of freedom (i.e. professional discretion) that individuals have in determining the work process” (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 58). Strategies to influence by granting professional autonomy include: emphasize what is meant by autonomy – emphasize freedom to, not freedom from, emphasize that autonomy is extended out of a sense of trust – it is not an abandonment of authority, use other influence strategies in conjunction with autonomy and assess individual readiness for autonomy.

5. *Leading by Standing Behind*: Principals in the Blase & Kirby study (2009) found that teachers’ overall capacity were enhanced through direct assistance in four main areas: “provision of the material and financial resources necessary to teach, support for the teachers in the area of student discipline, protection of the allocated instructional time, and reward for teachers’ efforts” (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 68). Strategies to address these four main areas include: devote ample time to orient new teachers to school and district resources, ensure that all teachers have a sufficient number of appropriate textbooks for all students, provide the means for teachers to attend professional development conferences, collaborate with teachers to write school improvement grants, work with teachers to develop and implement a student discipline policy, support teachers’ decision on discipline issues unless those decisions are

inconsistent with written policy, monitor and develop teachers' classroom management skills, take time to listen to teachers who have problems with student discipline, limit the number of scheduled meetings, limit paperwork and provide creative tangible rewards.

6. *Influence by Gentle Nudges*: Suggesting vs. directing; help and support provided by the principal "must be perceived by teachers not as orders, but as friendly, concerned advice" (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 81). Strategies to influence in this area include: know when to push and when to nudge, know how to give advice-particularly regarding instruction, provide training opportunities to reinforce goals and improve instruction, allow discretion in implementation of knowledge gained through staff development, assist teachers in evaluating newly attempted techniques and keep informed of new developments in curriculum and instruction and provide relevant information to teachers.

7. *Influence by Positive Use of Formal Authority*: "Power is vested not in rank or title, but in those with valued expertise and strong interpersonal skills. Power and influence are functions of the person, not only the position" (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 93). Strategies to influence the use of formal authority include: work to change bureaucratic rules and policies that reduce teachers' status, where authority is necessary to enforce necessary rules or policies, justify its use in ethical terms, solicit input in creating policies that may have to be enforced through the exercise of

authority, accept that there are appropriate times to exercise authority and dispense authoritative punishments with care.

8. *Mirrors to the Possible*: In Blase and Kirby's study (2009), teachers reported that "effective principals are highly visible and model attitudes and behaviors consistent with personal values and with the expectations they hold for teachers" (p. 103). Strategies that will help mirror the possible include: not becoming so concerned with being effective as to ignore the affective, practice being more optimistic, and be visible – but beware the power of the mirror (meaning the mirror never stops reflecting).

In Whitakers' book, *Motivating and Inspiring Teachers: The Educational Leader's Guide for Building Staff Morale – 2nd Edition*, (2009) the authors strategies that leaders can use to make a positive impact on staff morale. The premise behind the book is that the authors agree that teachers have the greatest impact on the daily functions of the building, on the school culture and climate, on student achievement and the overall outcomes from the educational setting. With this belief, the authors developed strategies in six main areas in order to guide education leaders in building and improving their staff's morale. The six main areas included these themes:

1. *The Role of the Leader*: This area included strategies that would help educational leaders understand "why it all works" by exploring a variety of theoretical frameworks, by understanding staff dynamics, identifying

teacher leaders, raising the praise and minimizing the criticizing, and building a shared vision.

2. *Communication: It's What You Say and How You Say It:* This area included strategies regarding perception around communication , staff memos, sharpening the focus of communication, making a difference each day, and strategies to show off the school.

3. *Supervision, Evaluation and Morale Improvement:* This area included strategies to find time to be visible and present, to turn what could be a painful or negative process into a positive growth process, establishing credibility and creating professional development plans for staff.

4. *Meetings, Meetings, Meetings. You mean these can be fun?:* This area included strategies to improve monthly staff meetings, to improve small group meetings and to develop meaningful staff development opportunities.

5. *Special Is as Special Does:* This area included strategies that help to build and enhance building morale such as fitness and wellness opportunities and strategies to make everybody feel like somebody.

6. *Focusing Outside the Staff to Affect Staff Morale:* This area focuses on enhancing the physical aspects of the working environment and it encourages the educational leader to set the example through getting staff buy in.

The above guiding strategies from Blase & Kirby (2009) and Whitaker, Whitaker & Lumpa (2009) will be utilized to create the theoretical framework for the proposed study found in chapter three.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Background

A study conducted by M. Zigarelli (1996) concluded that the single, general measure of teacher satisfaction is a highly significant predictor of effective schools. Hattie's (2003) meta-analysis of studies regarding teacher efficacy found that "teachers' responses made up 30% of the variance of determining what influenced learning the most" (Hemric, Eury, & Shellman, 2008). The knowledge the teacher possesses and their level of job satisfaction are the keys to quality teaching (Bolin, 2008). "Many studies indicate that social factors such as group interaction, supportive relationships, skills, high performance goals, and above all, morale, are the most important determinants of productivity and success in human enterprises" (Bhella, 2001, p. 369). Multiple studies have found that teachers whose students achieve relatively high scholastically have higher levels of job satisfaction (Bhella, 2001, Koura, 1963, Anderson, 1953). These studies conclude that students' achievement increases with teachers who have higher levels of job satisfaction, and decreases with teachers with low levels of job satisfaction. In addition, a critical review of 25 years of teacher job satisfaction/morale research conducted by Blocker and Richardson (2002) concludes that the key to teacher morale and job satisfaction

is the administrator and the leadership that the building administrator provides. With these facts in mind, it would seem imperative that a leader in education understand how to increase the level of teacher job satisfaction and overall staff morale as they have a direct impact on student achievement and school effectiveness (Zigarelli, 1996, Bhella 2001, Blocker & Richardson, 2002).

Purpose

Research studies have identified qualities of an effective educational leader (Marzano et al., 2005, Langley & Jacobs 2006, Covey). Studies also have found that higher levels of teacher job satisfaction are affected the building principal (Blocker and Richardson, 2002). However, there have been few studies conducted that identify key strategies or practices that educational leaders can utilize to improve teacher job satisfaction/staff morale. “Interestingly, because we believe high staff morale (teacher job satisfaction) is so critical, and because it applies to every school, we assumed that there were many books on building staff morale (teacher job satisfaction) for educators. Surprisingly, such books are almost non-existent” (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. xvii).

Many would argue that school principals could affect virtually all aspects of school life. Yet, empirical research provides few detailed pictures of everyday social and behavioral dynamics of effective school-based leadership. This is especially true with regard to understanding leadership from the perspective of teachers and, in particular, how school leadership enhances teachers and their overall performance. (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 2)

Research, over several decades, has identified what impacts teacher job satisfaction and what leads to overall higher levels of staff morale and also clearly identifies the qualities of an effective educational leader. The research

consistently identifies the educational leader as a predominant factor in influencing higher levels of staff morale and teacher job satisfaction, but there is little research that identifies the specific practices an educational leader utilizes to improve teacher job satisfaction. The purpose of this study is to identify which practices building principals use to improve teacher job satisfaction and examine how effective those practices are as perceived by the teaching staff.

Research Methods

In quantitative research, “researchers collect numerical data, or information, from individuals or groups and usually subject these data to statistical analyses to determine whether there are relationships among them” (Slavin, 2007, p. 7). In this study, leadership practices were analyzed to determine which practices principals identified as important to improving teacher job satisfaction and which principal practices teachers identified as having the greatest impact on improving their level of job satisfaction. In addition, a comparison was conducted between what principals and teachers identified as important practices in improving teacher job satisfaction.

A quantitative research methodology was used to conduct an in-depth case study on principal practices and teacher job satisfaction. In quantitative research, “researchers seek facts and causes of human behavior and want to know a lot about a few variables so differences can be identified” (Roberts, 2010, p. 142). “Case study research excels at bringing us to an understanding of a complex issue or object and can extend experience or add strength to what is already known through previous research” (<http://www.glsis.edu>***Cite***). Case

studies allow the researcher to intensively examine a person, group or setting with the aim to generalize the information to a larger set of people, groups or settings (Gerring, 2004). An in-depth case study consisting of 25 principals and 488 certified teachers examined the following research questions:

1. What leadership practices do principals utilize to attempt to develop and improve teacher job satisfaction?
2. What do teachers identify as the key practices that principals use that have the most impact on their job satisfaction?
3. What are the differences between what principals and teachers identify as the key practices that principals use that have the most impact on teacher job satisfaction?
4. What are the differences in principal's perceptions of their teaching staff's overall job satisfaction across the principal's gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level, and building size?
5. What are the differences in the teacher's reported overall job satisfaction across the teacher's gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level, building size, and subject area?

Theoretical Framework Informing Research Methodology

Effective case studies utilize a conceptual or theoretical framework to allow the data to be analyzed or reviewed and placed in categories based upon their relationship to the research questions used by the researcher. "The conceptual or theoretical framework provides the boundaries, or scaffolding, for

your study” (Roberts, 2010, p. 129). In reviewing the literature, several researchers emerged in regards to their explicit focus on building principal practices and how their practices improved or could improve teacher job satisfaction.

In Whitakers’ book, *Motivating and Inspiring Teachers: The Educational Leader’s Guide for Building Staff Morale*, multiple strategies were identified that, according to Whitaker, have helped educational leaders build staff morale and improve teacher job satisfaction within their educational settings. The strategies that were identified were classified in six main categories. Within each category, multiple strategies and practices were identified to assist educational leaders in enhancing teacher job satisfaction. In the book, *Bringing Out the Best in Teachers: What Effective Principals Do – 3rd Edition* (Blase & Kirby, 2009) key strategies are delineated to help educational leaders influence teachers and their performance. Blase and Kirby offered eight key elements regarding effective principals and constructed a list of strategies associated with each of those elements. The premise or foundation of Blase and Kirby’s work centered on open response perceptions of the effectiveness of building principal leadership strategies that were collected during their study of over 1,200 teachers who responded to the *Inventory of Strategies Used by Principals to Influence Teachers (ISUPIT)* survey. Based upon the works of Whitaker et. al (2009) and Blase & Kirby, (2009) the theoretical framework for this dissertation was conceived and employed.

According to these researchers, teacher job satisfaction improves or is achieved at higher levels when a building principal demonstrates skills and strengths in the following areas:

1. *Staff Acknowledgement/Recognition*: Principals have more satisfied teaching staff members and higher levels of staff morale when they are cognizant of and make daily conscious efforts to recognize and appreciate their staff. In Blase and Kirby's study (2009) "praise was the most frequently reported and perceived as the most effective" (p.10) strategy used by building principals. These principals are described as the principals that "raise the praise and minimize the criticize" (Whitaker et. al, 2009), "love their employees" (Fullen, 2008) and "brag" about what their teachers do and how they do it every chance they get. Acknowledging staff effectively not only means recognizing the positive practices of teachers, but also having a system in place to address the ineffective practices of teachers. Teachers with higher levels of job satisfaction identified that their principals have clearly developed and consistently implemented supervision and evaluation practices. Effective principals demonstrate a balance between supporting and guiding their staff and utilizing their formal authority.
2. *Shared Leadership*: Principals influence their staff by involving them and creating a shared decision-making process. Effective principals capitalize on the expertise and passion of their staff and they create a culture where team decisions are a priority. Principals develop,

implement and encourage both formal and informal mechanisms for involvement and they emphasize continuous school improvement.

3. *Professional Autonomy*: “Autonomy refers to the degree of freedom (i.e. professional discretion) that individuals have in determining the work process” (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 58). Principals work with their staff and emphasize that professional autonomy is granted out of a sense of trust and that it is a freedom to, not a freedom from.
4. *Creating Staff Expectations*: “Principals use expectations to achieve two broad goals: changes in attitudes and changes in behaviors” (Kirby & Blase, 2009, p.24). Principals consistently communicate and model the expectations that they have for staff. Effective principals recognize staff when they are meeting expectations, and they intervene when staff are not meeting expectations.
5. *Leading by Standing Behind*: Principals in the Blase & Kirby study (2009) found that teachers’ overall capacities were enhanced through direct assistance in four main areas: “provision of the material and financial resources necessary to teach, support for the teachers in the area of student discipline, protection of the allocated instructional time, and reward for teachers’ efforts” (Blase & Kirby, 2009, p. 68).
6. *Communication*: Principals have multi-faceted ways to communicate with their teaching staff and their communications are clear, consistent and concise. Effective principals understand that it is not what they say that matters but how they say it, and most importantly, how it is

perceived. Principals who inspire higher levels of teacher job satisfaction have teachers that report their principals are genuine in their communications, hold meetings that are purposeful, and the principal's non-verbal communications is often more powerful than their verbal or written communications.

7. *Professional Role*: Effective principals understand their professional role, understand staff dynamics and employ a variety of strategies to encourage and lead their staff. These principals influence staff by expecting high levels of student engagement, high levels of teacher/school involvement and teaching efficacy. Building principals who are visible lead by example and “mirror the possible” (Blase & Kirby, 2009).

Instrumentation

Based upon this dissertation's theoretical and conceptual framework, the following two survey instruments were developed to collect data regarding the practices building principals used the most to improve teacher job satisfaction and to examine how effective those practices were as perceived by the teaching staff.

The first survey instrument, “Leadership Practices” (Appendix A), measured what principals identified as the most important practices that could be employed to improve teacher job satisfaction. Different strategies that are associated with the seven core areas of the theoretical framework (professional role, communication, staff acknowledgement, professional autonomy, supporting

staff [leading by standing behind], creating staff expectations and shared leadership) were identified on the survey instrument, and principals were asked to identify the three strategies that they believe had the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction. At the end of each core area, an open comment box was listed to allow a principal to identify additional practices that he/she believed were relevant to improving teachers' job satisfaction. At the conclusion of the survey, the principal was asked to rate on a scale from one-ten (one being the lowest and ten being the highest), what they believed was the overall level of job satisfaction among his/her teaching staff.

The second survey, "Teacher Survey" (Appendix B), measured what teachers believed were the most important practices that a principal could employ to create higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. Different strategies that are associated with the seven core areas of the theoretical framework (professional role, communication, staff acknowledgement, professional autonomy, supporting staff (leading by standing behind), creating staff expectations and shared leadership) were identified on the survey instrument, and teachers were asked to identify the three strategies that they believed had the greatest impact on their level of job satisfaction. At the end of each core area, an open comment box was listed to allow a teacher to identify additional principal practices that he/she felt were relevant to improving his/her level of job satisfaction. At the conclusion of the survey, the teacher was asked to rate on a scale from one-ten (one being the lowest and ten being the highest), what he/she believed was his/her overall level of job satisfaction.

In order to ensure the reliability and validity of the survey instruments, the surveys were given to multiple test groups to be refined prior to implementation. The “Leadership Practices” survey was given to both a doctoral level cohort of district administrators and to a large (7,000 plus students) district administrative professional learning community. The two administrative groups completed the survey, and then provided feedback for wording and re-wording of survey questions. The “Teacher Survey” was given to ten teachers in an elementary building, ten teachers in a middle school building and ten teachers in a high school setting. The teachers completed the survey, provided individual feedback and then met as a large group to provide feedback for wording and re-wording of survey questions. Once both the administrative and teacher survey pilots were completed, the researcher analyzed the responses to ensure that there was consistency in the responses given. As a final step, the researcher had the dissertation committee make final revisions and the surveys were submitted to the IRB office and were approved.

Sample Selection

The population for this study consisted of 25 principals and 488 certified teachers working in K-12 public schools in Minnesota. Convenience sampling was used to identify principals and teachers for participation in this study. Convenience sampling is “a statistical method of drawing representative data by selecting people because of the ease of their volunteering or selecting units because of their availability or easy access” (www.phoenix.edu). The researcher met with multiple superintendents and principals and gave a brief overview of the

study and asked permission for the principals and certified teachers to participate in the study. The criteria for selection included:

1. The superintendent and/or principal were familiar with the researcher, but not someone in which the researcher had any type of direct working relationship.
2. The principals participating in the study needed to agree to ask their certified teaching staff to consider volunteering to participate in the study.

The rationale for selecting the first criterion was two-fold: (1) to minimize bias by not having any participants that had a direct working relationship with the researcher; (2) to access potential willing volunteers to increase the likelihood of a larger sample size of principals and certified teachers. The rationale for criterion two suggests that each principal's willingness to participate in the study is important and that the participation of his or her certified teaching staff is critical. This second criterion was established to increase the likelihood of a larger certified teacher sample.

Data Collection Methods

Data collection began in December of 2012 and was completed on January 25th, 2013. The researcher contacted multiple superintendents and principals to seek out participants for the study. The researcher mailed a two-page letter (Appendix C) that overviewed the purpose of the study and requested that principals and teachers participate in the study by completing the "Leadership Practices Survey" and the "Teacher Survey." The researcher also

included copies of the “Leadership Practices Survey” and “Teacher Survey” (Appendices A and B) as well as permission forms to participate in the study (Appendices D and E).

Once the superintendent or principal expressed interest, the researcher met with each potential participating principal and gained signed permission for the principal to complete the “Leadership Practice Survey” and a commitment that the principal would ask his/her teaching staff to volunteer. As part of the permission process, principals identified when they would like the survey window to be opened and closed. Surveys were distributed via an e-mail, which contained a brief explanation of the study and a Survey Monkey link to the survey. Half way through the survey window, principals were sent an e-mail telling them how many teachers had completed the survey. Principals sent a reminder asking staff to volunteer for the survey and they included the survey link in the e-mail reminder. Twenty-seven principals’ agreed to participate in the study and by January 25th, 2013, 25 principals completed the “Leadership Practices Survey,” a response rate of 93%. With the principals participating in the study, there was a potential for 807 certified teaching staff to complete the “Teacher Survey.” By January 25th, 2013, 488 certified teachers had completed the “Teacher Survey,” a response rate of 61%.

Methods of Analysis

The results of the “Leadership Practices Survey” and the “Teacher Survey” were downloaded into excel spreadsheets. Data were imported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), where it was analyzed.

To answer research question one, the percent of principals who identified each item as one of the three practices having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction was calculated. Research question two was analyzed in the same way, by calculating the percent of teachers who identified each item as one of the three practices having the greatest impact on their level of job satisfaction.

A comparative analysis was used to address research question three. To determine whether there was a difference between what principals identified as key practices to increase teacher job satisfaction and what teachers identified as key practices that principals could use to improve teacher job satisfaction, a two-proportion z-test for independent samples was used. This test is used to determine whether the difference between the two proportions is significant. In this instance, the two proportions being compared were the proportion of principals identifying a key practice and the proportion of teachers identifying a key practice. Results were calculated for each pair of key practice responses from principals and teachers.

One of the assumptions that must be met for this test is that the sample size must justify the normal approximation distribution. To test this, $n_1p_1 > 5$ and $n_1(1-p_1) > 5$ must be true; where n_1 is sample size of group 1 and p_1 is the proportion or ratio of hits (Lowry, 2013). This assumption was not always met with the principal data. When this assumption was not met, z could not be calculated.

To answer research questions four and five, the data were split and looked at separately for principals and teachers. When looking at teachers and

principals one at a time, a *t*-test was conducted to determine if overall levels of satisfaction perceptions differed across genders. To look for differences across the other variables that were part of the research question, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. ANOVA is a test of the hypothesis, where the mean of the tested variable is equal to that of the factor (Slavin, 2007). A one-way ANOVA is the analysis of the variance of the values (of a dependent variable), in this case the perceived overall level of satisfaction, by comparing one group to other independent variables like: age, years of experience, building size, etc. Post-hoc tests were used when significant *F*-statistics were found to determine which groups were significantly different from which other groups. Again, the type of test used was dependent upon whether the homogeneity of variances assumed, were violated.

Additional analyses were done to address the last question on the survey, in which the principal was asked to rate on a scale from one to ten (one being the lowest and ten being the highest), what they believed was the overall level of job satisfaction among their teaching staff. Teachers were asked to rate on a scale from one to ten as well what they believed to be the overall level of job satisfaction as a teacher. An independent sample *t*-test was conducted to test whether a significant difference existed between principals' and teachers' perceptions.

When conducting an independent samples *t*-test, equal variances are assumed. When analyzing this data using a *t*-test, Levene's test for equality of variances revealed variances in reported perceived overall job satisfaction were

not equal (Field, 2009). Therefore, an adjustment was made and t was calculated assuming unequal variances.

Qualitative analysis was used for a portion of the data analysis. In qualitative research, researchers “typically seek to describe a given setting in its full richness and complexity to explore reasons that a situation exists” (Slavin, 2007, p. 8). In this study, the responses in the open comment boxes on the survey instruments were analyzed, coded, placed into themes, and reported according to their relevance in each area.

A qualitative research methodology with open comment boxes as part of the survey instrument was used and allowed for an intensive case study to be completed. The data were examined and analyzed with the assumption that what was learned from the principals and teachers participating in the study, coupled with the existing research base, allowed for generalizations to be made regarding leadership practices of principals and their impact on teacher job satisfaction.

Assumptions

Assumptions are conditions that are thought to be true (Roberts, 2010). In this study, it is assumed:

- Principals want their teachers to have high rates of job satisfaction and that high job satisfaction is important.
- Principals are intentional about their efforts in working to improve the levels of teacher job satisfaction in their buildings.

- Principals care about their staff, and that teachers want to be subordinate to a principal that cares about them.
- Teachers and principals will be truthful/honest, though teachers may feel uncomfortable reflecting on principals' practices.

Limitations

Limitations are conditions over which the researcher does not have any control (Roberts, 2010). The limitations within this study include:

- The participation survey return rate of the teaching staff and principals.
- The manner in which the survey was introduced to teaching staff as this was done by the building principals.
- The level of involvement or support of the districts superintendents.
- The information gained from this study is based upon what the participants reported.
- The researcher utilized a sample of convenience and participants may have responded due to the connection with the researcher.
- Principals participating in this study sought to learn from their teaching staff and they encouraged them to participate; this could elevate the teacher survey return rate and responses.

Delimitations

Delimitations are the parameters that the researcher places on the study, and the researcher has control over the delimitations (Roberts, 2010). This study

is focused on the leadership practices of building principals and how they impact teacher job satisfaction.

- The researcher utilized a sample of convenience to gain participants for the study.
- The researcher sought participants from multiple school districts across multiple grade levels.

Summary

In summary, the goal of this doctoral dissertation was to identify key leadership practices that principals use to attempt to improve teacher job satisfaction and what key practices teachers identified as having the greatest impact on their level of job satisfaction. Employing the theoretical and conceptual framework of Whitaker et. al (2009) and Blase and Kirby (2009) an intensive case study involving 25 principals and 488 certified teachers was completed and the data were examined and analyzed to the existing body of research to gain new insight and provide general direction to the leadership practices of principals and their impact on teacher job satisfaction

Chapter IV

FINDINGS

STUDY OVERVIEW

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify those leadership practices principals used to improve teacher job satisfaction and those leadership practices identified by teachers as having the greatest impact on their level of job satisfaction. In addition, the study investigated the similarities and differences between the principal and teacher responses.

Research Methodology

This chapter reports the findings of the study. The data are analyzed and organized by research question. Due to some of the significant findings within the data, an additional analysis was completed to determine if there was a significant difference between principals' perceptions of teachers' level of job satisfaction, and teachers' reported level of job satisfaction. The following research questions were used in the study:

1. What leadership practices do principals utilize to attempt to develop and improve teacher job satisfaction?

2. What do teachers identify as the key practices that principals use to have the most impact on their job satisfaction?
3. What are the differences principals and teachers identify as the key practices principals use that have the most impact on teacher job satisfaction?
4. What are the differences in principals' perceptions of their teaching staff's overall job satisfaction across the principals' gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level, and building size?
5. What are the differences in the teachers' reported job satisfaction by teacher gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level, building size, and subject area?

Analysis

Analysis of the data was done using the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS). To answer research question one, the percent of principals who identified each item as one of the three practices having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction was calculated. Research question two was analyzed similarly, by calculating the percent of teachers who identified each item as one of the three practices having the greatest impact on their level of job satisfaction.

A comparative analysis was used to address research question three. To determine whether there was a difference between key practices the principals identified to increase teacher job satisfaction and key practices identified by teachers that principals could use to improve teacher job satisfaction, a two-

proportion z-test for independent samples was used. This test was used to determine whether the difference between the two proportions was significant. In this instance, the two proportions being compared were the proportion of principals identifying a key practice and the proportion of teachers identifying a key practice. This was calculated for each pair of key practice responses from principals and teachers.

One of the assumptions that must be met for this test was that the sample size must justify the normal approximation distribution. To test this, $n_1p_1 > 5$ and $n_1(1-p_1) > 5$ must be true; where n_1 is sample size of group 1 and p_1 is the proportion or ratio of hits (Lowry, 2013). This assumption was not always met with the principal data. When this assumption was not met, z could not be calculated.

To answer research questions four and five, the data were split and examined separately for principals and teachers. When inspecting teachers' data then principals, individually, a *t*-test was conducted to determine if overall levels of satisfaction perceptions differed across genders. To search for differences across other variables that were part of the research question, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. This is a test of the hypothesis where the mean of the tested variable is equal to that of the factor (Slavin, 2007). A one-way ANOVA is the analysis of the variance of the values (of a dependent variable), in this case the perceived overall level of satisfaction—by comparing one group to others (the independent variable, in this study, the variables such as age, years of experience, building size, other.). Post-hoc tests were used

when significant F -statistics were found to determine *which* groups were significantly different from other groups. Again, the type of test employed was dependent upon whether or not the homogeneity of variances assumption was violated.

Additional analyses were done to address the final question on the survey, when principals were asked to rate on a scale from one to ten (one being the lowest and ten being the highest), what they believed were the overall levels of job satisfaction among members of their teaching staff. Teachers were asked to rate on a scale from one to ten what they believed to be their overall levels of job satisfaction as teachers. An independent sample t -test was conducted to determine whether or not a significant difference existed between principals' and teachers' perceptions.

When conducting an independent samples t -test, equal variances are assumed. When analyzing these data using a t -test, Levene's test for equality of variances revealed variances in reported perceived overall job satisfaction as not equal (Field, 2009). Therefore, an adjustment was made and t was calculated assuming unequal variances.

Qualitative analysis was used for a portion of the data analysis. In qualitative research, researchers "typically seek to describe a given setting in its full richness and complexity to explore reasons that a situation exists" (Slavin, 2007, p. 8). In this study, the responses in the open comment boxes on the survey instruments were analyzed, coded, placed into themes, and reported according to their relevance in each area.

A qualitative research methodology with open comment boxes as part of the survey instrument was used and allowed for an intensive case study to be completed. The data were examined and analyzed with the intent that the information acquired from the principals and teachers participating in the study, coupled with the existing research base, would result in the formulation of generalizations about leadership practices of principals and their impact on teacher job satisfaction.

Sample Demographics

In this study, 21 schools agreed to participate. The principal participants were asked to complete the “Leadership Survey,” and the teacher participants were asked to complete the “Teacher Survey.” From the 21 schools participating in the study, there 807 potential teacher respondents to the “Teacher Survey” and 27 potential principal respondents to the “Leadership Survey.” This chapter contains data gathered from 488 teacher respondents (a response rate of 61%) and 25 principal respondents (a response rate of 93%).

Both principals and teachers were asked to respond to a series of demographic questions. The data for the demographic information are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Demographics of Respondents

Demographics	Principals		Teachers	
	N	%	N	%
Gender				
Female	11	44.0%	369	75.6%
Male	14	56.0%	105	21.5%
No Response	0	0.0%	14	2.9%
Age				
25-35	3	12.0%	165	33.8%
36-45	8	32.0%	156	32.0%
46-55	10	40.0%	103	21.1%
56 plus	4	16.0%	42	8.6%
No Response	0	0.0%	22	4.5%
Total Years Experience				
0-3 years	3	12.0%	37	7.6%
4-7 years	8	32.0%	76	15.6%
8-12 years	6	24.0%	114	23.4%
13-17 years	4	16.0%	106	21.7%
18 or more years	3	12.0%	143	29.3%
No Response	1	4.0%	12	2.5%
Grade Level				
Elementary	14	56.0%	308	63.1%
Middle	3	12.0%	94	19.3%
High School	8	32.0%	57	11.7%
Alternative Education	0	0.0%	4	0.8%
K-12	0	0.0%	13	2.7%
No Response	0	0.0%	12	2.5%
District Type				
Metro	3	12.0%	24	4.9%
Suburban	12	48.0%	277	56.8%
Out-State	10	40.0%	173	35.5%
No Response	0	0.0%	14	2.9%
Building Size				
Less than 150 students	0	0.0%	5	1.0%
Between 150-250 students	0	0.0%	3	0.6%
Between 250-400 students	2	8.0%	44	9.0%
Between 400-600 students	7	28.0%	193	39.5%
Between 600-800 students	9	36.0%	110	22.5%
Between 800-1,000 students	3	12.0%	105	21.5%
More than 1,000 students	4	16.0%	17	3.5%
No Response	0	0.0%	11	2.3%
Subject Area Taught				
Elementary			213	43.6%
Reading/language arts/English			39	8.0%
Science			18	3.7%
Social Studies			19	3.9%
Math			25	5.1%

Table 1 Cont.

Demographics	Principals		Teachers	
	N	%	N	%
Special Education			74	15.2%
Music			20	4.1%
Art			5	1.0%
Physical education/health			17	3.5%
No Response			58	11.9%
Years with Building Principal				
0-3 years			233	47.7%
4-7 years			141	28.9%
8-12 years			69	14.1%
12-18			20	4.1%
18 or more years			12	4.1%
No Response			13	2.5%
Years Experience as Principal in Minnesota				
0-3 years	4	16.0%		
4-7 years	8	32.0%		
8-12 years	6	24.0%		
13-18 years	4	16.0%		
18 or more years	2	8.0%		
No Response	1	4.0%		
Years Experience in Education prior to Becoming a Principal				
0-5 years	2	8.0%		
6-10 years	8	32.0%		
11-15 years	8	32.0%		
16-20 years	3	12.0%		
21 or more years	3	12.0%		
No Response	1	4.0%		
Number of Certified Teaching Staff Supervised				
1-25 certified staff	0	0.0%		
26-40 certified staff	5	20.0%		
41-75 certified staff	15	60.0%		
76-100 certified staff	1	4.0%		
101-125 certified staff	2	8.0%		
More than 126 certified staff	2	8.0%		

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ONE, TWO AND THREE: RANKINGS BY CORE PRACTICE AREAS

In question one, a calculation was completed on the percent of principals who identified each item as one of the three practices having the greatest impact

on teacher job satisfaction. Research question two was analyzed by calculating the percent of teachers who identified each item as one of the three practices having the greatest impact on their level of job satisfaction.

A comparative analysis was used to address research question three. A two-proportion z-test for independent samples was conducted to determine whether or not there was a difference between those key practices principals identified as increasing teacher job satisfaction and those key principal practices teachers identified as improving teacher job satisfaction.

The data for research questions one, two and three are reported according to the following seven, core leadership practice areas:

- Staff Acknowledgement
- Shared Leadership
- Professional Autonomy
- Creating Staff Expectations
- Supporting Staff (leading by standing behind);
- Communication
- Professional Role

The qualitative data that were gathered through the open comment box responses were also reported according to the seven, core leadership practice areas.

Staff Acknowledgement

Principals and teachers were asked to identify the most important leadership practices used by principals to recognize teachers that have the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction.

Table 2 deliniates the percent of respondents endorsing each “*Staff Acknowledgement*” core practice item and the difference between the principal and teacher responses using a frequency distribution.

Table 2
*Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each
'Staff Acknowledgement' Core Practice Item*

Leadership Practices	Research Question 1	Research Question 2	Research Question 3
	Principals	Teachers	Difference
Scheduling a time or forum where teaching staff are recognized	0%	7%	-7% ^a
Targeting praise to a teacher's specific work	32%	26%	6%
Boasting and speaking positively about teaching staff in professional and public settings	20%	35%	-15%
Recognizing and praising teaching staff at faculty meetings	32%	29%	3%
Individually talking with teachers and recognizing and acknowledging their accomplishments	60%	68%	-8%
Writing individual notes to teachers recognizing the good things they are doing	52%	37%	15%
Taking the time to know more about teachers beyond what they are teaching in the classroom	44%	52%	-8%
Writing a weekly newsletter or memo that includes recognition of teaching staff for the work they do	4%	26%	-22% ^a
Providing specific and immediate feedback when recognizing or praising teaching staff	52%	8%	44%**
Using non-verbal methods such as a smile or a thumbs up when teachers are observed in their classrooms and hallways	4%	17%	-13% ^a
<i>N</i>	25	486	

Note. ^a Indicates z could not be calculated due to sample size; *p < .05, **p < .01. If the 'Difference' is negative, this indicates teachers rated the key practice as more important. If the 'Difference' is positive, this indicates principals rated the key practice as more important.

Principal responses. The leadership practice pertaining to staff acknowledgement and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most frequently by principal respondents was “*individually talking with teachers and recognizing the good things they are doing*” (N = 15, 60%). The subsequent two leadership practices related to staff acknowledgement and teacher job satisfaction that principal respondents endorsed most often were “*providing specific and immediate feedback when recognizing or praising teaching staff*” (N = 13, 52%) and “*writing individual notes to teachers recognizing the good things they are doing*” (N = 13, 52%). The leadership practice pertaining to staff acknowledgement that the principal respondents least endorsed was “*scheduling a time or forum where teaching staff are recognized*” (N = 0, 0%).

Principals were requested to list any additional practices they believed increased teacher job satisfaction that could be used to recognize and praise teaching staff. Three principals (38% of responses), thought bringing in treats to meetings or doing drawings/presenting rewards would increase teacher job satisfaction. This response was reported by only one of the 488 teachers as a quality practice.

Teacher responses. The leadership practice pertaining to staff acknowledgement and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most frequently by teacher respondents was “*individually talking with teachers and recognizing the good things they are doing*” (N = 332, 68%). The subsequent two leadership practices regarding staff acknowledgement and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most frequently by teacher respondents were “*taking the time to know more*

about teachers beyond what they are doing in the classroom” (N = 254, 52%) and “writing individual notes to teachers recognizing the good things they are doing” (N = 179, 37%). The leadership practice treating staff acknowledgement and teacher job satisfaction that teacher respondents endorsed least often was “scheduling a time or forum where teaching staff are recognized” (N = 35, 7%).

Principals and teachers were asked to list additional principal practices that would be used to recognize and praise teaching staff they believe increases teacher job satisfaction. When analyzing the responses, some of the common themes found were (a) principals should spend time in the classroom (12% of responses); (b) more recognition for time put in by staff, day-to-day frustrations, and those going above and beyond (10%); (c) recognize everyone or each department equally, not just the same few individuals (10%). One teacher wrote, the principal “take the time to recognize all staff - not just classroom teachers, but specialists, paras, cooks, custodians, office staff, anyone who is involved in working with students.”

Response Discrepancies. There was one leadership practice pertaining to staff acknowledgement and teacher job satisfaction where the difference between the principal and teacher endorsement was highly significant ($p < .01$). Principals highly endorsed the staff acknowledged practice, “*providing specific and immediate feedback when recognizing or praising teachings staff*” (N = 13, 52%) compared to teachers’ endorsement (N = 41, 8%), a difference of 44%, ($z = 6.91, p < .001$).

Shared Leadership

Principals and teachers were asked to identify the most important leadership practices that principals use to involve teachers in the shared decision making process. Table 3 describes the percent of respondents endorsing each “*Shared Leadership*” core practice and the differences between principal and teacher responses.

Table 3
*Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each
 ‘Shared Leadership’ Core Practice*

Shared Leadership Practices	Research Question 1	Research Question 2	Research Question 3
	Principals	Teachers	Difference
Allowing teachers to identify the goals and objectives for the school	24%	35%	-11%
Seeking teacher input/involvement at the early planning stages of a project	72%	71%	1%
Identifying instructional leaders within a school and relying on them for curriculum expertise	48%	22%	26%**
Having a formal system in place to address concerns from teaching staff	12%	30%	-18% ^a
Using language like team, family, community when involving staff	12%	20%	-8% ^a
Seeking out individual teachers and connecting them with projects and leadership opportunities	40%	27%	13%
Communicating to teaching staff how the principal intends to manage and involve others	4%	36%	-32% ^a
Identify top teachers and seek them out to peer coach and mentor	24%	19%	5%
Encouraging staff to present at local, state and national conferences	0%	5%	-5% ^a
Having formal leadership teams in the school and relying on their expertise for decisions and/or advisory purposes	64%	33%	31%**
N	25	483	

Note. ^a Indicates z could not be calculated due to sample size; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. If the ‘Difference’ is negative, this indicates teachers rated the key practice as more important. If the ‘Difference’ is positive, this indicates principals rated the key practice as more important.

Principal responses. The leadership practice pertaining to shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most frequently by principal respondents was “*seeking teacher input/involvement at the early planning stages of a project*” (N=18, 72%). The next two leadership practices pertaining to shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction that principal respondents endorsed most frequently were “*having formal leadership teams in the school and relying on their expertise for decisions and/or advisory purposes*” (N= 16, 64%) and “*identifying instructional leaders within a school and relying on them for curriculum expertise*” (N = 12, 48%). The leadership practice related to shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction that principal respondents endorsed least was “*encouraging staff to present at local, state and national conventions*” (N = 0, 0%).

Teacher responses. The leadership practice pertaining to shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most frequently by teacher respondents was “*seeking teacher input/involvement at the early planning stages of a project*” (N = 344, 71%). The next two leadership practices related to shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction that teacher respondents endorsed most were “*communicating to teaching staff how the principal intends to manage and involve others*” (N = 175, 36%) and “*allowing teachers to identify the goals and objectives for the school*” (N = 170, 35%). The leadership practice relating to shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction that the teacher respondents endorsed least was “*encouraging staff to present at local, state and national conferences*” (N = 25, 5%).

Principals and teachers were requested to identify additional practices building principals can use to involve teaching staff in the shared decision making process that they believe increases teacher job satisfaction. Fifteen percent of the open-ended responses involved the concept of principals gaining both the support and trust of the staff. Another common theme specified that principals should involve more people and not always just the same few (15%). A further suggestion was that the principal needs to develop the culture. It is only then, that “agendas and platforms can be created or presented.”

Response discrepancies. There were two leadership practices focused on shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction where the difference between the principal and teacher endorsement was highly significant ($p < .01$): principals highly endorsed the shared leadership practice “*identifying instructional leaders within the school and relying on them for curriculum expertise*” ($N = 12, 48\%$) compared to teachers’ endorsement ($N = 107, 22\%$), a difference of 26% ($z = 2.98, p < .01$). In addition, the shared leadership practice “*having formal leadership teams in the school and relying on their expertise for decisions and/or advisory purposes*” was highly endorsed by principals ($N = 16, 64\%$) when compared to teachers’ endorsement ($N = 160, 33\%$), a difference of 31% ($z = 3.16, p < .01$).

An additional leadership practice related shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction was worthy of note, but due to the sample size of the principals, a z-test could not be run. The leadership practice “*communicating to teaching staff how the principal intends to manage and involve teachers*” was highly endorsed

by the teacher respondents ($N = 175, 36\%$), compared to the principal respondents ($N = 1, 4\%$), a difference of 32%. Due to the small number of principal respondents, statistical significance could not be established.

Professional Autonomy

Principals and teachers were asked to identify the most important leadership practices that principals employ when working to create a culture of professional autonomy. Table 4 describes the percent of respondents endorsing each “*Professional Autonomy*” core practice, and the difference between the principal and teacher responses.

Table 4

Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each ‘Professional Autonomy’ Core Practice Item

Professional Autonomy Practices	Research Question 1	Research Question 2	Research Question 3
	Principals	Teachers	Difference
Trusting teachers to make informed instructional decisions for their students	52%	27%	25%**
Developing and implementing a shared decision making structure with my teaching staff	36%	15%	21%**
Protecting teachers' instructional time from interruptions	28%	35%	-7%
Allowing teachers the freedom to teach in the ways that they feel are the most effective	0%	45%	-45% ^a
Providing guidance and professional development opportunities regarding effective teaching practices	28%	32%	-4%
Encouraging and allocating time for professional learning communities	44%	69%	-25%**
Trusting teaching staff as professionals and as experts in their field/content area	36%	21%	15%
Knowing when to use and how to balance the use of formal verse informal authority	8%	13%	-5% ^a
Informing teachers of what outcome is expected and then leaving the details to the teacher's discretion	40%	19%	21%**
Allowing and encouraging teaching staff the freedom to teach within his/her style as long as they stay within	28%	29%	-1%

the guidelines of the school philosophy N	25	484	
--	----	-----	--

Note. ^a Indicates z could not be calculated due to sample size; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. If the 'Difference' is negative, this indicates teachers rated the key practice as more important. If the 'Difference' is positive, this indicates principals rated the key practice as more important.

Principal responses. The leadership practice pertaining to professional autonomy and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most frequently by principal respondents was *“trusting teachers to make informed instructional decisions”* ($N = 13, 52\%$). The next two leadership practices related to professional autonomy and teacher job satisfaction that principal respondents endorsed most often were *“encouraging and allocating time for professional learning communities”* ($N = 11, 44\%$) and *“informing teachers of what outcome is expected and then leaving the details to the teacher discretion”* ($N = 10, 40\%$). The leadership practice pertaining to professional autonomy and teacher job satisfaction that the principal respondents endorsed the least was *“allowing teachers the freedom to teach in ways that they feel are most effective”* ($N = 0, 0\%$).

Teacher responses. The leadership practice pertaining to professional autonomy and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most frequently by teacher respondents was *“encouraging and allocating time for teachers to participate in professional learning communities”* ($N = 336, 69\%$). The subsequent two leadership practices pertaining to professional autonomy and teacher job satisfaction that teacher respondents rated most highly were *“allowing teachers the freedom to teach in the ways that they feel are the most effective”* ($N = 217, 45\%$) and *“protecting teachers’ instructional time from interruptions”* ($N = 171, 35\%$). The leadership practice pertaining to professional autonomy and teacher

job satisfaction that the teacher respondents endorsed least often was “*knowing when to use and how to balance the use of formal versus informal authority*” ($N = 62, 13\%$).

Principals and teachers were asked to list additional leadership practices that could be used to create a culture of professional autonomy with the teaching staff and, thus, believed would increase teacher job satisfaction. A common theme of the open-ended responses from teachers was “*allowing teachers the freedom to teach in ways that they feel are the most effective.*” The number of teachers who reported that principals should allow teachers to make instructional decisions and differentiate in ways of teaching (22% of open-ended responses), provides further support that there might well have been a significant difference in this key practice between principals and teachers had a larger number of principals responded to the survey. One respondent said they thought principals should “provide leadership but not micromanage.”

Response discrepancies. There were four leadership practices pertaining to professional autonomy and teacher job satisfaction where the differences between the principal and teacher endorsements were highly significant ($p < .01$). The leadership practice “*trusting teachers to make informed instructional decisions for their students*” was highly endorsed by the principals ($N = 13, 52\%$), compared to the teachers’ endorsement ($N = 130, 27\%$), a difference of 25% ($z = 2.73, p < .01$). A second practice highly endorsed by the principals ($N = 10, 40\%$) compared to the teacher endorsement ($N = 91, 19\%$), a 21% difference ($z = 2.69, p < .01$), was “*informing teachers of what outcome is expected and then leaving*

the details to the teacher's discretion." The leadership practice "*developing and implementing a shared decision making structure with my teaching staff*" was highly endorsed by principals ($N = 9$, 36%) but not by teachers ($N = 75$, 15%), a difference of 21% ($z = 2.59$, $p < .01$).

In contrast, there was one leadership practice pertaining to professional autonomy and teacher job satisfaction that was more frequently endorsed by teachers than principals and the difference was highly significant ($p < .01$): "*encouraging and allocating time for professional learning communities*" was highly endorsed by teachers ($N = 336$, 69%), compared to the principals' endorsement ($N = 11$, 44%), a difference of 25% ($z = -2.66$, $p < .01$).

The leadership practice "*allowing teachers the freedom to teach in ways that they feel are most effective*" was highly endorsed by the teacher respondents ($N = 217$, 45%), compared to the principal respondents ($N = 0$, 0%), a difference of 45%. Due to the small number of principal respondents, however, statistical significance could not be established.

Creating Staff Expectation

Principals and teachers were asked to identify the most important leadership practices that principals use to create expectations that will influence the actions and behaviors of their teaching staff. Table 5 describes the percent of respondents endorsing each "*Creating Staff Expectations*" core practice item, and the difference between the principal and teacher responses.

Table 5

*Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each
'Creating Staff Expectations' Core Practice Item*

Creating Staff Expectation Practices	Research Question 1	Research Question 2	Research Question 3
	Principals	Teachers	Difference
Repeating, restating and clarifying what is expected from teaching staff	12%	22%	-10% ^a
Consistently modeling the behaviors and actions that are expected from teachers	68%	47%	21%*
Expecting teachers to maximize learning time, therefore minimizing disruptions	20%	27%	-7%
Clearly, consistently, directly and tactfully communicating what is expected from teaching staff	60%	50%	10%
Consistently addressing teaching staff when they are not meeting expectations	12%	19%	-7% ^a
Providing individual feedback to teachers regarding expectations	32%	34%	-2%
Expecting teaching staff to model appropriate behavior for students and fellow colleagues	24%	27%	-3%
Expecting teachers and modeling for them that all students should be treated with dignity and respect	28%	35%	-7%
Recognizing teachers positively when they are meeting or exceeding expectations	44%	42%	2%
N	25	486	

Note. ^a Indicates z could not be calculated due to sample size; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. If the 'Difference' is negative, this indicates teachers rated the key practice as more important. If the 'Difference' is positive, this indicates principals rated the key practice as more important.

Principal responses. The leadership practice related to creating staff expectations and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most frequently by principal respondents was “*consistently modeling the behaviors and actions that are expected from teachers*” (N = 17, 68%). The next two leadership practices pertaining to creating staff expectations and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most frequently by principal respondents were “*clearly, consistently, directly and tactfully communicating what is expected from teaching staff*” (N = 15, 60%) and “*providing individual feedback to teachers regarding expectations*” (N = 8, 32%). The leadership practice pertaining to creating staff expectations that the principal

respondents endorsed least often was “*consistently addressing teaching staff when they are not meeting expectations*” ($N = 3, 12\%$).

Teacher responses. The leadership practice pertaining to creating staff expectations and teacher job satisfaction endorsed in greatest number by teacher respondents was “*clearly, consistently, directly and tactfully communicating what is expected from teaching staff*” ($N = 243, 50\%$). The subsequent leadership practices pertaining to creating staff expectations and teacher job satisfaction that teacher respondents most frequently endorsed were “*consistently modeling the behaviors and actions that are expected from teachers*” ($N = 226, 47\%$) and “*expecting teachers and modeling for them that all students should be treated with dignity and respect*” ($N = 170, 35\%$). The leadership practice pertaining to creating staff expectations and teacher job satisfaction teacher respondents endorsed least frequently was “*consistently addressing teaching staff when they are not meeting expectations*” ($N = 91, 19\%$).

When principals and teachers were asked to list any additional leadership practices a building principal could use to create expectations among teaching staff and, hence, increase teacher job satisfaction, there was one theme that was not reflected in any of the key practices listed. Of the responses, 39% were similar in that they wanted principals to be honest about whether expectations are being met. One teacher wrote, “I highly respect a principal who is not afraid of letting his staff know when they are NOT meeting the expectations. ‘Good enough’ is not good enough when it comes to a child's education.”

Response discrepancies. There was one leadership practice pertaining to creating staff expectations and teacher job satisfaction where the difference between the principal and teacher endorsement was significant ($p < .05$). Principals highly endorsed the practice “*consistently modeling the behaviors and actions that are expected from teachers*” ($N = 17, 68\%$) compared teachers’ endorsement ($N = 226, 47\%$) for a difference of 21% ($z = 2.10, p < .05$).

Supporting Staff/Leading by
Standing Behind

Principals and teachers were asked to identify the most important leadership practices that principals use to demonstrate that they support and stand behind their teachers. Table 6 describes the percent of respondents endorsing “*Leading By Standing Behind*” core practices and the difference between the principal and teacher responses.

Table 6

*Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each
‘Leading by Standing Behind’ Core Practice Item*

Leading by Standing Behind	Research Question 1	Research Question 2	Research Question 3
	Principals	Teachers	Difference
Assigning teachers to teach the classes that they are the most trained and skilled to teach	12%	21%	-9% ^a
Assuring that teachers have ample textbooks, paper and equipment to teach the required curriculum	12%	20%	-8% ^a
Advocating and supporting teachers to go to conferences and trainings	4%	22%	-18% ^a
Ensuring that there is an orderly and safe environment conducive to learning	40%	41%	-1%
Supporting teachers in their decisions regarding classroom management	16%	18%	-2% ^a
Supporting teachers' discipline strategies	0%	36%	-36% ^a
Developing, implementing and supporting a school wide behavior/discipline program	56%	46%	10%
Being visible in the hallways, teachers' classrooms and school activities	64%	22%	42%**
Supporting teachers' authority in enforcing policy	12%	19%	-7% ^a
Taking time to listen to teachers' concerns and work to problem solve with the teacher regarding the concerns	84%	60%	24% ^a
N	25	484	

Note. ^a Indicates z could not be calculated due to sample size; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. If the 'Difference' is negative, this indicates teachers rated the key practice as more important. If the 'Difference' is positive, this indicates principals rated the key practice as more important.

Principal responses. The leadership practice pertaining to leading by standing behind and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most frequently by principal respondents was *“taking the time to listen to the teachers’ concerns and work to problem solve with the teacher regarding the concerns”* (N = 21, 84%). The next two leadership practices pertaining to leading by standing behind and teacher job satisfaction that principal respondents endorsed most frequently were *“being visible in the hallways, teachers’ classrooms and school activities”* (N = 16, 64%) and *“developing, implementing and supporting a school wide behavior/discipline program”* (N = 14, 56%). The leadership practice of leading by

standing behind and teacher job satisfaction that the principal respondents endorsed least often was “*supporting teachers’ discipline strategies*” ($N = 0, 0\%$).

Teacher responses. The leadership practice of leading by standing behind and teacher job satisfaction endorsed with greatest frequency by teacher respondents was “*taking the time to listen to teachers’ concerns and work to problem solve with the teacher regarding the concern*” ($N = 289, 60\%$). The next two leadership practices of leading by standing behind and teacher job satisfaction endorsed most often by teacher respondents were “*developing, implementing and supporting a school wide behavior/discipline program*” ($N = 223, 46\%$) and “*ensuring that there is an orderly and safe environment conducive to learning*” ($N = 199, 41\%$). The leadership practice related to leading by standing behind and teacher job satisfaction teacher respondents endorsed least often was “*supporting teachers in their decisions regarding classroom management*” ($N = 85, 18\%$).

Principals and teachers were asked to list practices that principals can use as a way to demonstrate that they stand behind and support their teachers that they believe increases teacher job satisfaction. One common theme in the responses was trying to encompass a couple of the key practices listed. Twenty-four percent of responses suggested the principals and teachers should be unified when dealing with stakeholder groups. This idea includes the key practices, “*supporting teachers’ discipline strategies*”, “*supporting teachers’ authority in enforcing policy*”, and “*supporting teachers in their decisions regarding classroom management.*” A unique response came from one teacher

who thought principals should, “Push for structural and policy changes that improve teacher effectiveness, stress levels, and ability to implement best practices.”

Response discrepancies. There was one leadership practice pertaining to leading by standing behind and teacher job satisfaction where the difference between the principal and teacher endorsement was highly significant ($p < .01$). Principals highly endorsed the leading by standing behind practice “*being visible in the hallways, teachers’ classrooms and school activities*” ($N = 16, 64\%$) compared to teachers’ endorsement ($N = 105, 22\%$) for a difference of 42% ($z = 4.85, p < .001$).

There was an additional leadership practice pertaining to leading by standing behind and teacher job satisfaction that more than likely would have been statistically significant, but due to the sample size of the principals, a z-test could not be run. The leadership practice “*supporting teachers’ discipline strategies*” was highly endorsed by the teacher respondents ($N = 172, 36\%$), compared to the principal respondents ($N = 0, 0\%$), a difference of 36%. Due to the small number of principal respondents, statistical significance could not be established.

Communication

Principals and teachers were asked to identify the most important leadership practices that principals use to communicate with their teaching staff. Table 7 describes the percent of respondents endorsing each “*Communication*”

core practice item, and the difference between the principal and teacher responses.

Table 7
*Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each
 'Communication' Core Practice Item*

Communication Practices	Research Question 1	Research Question 2	Research Question 3
	Principals	Teachers	Difference
Providing clear, consistent, direct and tactful communication with teaching staff	48%	59%	-11%
Holding formal conferences with individual teachers	4%	8%	-4% ^a
Holding formal conferences with small groups of teachers	4%	7%	-3% ^a
Utilizing faculty meetings as opportunities to reinforce goals with teaching staff	28%	36%	-8%
Encouraging teachers and teaching staff to have informal "drop-in" meetings	52%	31%	21%*
Sending e-mails to individual staff to communicate concerns or needs	4%	21%	-17% ^a
Writing individual notes to teachers to recognize their good work and thank them	28%	24%	4%
Being open and honest and providing immediate feedback when communicating with teaching staff	84%	64%	20% ^a
Having an agenda for all meetings with teaching staff and keeping summary notes from those meetings	24%	23%	1%
Writing a weekly memo to my teaching staff highlighting important information, dates, things to celebrate, etc...	24%	30%	-6%
N	25	484	

Note. ^a Indicates z could not be calculated due to sample size; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. If the 'Difference' is negative, this indicates teachers rated the key practice as more important. If the 'Difference' is positive, this indicates principals rated the key practice as more important.

Principal responses. The leadership practice pertaining to communication and teacher job satisfaction endorsed the most by principal respondents was “being open and honest and providing immediate feedback when communicating with teaching staff” (N = 21, 84%). The next two leadership practices pertaining to communication and teacher job satisfaction that principal respondents

endorsed the most were “*encouraging teachers and teaching staff to have informal “drop-in” meetings*” (N = 13, 52%), and a tie between “*utilizing faculty meetings as opportunities to reinforce teaching goals with staff*” (N = 7, 28%) and “*writing individual notes to teachers to recognize their good work and thank them*” (N = 7, 28%). The leadership practice pertaining to communication and teacher job satisfaction that the principal respondents endorsed the least was a two-way tie: “*holding formal conferences with individual teachers*” (N = 1, 4%), and “*sending e-mails to individual staff to communicate concerns or needs*” (N = 1, 4%).

Teacher responses. The leadership practice pertaining to communication and teacher job satisfaction endorsed the most by teacher respondents was “*being open and honest and providing immediate feedback when communicating with teaching staff*” (N = 310, 64%). The next two leadership practices pertaining to communication and teacher job satisfaction that teacher respondents endorsed the most were “*providing clear, consistent, direct and tactful communication with teaching staff*” (N = 284, 59%) and “*utilizing faculty meetings as opportunities to reinforce goals with teaching staff*” (N = 173, 36%). The leadership practice pertaining to communication and teacher job satisfaction that the teacher respondents endorsed the least was “*holding formal conferences with small groups of teachers*” (N = 33, 7%).

Principals and teachers were asked to list additional leadership practices that principals could use to communicate with teaching staff they believe increases teacher job satisfaction. The most common theme identified was that

principals should be timely, in respect of staff's time (25% of responses centered on this theme).

Response discrepancies. There was one leadership practice relating to communication and teacher job satisfaction where the difference between the principal and teacher endorsement was significant ($p < .05$). Principals highly endorsed the communication practice "*encouraging teachers and teaching staff to have informal "drop-in" meetings*" ($N = 13, 52%$) compared to teachers' endorsement ($N = 150, 31%$) for a difference of 21% ($z = 2.20, p < .05$).

Professional Role

Principals and teachers were asked to identify the most important leadership practices that principals use to fulfill their professional role. Table 8 describes the percent of respondents endorsing each "*Professional Role*" core practice item, and the difference between the principal and teacher responses.

Table 8

*Percent of Respondents Endorsing Each
'Professional Role' Core Practice Item*



Professional Role Practices	Research Question 1	Research Question 2	Research Question 3
	Principals	Teachers	Difference
Providing training opportunities to reinforce goals and improve instruction	24%	24%	0%
Being visible and modeling expectations for teaching staff	80%	41%	39% ^a
Using authority when necessary to enforce rules and policies	4%	24%	-20% ^a
Not becoming so concerned with being effective, that a principal loses sight of what is affective	4%	72%	-68% ^a
Soliciting input in creating policies that may be enforced through the exercise of authority	20%	57%	-37%**
Being honest, open and consistent with words and actions	92%	8%	84% ^a
Demonstrating concerned for teaching staff	44%	9%	35%**
Allowing discretion in implementation of knowledge gained through staff development	4%	16%	-12% ^a
Assisting teachers in evaluating newly attempted teaching techniques	8%	24%	-16% ^a
Keeping informed of new developments in curriculum and instruction and providing relevant information to teachers	20%	24%	-4%
N	25	485	

Note. ^a Indicates z could not be calculated due to sample size; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. If the 'Difference' is negative, this indicates teachers rated the key practice as more important. If the 'Difference' is positive, this indicates principals rated the key practice as more important.

Principal responses. The leadership practice pertaining to professional role and teacher job satisfaction endorsed the most by principal respondents was “*being honest, open and consistent with words and actions*” ($N = 23, 92\%$). The next two leadership practices pertaining to professional role and teacher job satisfaction that principal respondents endorsed the most were “*being visible and modeling expectations for staff*” ($N = 20, 80\%$) and “*demonstrating concern for teaching staff*” ($N = 11, 44\%$). The leadership practice pertaining to professional role and teacher job satisfaction that the principal respondents endorsed the least was a three-way tie: “*using authority when necessary to enforce rules and*

policies" (N = 1, 4%), "*not becoming so concerned with being effective, that a principal loses sight of what is effective*" (N = 1, 4%) and "*allowing discretion in implementation of knowledge gained through staff development*" (N = 1, 4%).

Teacher responses. The leadership practice pertaining to professional role and teacher job satisfaction endorsed the most by teacher respondents was "*not becoming so concerned with being effective, that a principal loses sight of what is effective*" (N = 350, 72%). The next two leadership practices pertaining to professional role and teacher job satisfaction that teacher respondents endorsed the most were "*soliciting input for creating policies that may be enforced through the exercise of authority*" (N = 278, 57%) and "*being visible and modeling expectations for teaching staff*" (N = 201, 41%). The leadership practice pertaining to professional role and teacher job satisfaction that the teacher respondents endorsed the least was "*being honest, open and consistent with words and actions*" (N = 39, 8%).

Principals and teachers were asked to list any additional leadership practices that can be used by building principals to fulfill their professional role that they believe increases teacher job satisfaction. A small number of teachers reported principals should take the time to talk and more importantly, listen (N = 5, 33%). Twenty percent thought it was important for principals to guide the big picture, making sure that everything that takes place and all decisions made come back to that vision.

Response discrepancies. There were two leadership practices pertaining to professional role and teacher job satisfaction where the difference between the

principal and teacher endorsement was highly significant ($p < .01$). Principals highly endorsed the professional role practice “*demonstrating concern for teaching staff*” ($N = 11, 44\%$) compared to teachers’ endorsement ($N = 46, 9\%$), a difference of 35% ($z = 5.34, p < .001$). Teachers highly endorsed the professional role practice “*soliciting input in creating policies that may be enforced through the exercise of authority*” ($N = 278, 57\%$) compared to principals’ endorsement ($N = 5, 20\%$), a difference of 37% ($z = -3.66, p < .001$).

There were two additional leadership practices pertaining to professional role and teacher job satisfaction that more than likely would have been statistically significant, but due to the sample size of the principals, a z-test could not be run. The leadership practice “*not becoming so concerned with being effective, that a principal loses sight of what is affective*” was highly endorsed by the teacher respondents ($N = 350, 72\%$), compared to the principal respondents ($N = 1, 4\%$), a 68% difference. Due to the small number of principal respondents, statistical significance could not be established. The second leadership practice pertaining to professional role and teacher job satisfaction that more than likely would have been statistically significant was “*being honest, open and consistent with words and actions.*” The principal respondents highly endorsed this practice ($N = 23, 92\%$) compared to teacher respondents ($N = 39, 8\%$), a difference of 84%. A z-test could not be run in this case due to the small teacher sample.

RESEARCH QUESTION FOUR: DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION

What are the differences in principals' perceptions of their teaching staff's overall job satisfaction by the gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level and building size of the principal? The data for research question four was analyzed two different ways. A *t*-test was conducted to determine if overall perceptions of levels of teachers' job satisfaction differed based on the principal's gender. No significant difference was found.

The second data analysis method employed to analyze differences with other variables (age, years of experience, district type, grade level and building size) was a one-way ANOVA. No significant differences were found within these principal variables. Principals' perceptions of their teaching staff's overall job satisfaction did not significantly vary based on their gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level or building size.

RESEARCH QUESTION FIVE

What are the differences in the teachers' reported overall job satisfaction by the gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level, building size and subject area of the teachers? To determine if there were differences in the teachers' reported overall job satisfaction across the teachers' gender, a *t*-test was conducted. A significant difference was found between male teachers ($M = 7.99$) compared to female teachers ($M = 7.60$; $t(188) = -2.45$, $p < .015$). Male teachers reported higher levels of job satisfaction than female teachers.

The second data analysis method used to examine differences by other variables (age, years of experience, district type, grade level and building size)

was a one-way ANOVA. Significant differences in teachers' reported level of job satisfaction were found with two of the variables.

The first variable where significant differences were found was age. There were four levels of the age variable, so an ANOVA was run to determine whether or not there were differences in the teachers' overall reported levels of job satisfaction based on age. The ANOVA revealed highly significant differences in overall job satisfaction between age groups, $F(3, 461) = 5.412, p = .001$; teachers age 25-35 ($M = 7.87$), teachers age 36-45 ($M = 7.46$), teachers age 46-55 ($M = 7.50$) and teachers age 56 plus ($M = 8.41$). Table 9 displays these mean differences. The ANOVA results are displayed in Table 10.

Post hoc tests were run to determine which age groups were significantly different from other age groups. Post hoc tests revealed that teachers age 36-45 ($M = 7.46$) reported significantly lower levels of job satisfaction than teachers age 56 plus ($M = 8.41; p = .003$). Post hoc tests also revealed that teachers age 46-55 ($M = 7.50$) reported significantly lower levels of job satisfaction than teachers age 56 plus ($M = 8.41; p = .008$). Teachers age 56 plus report higher levels of job satisfaction than teachers ages 25-55. Age groups 25-35, 36-45 and 46-55 were not significantly different from each other in their perceptions of overall job satisfaction.

Table 9

Teacher's Reported Mean Overall Level of Job Satisfaction by Age Group

Age Group	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
-----------	----------	----------	-----------

Age 25-35	165	7.87	1.40
Age 36-45	156	7.46	1.66
Age 46-55	103	7.50	1.73
Age 56 plus	41	8.41	1.07

Table 10

ANOVA: Teacher's Reported Overall Level of Job Satisfaction by Age Group

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	38.794	3	12.931	5.412	.001
Within Groups	1101.451	461	2.389		
Total	1140.245	464			

The second variable where significant statistical differences were found was district type. There were three levels of the district type variable (metro, suburban, and out-state). An ANOVA was completed to determine whether or not there were differences in the teachers' reported levels of job satisfaction based upon district type. The ANOVA revealed significant differences in levels of job satisfaction between district types, $F(2, 469) = 3.83, p = .022$; metro teachers ($M = 7.96$), suburban teachers ($M = 7.82$) and out-state teachers ($M = 7.43$). Table 11 displays these mean differences. The ANOVA results are displayed in Table 12.

Table 11

Teacher's Reported Mean Overall Level of Job Satisfaction by District Type

District Type	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Metro	24	7.96	1.30
Suburban	275	7.82	1.48
Out-state	173	7.43	1.69

Table 12

ANOVA: Teacher's Reported Overall Level of Job Satisfaction by District Type

	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	18.390	2	9.195	3.831	.022
Within Groups	1125.574	469	2.400		
Total	1143.964	471			

Post hoc tests were run to locate the differences between metro, suburban and/or out-state teachers. The tests revealed that there were significant differences between suburban teachers ($M = 7.82$) and out-state teachers ($M = 7.43, p = .024$). Suburban teachers reported higher levels of job satisfaction than out-state teachers. The sample size of metro teachers, however, was too small to compare with suburban and out-state teachers and determine if significant differences existed.

There were no significant differences found regarding teachers' levels of job satisfaction based upon the other variables (years of experience, years with current principal, grade level, building size or subject area).

RESEARCH QUESTION SIX

Additional analyses were completed to address the last question of the survey. In this question principals were asked to rate on a scale from one to ten (one being the lowest and ten being the highest), what they believed were the levels of job satisfaction with their teaching staffs. Teachers were asked to rate on a scale of one to ten their overall level of job satisfaction. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to determine whether or not a significant difference existed between principals' and teachers' perceptions. The test revealed there was a significant difference between the principals' perceptions ($M = 7.20$) of their teachers' job satisfaction, and the teachers' reported level ($M = 7.68$) of job satisfaction, $t(33) = -2.56, p = .015$. Teachers were determined to be more satisfied ($M = 7.68$) than their principals ($M = 7.20$) perceived them to be.

SUMMARY

Data from 25 principals and 488 teachers were analyzed to identify leadership practices that improve teacher job satisfaction. Principal and teacher responses were compared for the frequencies of their responses and for the differences in their responses. Using analysis of variance calculations, demographic variables and levels of job satisfaction were analyzed to determine statistically significant relationships.

Chapter 5 summarizes the findings of the study, relates findings to the current review of literature, draws conclusions and offers recommendations to the field of leadership practice and for future studies.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify which leadership practices principals use to improve teacher job satisfaction, and which leadership practices teachers' identify as having the greatest impact on their overall level of job satisfaction. In addition, the study investigated the similarities and differences between the principal and teacher responses.

This chapter summarizes the findings from this study. The data is analyzed and organized by research question. Due to some of the significant findings within the data, an additional analysis was completed to determine if overall, there was a significant difference between principals' perceptions of teachers' overall level of job satisfaction and teachers' reported overall level of job satisfaction. The following Research Questions were used in the study:

1. What leadership practices do principals utilize to attempt to develop and improve teacher job satisfaction?
2. What do teachers identify as the key practices that principals use that have the most impact on their job satisfaction?

3. What are the differences between what principals and teachers identify as the key practices that principals use that have the most impact on teacher job satisfaction?
4. What are the differences in principals' perceptions of their teaching staff's overall job satisfaction across the principal's gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level, and building size?
5. What are the differences in the teachers' reported overall job satisfaction across the teachers' gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level, building size, and subject area?

For this study, 21 schools agreed to participate in the study. The principal participants were asked to complete the "Leadership Survey" and the teacher participants were asked to complete the "Teacher Survey." With 21 schools participating in the study, there was the potential for 807 teachers to complete the "Teacher Survey" and 27 principals to complete the "Leadership Survey." This study contains the results from the responses of 488 teachers (a response rate of 61%) and 25 principals (a response rate of 93%).

Analysis of the data was done using the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS). To answer research question one, the percent of principals who identified each item as one of the three practices having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction was calculated. Research question two was analyzed in the same way, by calculating the percent of teachers who identified each item as one of the three practices having the greatest impact on their level of job satisfaction.

A comparative analysis was used to address research question three. To answer research questions four and five, the data was split and looked at separately for principals and teachers. When looking at teachers then principals one at a time, a *t*-test was conducted to determine if overall levels of satisfaction perceptions differed across genders. To look for differences across the other variables that were part of the research question, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used.

Additional analyses were done to address the last question on the survey, when the principal was asked to rate on a scale from one to ten (one being the lowest and ten being the highest), what they believed was the overall level of job satisfaction among their teaching staff. An independent sample *t*-test was conducted to test whether a significant difference existed between principals' and teachers' perceptions. In addition, qualitative data gathered from the open comment boxes on the survey were reported by frequency and major theme.

This chapter reports the summary and conclusions drawn in this study. The information is organized by research question and by the core areas of the theoretical framework: staff acknowledgement/recognition, shared leadership, professional autonomy, creating staff expectations, supporting staff (leading by standing behind), communication and professional role.

CONCLUSIONS FROM QUESTIONS ONE, TWO AND THREE

Acknowledgement/Recognition

In Blase and Kirby's study (2009) "praise was the most frequently reported and perceived as the most effective" (p.10) strategy used by building principals to improve teachers' overall level of job satisfaction. Teachers report a higher level of job satisfaction when they have a supportive and quality leader (Blocker & Richardson, 1963) and when they are recognized for their accomplishments (Petty, 2007). Chapman and Lowther's (1982) study investigated teachers' satisfaction and found a strong positive relationship with the recognition the teacher actually received from their building administrators and their overall career satisfaction.

When identifying top leadership practices pertaining to staff acknowledgement/recognition and teacher job satisfaction, the principal and teacher respondents in this study both identified similar practices as important. The most endorsed staff acknowledgement practice for both teachers and principals was "*individually talking with teachers and recognizing and acknowledging their accomplishments*" (principals N = 15, 60%, teachers N = 332, 68%). The leadership practice, "*taking the time to know more about teachers beyond what they are teaching in the classroom*" was the second most endorsed practice by teachers (N = 254, 52%), and although important to principals (N = 11, 44%), this was the fourth most endorsed practice by principals. Teacher (N = 179, 39%) and principal (N = 13, 52%) respondents

both endorsed the leadership practice “*writing individual notes to teachers recognizing the good things they are doing,*” as their third most important practice regarding staff acknowledgement and its positive impact on teacher job satisfaction.

Where there was the greatest, and highly significant ($p < .01$) difference between what teachers and principals endorsed regarding the staff acknowledgement/recognition practice was “*providing specific and immediate feedback when recognizing and praising teaching staff.*” This leadership practice was the second most endorsed staff acknowledgement/recognition practice by principals ($N = 13, 52\%$) and it was number 9 out of 10 for teacher respondents ($N = 39, 8\%$). Principals believed it was important to provide immediate recognition to teachers, where teachers believed that the individual recognition and the genuineness of the recognition were more important. Both principal and teacher respondents agreed that the least important leadership practice pertaining to staff acknowledgement/recognition and job satisfaction was “*scheduling a time or forum where teaching staff are recognized*” (principals $N = 0, 0\%$, teachers $N = 34, 7\%$).

An interesting difference occurred between the teacher and principal respondents in the qualitative data regarding staff acknowledgement/recognition. Principal and teacher respondents were asked to list any additional principal practices that could be used to acknowledge and recognize staff that they believe would increase teacher job satisfaction. Three principals (38% of the responses) thought bringing in treats to meetings or doing drawings/presenting rewards

would increase teacher job satisfaction. This response came from only one of the 488 teachers.

Shared Leadership

Effective principals capitalize on the expertise and passion of their staff and they create a culture where team decisions are a priority. “The process of shared decision making significantly strengthens support for decisions and improves faculty morale” (Blasé & Kirby, 2009, p. 42). Teachers reported higher levels of job satisfaction when they participated in policy development (Blocker & Richardson, 1963), when they felt they had good rapport with their administrators, when they were involved in the curriculum and had input on other matters pertaining to their school environment (Bhella, 2001). “Feelings of comfort, satisfaction and heightened self-esteem were associated with involvement” (Blasé & Kirby, 2009, p. 44).

When identifying top leadership practices pertaining to shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction both principal and teacher respondents identified “*seeking teacher input/involvement at the early planning stages of a project*” as the most endorsed leadership practice (principals N = 18, 72%, teachers N = 343, 71%). The second most endorsed leadership practice pertaining to shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction by principals (N = 16, 64%) was “*having formal leadership teams in the school and relying on their expertise for decisions and/or advisory purposes.*” Teachers also identified this practice as important, yet it was their fourth identified leadership practice. The difference between the principal and teacher respondents regarding this practice was highly significant

($p < .001$) due to teacher respondents ($N = 159$, 33%) compared to principal respondents ($N = 16$, 64%), a difference of 31%.

One of the most unique differences regarding leadership practices pertaining to shared leadership and teacher job satisfaction was “*communicating to teaching staff how the principal intends to manage and involve others.*”

Teacher respondents identified this as the second most important leadership practice pertaining to shared leadership and job satisfaction ($N = 174$, 36%) compared to principal respondents ($N = 1$, 4%). The difference between the teacher and principal respondents would have been highly significant, but due to the small sample size of the principal respondents, significance could not be determined.

Principals and teachers were asked to list any additional practices that building principals can use to involve teaching staff in the shared decision making process that they believed increased job satisfaction. Fifteen percent of the open-ended responses revolved around the idea that principals need to gain both the support and the trust of the staff. Another common theme was that the principal should involve more people and not always just the same few (15%). “Principals may be sincerely interested in implementing shared leadership but fall victim to inadvertent domination” (Kirby & Blasé, 2009. P.45) by always leaning on the same, small number of faculty members or by not allowing teachers’ input to be reflected in the decisions that are ultimately made.

Professional Autonomy

“Autonomy refers to the degree of freedom (i.e. professional discretion) that individuals have in determining the work process” (Blasé & Kirby, 2009, p. 58). Teachers reported higher levels of job satisfaction when they experienced freedom in planning work (Blocker & Richardson, 1963), professional autonomy (Kim & Loadman, 1994) and more control over their schedule (Petty, 2007).

The most endorsed leadership practice pertaining to professional autonomy and teacher job satisfaction endorsed by principal respondents was “*trusting teachers to make informed instructional decisions for their students*” (N = 13, 52%). There was a highly significant ($p < .01$) difference (25%) between the principals’ endorsement and the teachers’ endorsement (N = 131, 27%). The most endorsed leadership practice pertaining to professional autonomy and teacher job satisfaction endorsed by teacher respondents was “*encouraging and allocating time for professional learning communities*” (N = 334, 69%). Principal respondents endorsed this practice as their second top practice (N = 11, 44%), however, there again was a highly significant ($p < .01$) difference (25%) between the principals’ endorsement and the teachers’ endorsement.

One of the greatest differences between the teacher and principal endorsements was in the area of professional autonomy. The second most endorsed leadership practice regarding professional autonomy and job satisfaction centered around the practice of “*allowing teachers the freedom to teach in ways that they feel are most effective.*” Forty-five percent of teachers

(N = 218) identified this as a top leadership practice for professional autonomy and teacher job satisfaction, and zero principals endorsed this practice. This difference would have been highly significant but due to the zero response and small sample size of principals, statistical significance could not be determined. Teachers and principals were asked to list any additional leadership practices that building principals could use to create a culture of professional autonomy with teaching staff that they believed would increase teacher job satisfaction. Twenty-two percent of teachers' open-ended responses reported that principals should allow teachers to make instructional decisions and be allowed to differentiate in their ways of teaching. According to the research of Blasé and Kirby (2009) which involved over 1800 teachers, "the most important aspect of autonomy for (our) teachers appears to be the freedom to teach in ways that teachers deem most effective" (p.62).

Creating Staff Expectation

"Principals use expectations to achieve two broad goals: changes in attitudes and changes in behaviors" (Blasé & Kirby, 2009, p. 24). Blasé and Kirby's study (2009) revealed that "expectations occasionally reflect school district policies and programs, (our) data indicate that the expectations of effective principals are largely derived from their personal values regarding human interaction and school purposes" (p. 25). "Principals actions create distinct working environments within schools that are highly predictive of teacher satisfaction and commitment" (Shann, 1998, p. 67).

Teacher respondents and principal respondents were much more in agreement about the top leadership practices pertaining to creating staff expectations and teacher job satisfaction compared to the other leadership practices. Both teacher and principal respondents identified the same top three practices, just in a slightly different order. Principal respondents endorsed the practice “*consistently modeling the behaviors and actions that are expected from teachers*” as their number one practice (N = 17, 68%) and teachers endorsed this practice as their second top practice (N = 226, 47%). The difference (21%) between the principal and teacher endorsement was significant ($p < .05$), however, teachers and principals both agree this is a top leadership practice. The number one practice that teacher respondents endorsed (N = 243, 50%) was “*clearly, consistently, directly and tactfully communicating what is expected from teaching staff.*” Principal respondents (N = 15, 60%) endorsed this as their number two leadership practice pertaining to creating staff expectations and teacher job satisfaction. The leadership practice “*recognizing teachers positively when they are meeting or exceeding expectations*” was the third top leadership practice pertaining to creating staff expectations and teacher job satisfaction endorsed by both principal (N = 11, 44%) and teacher (N = 204, 42%) respondents.

Leading by Standing Behind

Teachers reported higher levels of job satisfaction and felt their overall capacities for teaching were enhanced when direct assistance was given through “provision(s) of the material and financial resources necessary to teach, support

for teachers in the area of student discipline, protection of the allocated instructional time, and reward for teachers' efforts" (Blasé & Kirby, 2009, p. 68). Teachers also reported higher levels of job satisfaction when they had appropriate curriculum, manageable class sizes (Briggs & Richardson, 1993) and when they had their administrator's support when dealing with challenging situations with students and parents (Petty, 2007). Teachers report higher levels of satisfaction when they feel that they have a good rapport with their principal and can approach their principal about issues (Bhella, 2001).

The principal (N = 21, 84%) and teacher respondents (N = 290, 60%) in this study both identified "*taking time to listen to teachers' concerns and work to problem solve with the teacher regarding these concerns*" as the top leadership practice pertaining to Leading by Standing Behind and teacher job satisfaction. Principal respondents (N =14, 56%) and teacher respondents (N = 223, 41%) also agreed that "*developing, implementing and supporting a school wide behavior/discipline program*" is an important principal practice in regards to how principals support their teachers and teacher job satisfaction. Teacher respondents identified this as the second most important practice, and principal respondents identified this practice as the third most important. Principal (N = 10, 40%) and teacher (N = 198, 41%) respondents also agree that "*ensuring that there is an orderly and safe environment conducive to learning*" is another important leadership practice that principals can provide, that leads to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction.

There are two areas where principal and teacher respondents significantly differed. Principal respondents (N=16, 64%) identified “*being visible in the hallways, teachers’ classrooms and school activities*” as their second top practice to impact teacher job satisfaction, compared to teacher respondents (N = 106, 22%). This is a highly significant ($p < .01$) difference (42%) between principal and teacher respondents. Another gap between teacher and principal respondents in this area was connected to the leadership practice “*supporting teachers’ discipline strategies.*” Teacher respondents (N = 174, 36%) identified this as their fourth top practice impacting teacher job satisfaction, and zero principal respondents identified this as a top practice. This difference would have been highly significant, but due to zero principals choosing this practice a z-test could not be run. The qualitative data from the study also supports that the difference between the principal and teacher respondents would have been highly significant if the principal sample size would have been larger. Twenty-four percent of teachers identified the key practices of “*supporting teachers’ discipline strategies*”, “*supporting teachers’ authority in enforcing policy*”, and “*supporting teachers in their decisions regarding classroom management.*”

Communication

“Principals’ actions create distinct working environments within schools that are highly predictive of teacher satisfaction and commitment” (Shann, 1998, p.67). The relationship between Principals’ behavior and teachers’ job satisfaction and job related stress is significantly related (Evans et. al, 1990).

According to Whitaker, Whitaker and Lumpa (2009) the leadership behavior that has the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction relates to communication.

Whitaker et. al (2009) further clarifies this by detailing that communication is not only about what a principal says and how they say it, but communication is about what a principal says and how their staff perceive it.

Of the seven core leadership practices areas in this study, communication is the area where principal and teacher respondents had the most similarity in responses. Both principal (N = 21, 84%) and teacher (N = 310, 64%) respondents identified "*being open and honest and providing immediate feedback when communicating with teaching staff*" as their top leadership practice pertaining to communication and teacher job satisfaction. Principal (N=12, 48%) and teacher (N – 286, 59%) identified "*providing clear, consistent, direct and tactful communication with teaching staff*" as a top leadership practice that leads to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. There was one leadership practice where there was a significant ($p <.05$) difference between the principal (N = 13, 52%) and teacher (N = 150, 32%) respondents. The leadership practice "*encouraging teachers and teaching staff to have informal 'drop-in' meetings*" was the second highest leadership practice chosen by principals in this study, and the fourth leadership practice chosen by teachers.

The qualitative data that came from this study revealed a leadership practice that was not identified on the survey instrument. Twenty-five percent of teacher respondents identified that when principals are communicating with teaching staff, they should be on time and respect the teacher's time.

Professional Role

Principals serve in many and varied roles as the leader of their organization. Principals need to understand their professional role, understand the dynamics of their staff and employ a variety of strategies to encourage and lead their staff (Whitaker et. al, 2009). “Principals can affect virtually all aspects of school life” (Blasé & Kirby, 2009, p. 2) and how they conduct and employ their professional duties greatly influences the level of teacher satisfaction (Briggs & Richardson, 1993, Evans, 1997, Bhella, 2001, and Hurren, 2006).

Of the seven core leadership practices, Professional Role is the area principal and teacher respondents had some of the greatest differences in their responses. Principal respondents (N = 23, 92%) identified “*being honest, open and consistent with words and actions*” as the top leadership practice connected to professional role and teacher job satisfaction. In great contrast, only 8% (N = 39) of teacher respondents identified this as a top leadership practice. The difference between the principal and teacher respondents was 84%, the largest difference in the entire study. However, due to the small number of teacher respondents to this item, a z-test could not be run to determine statistical significance. The second largest difference between principal and teacher respondents also occurred in regards to the leadership practices pertaining to professional role and teacher job satisfaction. Teacher respondents (N = 349, 72%) identified the practice “*not becoming so concerned with being effective, that*

a principal loses sight of what is effective.” Only 4% (N =1) of principal respondents identified this as a top leadership practice; a difference between principal and teacher respondents of 68%. Again, due to the small sample size, in this case principal respondents, a z-test could not be run to determine statistical significance.

There were two areas where statistical significance could be determined. Principal respondents (N = 11, 44%) identified “*demonstrating concern for teaching staff*” as a top professional role practice that positively influences teacher job satisfaction. Teacher respondents (N = 43, 9%) ranked this practice 9 out of 10, compared to principals who ranked it 3 out of 10. The difference (35%) between principal and teacher respondents is highly significant ($p < .01$). One of the highest statistically significant ($p < .01$) differences between principal and teacher respondents (37%) occurred in the area of professional role and teacher job satisfaction. Fifty-seven percent (N = 276) of teacher respondents identified the leadership practice “*soliciting input in creating policies that may be enforced through the exercise of authority*” as a top leadership practice impacting their level of job satisfaction compared to 20% (N = 5) of the principal respondents.

CONCLUSIONS FROM RESEARCH QUESTION FOUR

What are the differences in principals’ perceptions of their teaching staff’s overall job satisfaction across the principal’s gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level and building size?

Multiple analyses were run and no significant differences were found. There was little to no variance regarding principals' perception of their teaching staff's overall job satisfaction across the principals' gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level and building size. The principal respondents in this group appear to be relatively homogenous in their response to their perception of their teaching staff's overall level of job satisfaction.

CONCLUSIONS FROM RESEARCH QUESTION FIVE

What are the differences in the teachers' reported overall job satisfaction across the teachers' gender, age, years of experience, district type, grade level, level, building size and subject area?

A significant difference was found between male teachers ($M = 7.99$) compared to female teachers ($M = 7.60$; $t(188) = -2.45$, $p < .015$). Male teachers in this study reported overall higher levels of job satisfaction than female teachers. The result is different than what the researcher learned through examining the literature. Multiple studies across several decades (Schultz, 1952, Blocker & Richardson, 1963, Chapman & Lowther, Borg & Riding, 1991) have concluded that females report higher levels of job satisfaction.

Two additional variables were found to hold statistical significance in regards to teachers' reported overall level of job satisfaction. Data analyses revealed that teachers age 56 plus ($M = 8.41$; $p = .008$) report overall higher levels of job satisfaction than teachers ages 25-55. Age groups 25-35, 36-45 and

46-55 were not significantly different from each other in their perceptions of overall job satisfaction. This finding somewhat differs from what was reviewed in the literature. Greene-Reese, Johnson & Campbell (1991) conducted a study and concluded that the age of the teacher is not significant in regards to level of perceived overall job satisfaction. Age was not looked at in-depth in the review of literature for this study.

The second variable where differences were determined was in teachers' district type. There were significant differences between suburban teachers ($M = 7.82$) and out-state teachers ($M = 7.43$, $p = .024$). Suburban teachers reported overall higher levels of job satisfaction than out-state teachers. The raw data reveals that metro teachers ($M = 7.96$) had the overall highest level of job satisfaction, but due to the smaller sample of metro teachers compared to suburban and out-state teachers no statistical differences could be determined.

Additional analyses were done to address the last question on the survey. Principals were asked to rate on a scale from one to ten (one being the lowest and ten being the highest), what they believed was the overall level of teaching job satisfaction with their teaching staff, and teachers were asked to rate on a scale from one to ten what they believed to be their overall level of job satisfaction. There was a significant difference between the principals' perceptions of their teachers' overall job satisfaction ($M = 7.20$) and the teachers' reported level ($M = 7.68$) of overall satisfaction ($t(33) = -2.65$, $p = .015$). Teachers were actually more satisfied than their principals perceived them to be.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

The following recommendations are made based on the research study and the conclusions drawn from the data. The recommendations will coincide with the seven core leadership practice areas of: staff acknowledgement, shared leadership, professional autonomy, creating staff expectations, supporting staff (leading by standing behind), communication and professional role.

Staff acknowledgement/recognition

Both principals and teachers in this study identified the leadership practices of “*individually talking with teachers and recognizing and acknowledging their accomplishments, and taking the time to know more about the teachers beyond what they are teaching in the classroom*” as having a significant impact on teacher job satisfaction. Teachers were not as concerned regarding the specificity and immediacy of the feedback, as much as they were concerned with the individual and genuine intent of the recognition. It is imperative for principals to talk to and know their teachers as individuals. Chapman and Lowther (1982) and Blasé and Kirby (2009) identify recognition as the greatest influence on teacher job satisfaction.

Shared leadership

Both principals and teachers in this study agreed that *seeking input and involvement at the early planning stages of a project* is a leadership practice that leads to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. Teachers also identified that principals should communicate to teaching staff how they intend to manage and involve others in the organization. Principals should be aware of this and explore how to implement this leadership practice as it was not identified as a top practice by principals in this study.

Professional Autonomy

Teachers in this study, and researchers (Kim & Loadman, 1994, Blasé & Kirby, 2009, Whitaker et al., 2009) identify the leadership practice of *allowing teachers the freedom to teach in ways that they feel are the most effective* as having a positive impact on teacher job satisfaction. Zero principals in this study identified this as a top practice. Principals, within their administrative teams, should discuss what this would mean and what it would look like to allow teachers the freedom to teach in ways that they feel are most effective in their settings. In addition, both principals and teachers identified the allocation of time for professional learning communities as having a positive impact on teacher job satisfaction. Research (Marzano, 2007, Fullen, 2007, Blasé & Kirby, 2009) also identified professional learning communities as having a positive impact on student achievement.

Creating Staff Expectation

In this study, and in the research, principals and teachers agree regarding what practices can be implemented to create staff expectation and have a positive influence on teacher job satisfaction. Teachers and principals agree that principals should clearly, consistently, directly and tactfully communicate what is expected from teaching staff. And, principals should consistently model the behaviors and actions that are expected from teachers. Teachers who perceive administrative behavior as consistent with their expectations have reported levels of higher job satisfaction (Bidwell, 1955, Whitaker et al., 2009).

Supporting Staff/ Leading by Standing Behind

Both teachers and principals in this study identified the leadership practice of *principals taking the time to listen to teachers' concerns and work to problem solve with the teacher* as the top practice that has a positive influence on teacher job satisfaction. Teachers in this study and teachers in research (Blasé & Kirby, 2009) identified principals supporting teachers' discipline strategies as having a positive impact on teacher job satisfaction. No principals in this study identified this as a top leadership practice influencing teacher job satisfaction. Again, it would be important for principals to talk with teachers about what it means to support their discipline strategies and what does it look like when a principal does support the teachers' discipline strategies.

Communication

Teachers and principals in this study were consistent in the leadership practices pertaining to communication and teacher job satisfaction. The top leadership practices included: *being open, honest and providing immediate feedback when communicating with teaching staff; providing clear, consistent, direct and tactful communication with teaching staff; and encouraging teachers and teaching staff to have informal “drop-in” meetings.* Whitaker et al. (2009), elaborates on the fact that principals need to be aware that is not necessarily what they communicate, but how they communicate and how the communication is perceived. The above practices involve a principal being clear, consistent and explicit in their communication and following up with teaching staff about their communication.

Professional Role

In this study, teachers clearly chose the following leadership practice as number one regarding principals' professional role influencing their level of job satisfaction: *not becoming so concerned with being effective, that a principal loses sight of what is affective.* Blasé & Kirby (2009) discuss that effective principals are “mirrors to the possible” (p.103-116). The researchers caution principals to not be so focused on mandates and implementing and imposing practices that they lose sight of the effective teachers and the positive work of their staff. Teachers described this best in their open comments regarding what additional leadership practices a building principal could use to fulfill their professional role and increase teacher job satisfaction. Twenty percent of the

teacher respondents stated it was important for principals to guide the big picture, making sure that everything that takes place and all decisions that are made come back to the overarching vision.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The following recommendations for future study are made based on the findings and conclusions drawn from this study's data.

Sample Size

This study included the responses of 408 teachers and 25 principals from twenty-one different schools. There were several instances where statistical significance between the principal and teacher respondents could not be determined due to the large difference between the number of principals and teachers. Conducting a larger study with more principal respondents would allow for more statistical significance to be determined between teachers and principals identify as important leadership practices that increase teacher job satisfaction.

Principal vs. Teacher Differences

There were three leadership practices that were strongly endorsed by teachers that were not endorsed by principals. The leadership practice "*allowing teachers the freedom to teach in ways that they feel are most effective*" was endorsed by 218 teachers (almost half of the respondents) and zero principals. The leadership practice "*supporting teachers' discipline strategies*" was endorsed

by 174 teachers and zero principals. And the leadership practice “*not becoming so concerned with being effective, that a principal loses sight of what is affective*” was endorsed by 349 teachers, and one principal. A researcher could conduct an in-depth case study of one school district where these glaring differences could be further explored and expanded upon through focus groups and follow-up interviews.

Gender Analysis

In this study, male teachers reported overall higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than female teachers and the difference was statistically significant. This is in contrast to what several decades of research has concluded. A researcher could conduct a study to explore what are some of the potential reasons that males are reporting overall higher levels of job satisfaction in this study, compared to other studies.

Teacher Location Analysis

In this study, suburban teachers reported overall higher levels of teacher job satisfaction than out-state teachers and the differences were statistically significant. The raw data also indicated that metro teachers were more satisfied than suburban teachers but the sample size of metro teachers was too small to determine statistical significance. A researcher could conduct a study to look at the differences between metro, suburban and out-state teacher job satisfaction and why those differences exist.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Aderfer, C. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1979). Life experiences of adults' enduring strength of desires in organizations [journal]. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 346-347.
- Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1998, January). 360 Degree feedback and leadership development [Journal]. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 6(1), 35-43.
- Anderson, L. W. (1953, May). Teacher morale and student achievement [journal]. *Journal of Educational Research*, 46(9), 693-698.
- Ashton, P. (1984, September). Teacher efficacy: A motivational paradigm for effective teacher education [journal]. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(5), 23-32.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. London: Sage Publications.
- Berry, L. L., & Seltman, K. D. (2008). *Management lessons from Mayo Clinic: Inside one of the world's most admired service organizations*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Bhella, S. K. (2001). Principal's leadership style: does it affect teacher morale? [Journal]. *Education*, 102(4), 369-376.

- Blase, J., & Kirby, P. C. (2009). *Bringing out the best in teachers: what effective principals do* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Blocker, C. E., & Richardson, R. C. (1963, January). Twenty-five years of morale research: A critical review [journal]. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 36(5), 200-210.
- Borg, M. G., & Riding, R. J. (1991, September). Occupational stress and satisfaction in teaching [Journal]. *British Educational Research Journal*, 17(3).
- Briggs, L. D., & Richardson, W. D. (1993). Causes and effects of low morale among secondary teachers [Journal]. *Instructional Psychology*, 19, 87-92.
- Burkhardt, P. E. (1993). *The effects of principal's gender and motivational style on teacher job satisfaction and school effectiveness* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Butt, G., Lance, A., Fielding, A., Gunter, H., Rayner, S., & Thomas, H. (2005, November). Teacher job satisfaction: lessons from the TSW pathfinder project [journal]. *School Leadership and Management*, 25(5), 455-471. DOI: 10.1080/13634230500340807
- Butt, G., Lance, A., Fielding, A., Gunter, H., Rayner, S., & Thomas, H. (November, 2005). Journal [Journal]. *School Leadership and Management*, 25(5), 455-471. DOI: 10.1080/13634230500340807
- Chapman, D. W., & Lowther, M. A. (1982). Teachers' satisfaction with teaching [journal]. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 75(4), 241-247.

- Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: a meta-analysis [Journal]. *Review of Educational Research, 77*, 113-143.
- Davis, J., & Wilson, S. M. (2000, July/August). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress [Periodical]. *The Clearing House, 349-353*.
- ERG Theory of Motivation - Clayton P. Alderfer. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.envisionsoftware.com/articles/ERG_Theory.html
- Eichinger, J. (2000). Job stress and satisfaction among special education teachers: effects of gender and social role orientation [journal]. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 47(4)*, 397-412. DOI: 10.1080/10349120020012708
- Eklund, N. (2008). *How was your day at school? Improving dialogue about teacher job satisfaction*. Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute Press.
- Evans, L. (1997). Understanding teacher morale and job satisfaction [journal]. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13(8)*, 831-845.
- Evans, L. (2001). Delving deeper into morale, job satisfaction and motivation among education professionals [Journal]. *Educational Management & Administration, 29(3)*, 291-306.
- Evans, L., Virden, Johnson, & Dewayne, J. (1990). The relationship of principals' leadership behavior and teachers' job satisfaction [Journal]. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 17(1)*, 941-956.

- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Fiore, D. (2004). *Introduction to educational administration: Standards, theories, and practice*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Frederick Herzberg - Motivational Theory. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.envisionsoftware.com/articles/Herzberg-Motivational-Theory.html>
- Fullen, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change: What the best leaders do to help their organizations survive and thrive*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- George, B. (2007). *True north: Discovering your authentic leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for? [Journal]. *American Political Science Review*, 98(2), 341-354.
- Greene-Reese, S., Johnson, D. J., & Campbell, W. A. (1991). Teacher job satisfaction and teacher job stress: School size, age and teaching experience [journal]. *Education*, 112(2), 247-252.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional Leadership: concepts, issues, and controversies*
- Hanson, P. M. (1989). *Meeting the needs: teacher motivation, morale, and job satisfaction* (Unpublished masters thesis). Mankato State University, Mankato, Minnesota.

- Heck, R. H., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1993). Principal leadership behaviors and school achievement [Bulletin]. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(553), 20-28.
- Heck, R., Larson, T. J., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model [journal]. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(2), 94-125.
- Hemric, M., Eury, A. D., & Shellman, D. (2008). Correlations between perceived teacher empowerment and perceived sense of teacher efficacy [journal]. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, 7(1), 37-50.
- Hofstede, G. (1994). Management scientists are human [journal]. *Management Science*, 40(1), 4-13.
- Hunter-Boykin, H. S., Evans, & Virden (1995, June). The relationship between high school principals' leadership and teachers' morale [Journal]. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 22(2), 941-956.
- Igonina, M. V. (2009). Why are young teachers refusing to teach school? [journal]. *Russian Education and Society*, 51(11), 10-19. DOI: 10.2753/RES1060-9393511102
- Klassen, R. M., & Anderson, C. J. (2009, October, 2009). How times change: secondary teachers' job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in 1962 and 2007 [Journal]. *British Educational Research Journal*, 35(5), 745-759. doi: 10.1080/01411920802688721
- Langley, N., & Jacobs, M. (2006). *5 essential skills for school leaders: Moving from good to great*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

- Lowry, R. (2013). The significance of the difference between two independent proportions. Retrieved from http://vassarstats.net/propdiff_ind.html
- Marsh, E. R. (1978). Maslow's implied matrix: A clarification of the need hierarchy theory [journal]. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 6(1), 113-116.
- Martson, S. H. (2009). Why do they teach? A comparison of elementary, high school, and college teachers [journal]. *Education*, 131(2), 437-454.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works from research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mertler, C. A. (2002, Fall). Job satisfaction and perception of motivation among middle and high school teachers [journal]. *American Secondary Education*, 31(1), 43-53.
- Morgan, M., Ludlow, L., Kitching, K., O'Leary, M., & Clarke, A. (2010, April). What makes teachers tick? Sustaining events in new teachers' lives [journal]. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(2), 191-208. DOI: 10.1080/0411920902780972
- Mufford, M. D. (Ed.). (2010). *Leadership 101*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company, .
- Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (1994). *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Owens, R. G., & Valesky, T. C. (2007). *Organizational behavior in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform*. Boston: Pearson.

- Pearson, L., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism [Journal]. *Education Research Quarterly*, 29(1), 37-53.
- Peknik, V. (2010). *Effect of motivation to improve the quality of work for employees in the company* (Doctoral dissertation, European Polytechnic Institute, Ltd., Kunovice). Retrieved from
- Perrachione, B., Rosser, V., & Petersen, G. (2008). Why do they stay? Elementary teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention [journal]. *The Professional Educator*, 32(2), 437-454.
- Petty, T. (2007). Empowering teachers: they have told us what they want and need to be successful [periodical]. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 25-28.
- Roberts, C. M. (2010). *The Dissertation Journey* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.
- Sadri, G., & Bowen, R. C. (2011, October). Meeting employee requirements: Maslow's hierarchy of needs is still a reliable guide to motivating staff [journal]. *Industrial Engineer*, 44-48.
- Senigaur, E. (1981). *The teacher's perception of the principal's leadership behavior and faculty morale: their impact on student achievement* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Houston, Houston, Texas.

- Shann, M. J. (1998). Professional commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools [journal]. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92(2), 63-73.
- Slavin, R. E. (2007). *Educational research in an age of accountability*. United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Tuettermann, E. (1991). Teaching: stress and satisfaction [journal]. *Issues in Education Research*, (1), 31-42. DOI: 10.1177/0263211X010293004
- Van Houtte, M. (2006, March/April). Tracking and teacher satisfaction: Role of study culture and trust [journal]. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 247-254.
- Van Houtte, M. (March/April 2006). Tracking and Teacher Satisfaction: Role of Study Culture and Trust [Journal]. *The Journal of Educational Leadership*, 99(4), 247-254.
- Whitaker, T., Whitaker, B., & Lumpa, D. (2009). *Motivating and inspiring teachers The educational leaders guide for building staff morale* (2nd ed.).
- Zigarelli, M. A. (1996). An emperical test of conclusions from effective schools research [Journal]. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 90(2), 103-109.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Heidi Hahn - Leadership Practices

Principal Practices and Their Impact on Teacher Job Satisfaction

Research has identified many qualities that comprise an effective educational leader (Marzano et al., 2005, Langley & Jacobs, 2006, Covey, 2007) and research over several decades has identified what impacts teacher job satisfaction (Anderson, 1953, Blocker & Richardson, 1963, Kim & Loadman, 1994, Petty, 2007). Research consistently identifies the building principal as the most influential and as the key factor impacting teacher job satisfaction (Blocker & Richardson, 2002).

This survey is created around the practices that principals use that have the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction (Kirby & Blaze, 2009, Whitaker et al., 2009). You will be asked to identify the practices that you believe have the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction.

CONSENT INFORMATION

Principal Practices and Their Impact on Teacher Job Satisfaction Study - Implied Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in this study to help assess what principal practices have an impact on teacher job satisfaction. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a teacher or principal within your school district, and your district has agreed to participate in this study.

Background Information and Purpose:

The purpose of this study is to identify which practices building principals use to improve teacher job satisfaction and examine how effective those practices are as perceived by the teaching staff.

Procedures:

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete the on-line survey which is completely anonymous so no one will be able to identify a specific individual's form. It is important that as many people as possible complete and turn in this survey to compile an accurate assessment of what principal practices are utilized to improve teacher job satisfaction and how teachers perceive the effectiveness of these practices.

Risks:

There are no foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study.

Benefits:

The questions on this survey were developed by reviewing the research on Principal practices that impact teacher job satisfaction. Research identifies multiple factors that lead to increased job satisfaction and for teachers, the building principal is key to creating and facilitating these satisfaction factors. It is our hope that the information gained will help principals and training programs for principals increase their skills that directly influence teacher job satisfaction.

Confidentiality:

All surveys will be completed anonymously. The data will only be examined in group format. Your information will be confidential and no answers that could identify a specific individual will be used.

Research Results:

If you are interested in learning the results of the survey, feel free to contact the Doctoral Studies Center for Educational Administration and Leadership at St. Cloud State University, B127 Education Building, 720 Fourth Ave. South, St. Cloud, MN 56301-4498, 320-308-2160.

Contact Information:

If you have any additional questions please contact the researcher, at 218-839-2953 or heidi.hahn@isd181.org, or the advisor, Dr. John Eller, at 320-308-4272 or jfeller@stcloudstate.edu.

Heidi Hahn - Leadership Practices

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal:
Participation is voluntary. Your decision about participation will not affect your current or future relations with your district or St. Cloud State University. If you decide to fill out the survey and there are any questions you are not comfortable answering, do not answer them. Please remember your responses are confidential. They are designed to assess principals practices and their relation to teacher job satisfaction. If you decide to participate in this study, you are free to withdraw at any time. Your completion of this survey indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and consent to participate in this study.

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES

Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions related to principal practices and their impact on teacher job satisfaction.

1. Below is a list of practices that principals use to recognize their teaching staff, please select the THREE practices that you identify as having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction:

(All these strategies impact teacher job satisfaction; identify the THREE that you believe impact teacher job satisfaction the most.)

- Scheduling a time or forum where teaching staff are recognized
- Targeting praise to a teacher's specific work
- Boasting and speaking positively about teaching staff in professional and public settings
- Recognizing and praising teaching staff at faculty meetings
- Individually talking with teachers and recognizing and acknowledging their accomplishments
- Writing individual notes to teachers recognizing the good things they are doing
- Taking the time to know more about teachers beyond what they are teaching in the classroom
- Writing a weekly newsletter or memo that includes recognition of teaching staff for the work they do
- Providing specific and immediate feedback when recognizing or praising teaching staff
- Using non-verbal methods such as a smile or a thumbs up when teachers are observed in their classrooms and hallways

2. Please list any additional principal practices that can be used to recognize and praise teaching staff that you believe increases teacher job satisfaction:

Heidi Hahn - Leadership Practices

3. Below is a list of leadership practices that building principals use to involve their teachers in the shared decision making process. Please select the THREE practices that you identify as having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction: (Again, all these practices impact teacher job selection, select the three that you identify as having the greatest impact.)

- Allowing teachers to identify the goals and objectives for the school
- Seeking teacher input/involvement at the early planning stages of a project
- Identifying instructional leaders within a school and relying on them for curriculum expertise
- Having a formal system in place to address concerns from teaching staff
- Using language like team, family, community when involving staff
- Seeking out individual teachers and connecting them with projects and leadership opportunities
- Communicating to teaching staff how the principal intends to manage and involve others
- Identify top teachers and seek them out to peer coach and mentor
- Encouraging staff to present at local, state and national conferences
- Having formal leadership teams in the school and relying on their expertise for decisions and/or advisory purposes

4. Please list any additional practices that a building principal can use to involve teaching staff in the shared decision making process that you believe increases teacher job satisfaction:

Heidi Hahn - Leadership Practices

5. Please select the THREE practices that you identify as having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction when a building principal works to create a culture of professional autonomy with teachers:

- Trusting teachers to make informed instructional decisions for their students
- Developing and implementing a shared decision making structure with my teaching staff
- Protecting teachers' instructional time from interruptions
- Allowing teachers the freedom to teach in the ways that they feel are the most effective
- Providing guidance and professional development opportunities regarding effective teaching practices
- Encouraging and allocating time for professional learning communities
- Trusting teaching staff as professionals and as experts in their field/content area
- Knowing when to use and how to balance the use of formal versus informal authority
- Informing teachers of what outcome is expected and then leaving the details to the teacher's discretion
- Allowing and encouraging teaching staff the freedom to teach within his/her style as long as they stay within the guidelines of the school philosophy

6. Please list any additional leadership practices that a building principal may use to create a culture of professional autonomy with teaching staff that you believe will increase teacher job satisfaction:

7. Many principals use expectations to influence the actions and behaviors of their teaching staff. Please select the THREE practices regarding expectations that you identify as having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction:

- Repeating, restating and clarifying what is expected from teaching staff
- Consistently modeling the behaviors and actions that are expected from teachers
- Expecting teachers to maximize learning time, therefore minimizing disruptions
- Clearly, consistently, directly and tactfully communicating what is expected from teaching staff
- Consistently addressing teaching staff when they are not meeting expectations
- Providing individual feedback to teachers regarding expectations
- Expecting teaching staff to model appropriate behavior for students and fellow colleagues
- Expecting teachers and modeling for them that all students should be treated with dignity and respect
- Recognizing teachers positively when they are meeting or exceeding expectations

Heidi Hahn - Leadership Practices

8. Please list any additional leadership practices that a building principal can use to create expectations among teaching staff that you believe increases teacher job satisfaction:

9. Below is a list of practices that principals use as a way to demonstrate that they stand behind and support their teachers. Please select the THREE practices that you identify as having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction:

- Assigning teachers to teach the classes that they are the most trained and skilled to teach
- Assuring that teachers have ample textbooks, paper and equipment to teach the required curriculum
- Advocating and supporting teachers to go to conferences and trainings
- Ensuring that there is an orderly and safe environment conducive to learning
- Supporting teachers in their decisions regarding classroom management
- Supporting teachers' discipline strategies
- Developing, implementing and supporting a school wide behavior/discipline program
- Being visible in the hallways, teachers' classrooms and school activities
- Supporting teachers' authority in enforcing policy
- Taking time to listen to teachers' concerns and work to problem solve with the teacher regarding the concerns

10. Please list any additional leadership practices that can be used to demonstrate how principals lead by "standing behind" teaching staff that you believe will increase teacher job satisfaction:

Heidi Hahn - Leadership Practices

11. Below is a list of key practices used by principals to communicate with their teaching staff. Please select the THREE practices that you identify as having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction:

- Providing clear, consistent, direct and tactful communication with teaching staff
- Holding formal conferences with individual teachers
- Holding formal conferences with small groups of teachers
- Utilizing faculty meetings as opportunities to reinforce goals with teaching staff
- Encouraging teachers and teaching staff to have informal "drop-in" meetings
- Sending e-mails to individual staff to communicate concerns or needs
- Writing individual notes to teachers to recognize their good work and thank them
- Being open and honest and providing immediate feedback when communicating with teaching staff
- Having an agenda for all meetings with teaching staff and keeping summary notes from those meetings
- Writing a weekly memo to my teaching staff highlighting important information, dates, things to celebrate, etc...

12. Please list any additional leadership practices that a building principal can use to communicate with teaching staff that you believe increases teacher job satisfaction:

13. As a building principal, you are required to wear many hats to fulfill the requirements of your professional role. Please select the THREE practices that you identify as having the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction:

- Providing training opportunities to reinforce goals and improve instruction
- Being visible and modeling expectations for teaching staff
- Using authority when necessary to enforce rules and policies
- Not becoming so concerned with being effective, that a principal loses sight of what is affective
- Soliciting input in creating policies that may be enforced through the exercise of authority
- Being honest, open and consistent with words and actions
- Demonstrating concern for teaching staff
- Allowing discretion in implementation of knowledge gained through staff development
- Assisting teachers in evaluating newly attempted teaching techniques
- Keeping informed of new developments in curriculum and instruction and providing relevant information to teachers

Heidi Hahn - Leadership Practices

14. Please list any additional leadership practices that can be used by a building principal to fulfill their professional role that you believe increases teacher job satisfaction:

15. On a scale from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest, and 10 being the highest, please rate what you believe is the overall level of job satisfaction for your teaching staff:

- 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions related to you as a principal:

16. From the drop down menu, please choose the school your currently work at:

17. Please select your gender:

- Female
 Male

18. Please select your age:

- 25-35
 36-45
 46-55
 56 plus

19. Please select the best response that describes your total experience as a principal:

- 0-3 years
 4-7 years
 8-12 years
 13-17 years
 18 or more years

20. Please select the response that best describes your total experience as a principal in Minnesota:

- 0-3 years
 4-7 years
 8-12 years
 13-18 years
 18 or more years

Heidi Hahn - Leadership Practices

21. Please select your years of experience in education prior to becoming a principal:

0-5 years
 6-10 years
 11-15 years
 16-20 years
 21 plus

22. Please select the response that best describes the grade level(s) you serve:

Elementary Middle High School Alternative Education K-12

23. Please select the district that best describes where you work:

Metro
 Suburban
 Out-State

24. Select the response that best describes the size of the building you currently lead:

Less than 150 students Between 150-250 students Between 250-400 students Between 400-600 students Between 600-800 students Between 800-1,000 students More than 1,000 students

25. Select the response that best describes the number of certified teaching staff you supervise.

1-25 Certified Staff 26-40 Certified Staff 41-75 Certified Staff 76-100 Certified Staff 101-125 Certified Staff More than 126 Certified Staff

APPENDIX B

Heidi Hahn - Teacher Survey

Principal Practices and Their Impact on Teacher Job Satisfaction

Research has identified many qualities that comprise an effective educational leader (Marzano et al., 2005, Langley & Jacobs, 2006, Covey, 2007) and research over several decades has identified what impacts teacher job satisfaction (Anderson, 1953, Blocker & Richardson, 1963, Kim & Loadman, 1994, Petty, 2007). Research consistently identifies the building principal as the most influential and as the key factor impacting teacher job satisfaction (Blocker & Richardson, 2002).

This survey is created around the practices that principals use that have the greatest impact on teacher job satisfaction (Kirby & Blaze, 2009, Whitaker et al., 2009). You will be asked to identify the practices that principals use that have the greatest impact on your level of job satisfaction as a teacher.

CONSENT INFORMATION

Principal Practices and Their Impact on Teacher Job Satisfaction Study - Implied Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in this study to help assess what principal practices have an impact on teacher job satisfaction. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a teacher or principal within your school district, and your district has agreed to participate in this study.

Background Information and Purpose:

The purpose of this study is to identify which practices building principals use to improve teacher job satisfaction and examine how effective those practices are as perceived by the teaching staff.

Procedures:

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete the on-line survey which is completely anonymous so no one will be able to identify a specific individual's form. It is important that as many people as possible complete and turn in this survey to compile an accurate assessment of what principal practices are utilized to improve teacher job satisfaction and how teachers perceive the effectiveness of these practices.

Risks:

There are no foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study.

Benefits:

The questions on this survey were developed by reviewing the research on Principal practices that impact teacher job satisfaction. Research identifies multiple factors that lead to increased job satisfaction and for teachers, the building principal is key to creating and facilitating these satisfaction factors. It is our hope that the information gained will help principals and training programs for principals increase their skills that directly influence teacher job satisfaction.

Confidentiality:

All surveys will be completed anonymously. The data will only be examined in group format. Your information will be confidential and no answers that could identify a specific individual will be used.

Research Results:

If you are interested in learning the results of the survey, feel free to contact the Doctoral Studies Center for Educational Administration and Leadership at St. Cloud State University, B127 Education Building, 720 Fourth Ave. South, St. Cloud, MN 56301-4498, 320-308-2160.

Contact Information:

If you have any additional questions please contact the researcher, at 218-839-2953 or heidi.hahn@isd181.org, or the advisor, Dr. John Eller, at 320-308-4272 or jfeller@stcloudstate.edu.

Heidi Hahn - Teacher Survey

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal:

Participation is voluntary. Your decision about participation will not affect your current or future relations with your school district or St. Cloud State University. If you decide to complete the survey and find there are questions you are not comfortable answering, do not answer them. Please remember your responses are confidential. They are designed to assess principal's practices and their relation to teacher job satisfaction. If you decide to participate in this study, you are free to withdraw at any time. Your completion of this survey indicates that you at least 18 years of age and consent to participate in this study.

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES

Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions related to what practices principals may use and how they might impact your level of job satisfaction.

1. Below is a list of practices that principals use to recognize their teaching staff. These practices have been identified as having a positive impact on teacher job satisfaction.

Please identify the THREE practices that you believe influence your level of job satisfaction the most:

(All of these strategies may impact your job satisfaction, but identify the THREE that have the greatest impact on you.)

- Schedules a time or forum where teaching staff is recognized
- Targets his/her praise to specific work of teachers
- Boasts and speaks positively about his/her teaching staff in professional and public settings
- Recognizes and praises his/her teaching staff at faculty meetings
- Individually talks with teachers and recognizes and acknowledges their accomplishments
- Writes individual notes to teachers recognizing the good things they are doing
- Takes the time to know more about his/her teaching staff beyond what they are teaching in the classroom
- Is specific and immediate when recognizing or praising the teaching of his/her teaching staff
- Sends out a weekly newsletter or memo and includes recognition of teaching staff for the work they do
- Uses non-verbal methods such as a smile or a thumbs up as he/she observes my teaching or when I am working in the hallways, lunchroom, etc.

2. Please list any additional practices that you identify as being important for a building principal to use when recognizing and praising his/her teaching staff that enhance your level of job satisfaction:

Heidi Hahn - Teacher Survey

3. Below is a list of leadership practices that building principals use to involve their teachers in the shared decision making process. Please identify the THREE practices that impact your level of job satisfaction the most: (Again, you might identify all of these as important, identify the THREE with the greatest impact.)

- Provides opportunities for participation in identifying goals and objectives for the school
- Seeks teachers' input/involvement at the early planning stages of a project
- Identifies instructional leaders within the school and relies on them for curriculum expertise
- Has a formal system in place to address concerns from teaching staff
- Uses language like team, family, community when referring to staff
- Seeks out individual teachers and connects them with projects and leadership opportunities
- Communicates to teaching staff how he/she intends to manage and involve others
- Identifies expert teachers and seeks them out to peer coach and mentor
- Encourages teaching staff to present at local, state and national conferences
- Has formal school leadership teams and relies on their expertise for decisions and/or advisory purposes

4. Please list any additional practices that you identify as important for a principal to use when involving teaching staff in the shared decision making process that enhance your level of job satisfaction:

5. Below is a list of practices that building principals use when creating a culture of professional autonomy with their teaching staff. Please identify the THREE practices that impact your level of job satisfaction the most:

- Encourages teachers to make informed instructional decisions for their students
- Encourages and expects a shared decision making philosophy with teaching staff
- Makes conscious effort to protect teachers' instructional time from interruptions
- Encourages teachers the freedom to teach in the ways that they believe are the most effective
- Encourages and allocates time for professional learning communities
- Treats the teaching staff as professionals who are knowledgeable in their field/content area
- Knows when and how to use of his/her formal and informal authority
- Informs teachers of expected outcomes and delegates procedural details to the teacher's discretion
- Provide guidance and professional development opportunities about effective teaching practices
- Permits teachers to employ a variety of teaching styles that are consistent with the school's philosophy

Heidi Hahn - Teacher Survey

6. Please list any additional practices that you identify as important for a building principal to use when creating a culture of professional autonomy with teaching staff that enhance your level of job satisfaction:

7. Below is a list of practices that principals use to establish expectations among their teaching staff. Please identify the THREE practices that impact your level of job satisfaction the most:

- Repeats, restates and clarifies what he/she expects from teaching staff
- Consistently models the behaviors and actions that he/she expects from teachers
- Expects teachers to maximize learning time, therefore he/she minimizes disruptions
- Emphasizes clear, consistent, direct and tactful communication about what he/she expects from teaching staff
- Intervenes when teaching staff are not meeting expectations
- Provides individual feedback to teachers regarding expectations
- Expects the teaching staff to model appropriate behavior for students and fellow colleagues
- Expects teachers to treat all students with dignity and respect
- Recognizes teachers positively when they are meeting or exceeding expectations

8. Please list any additional practices that you identify as important for a building principal to use when establishing expectations among teaching staff that enhance your level of job satisfaction:

Heidi Hahn - Teacher Survey

9. Below is a list of practices that principals use as a way to demonstrate that they stand behind and support their teachers. Please identify the THREE practices that impact your level of job satisfaction the most:

- Assigns teachers to teach the classes for which they are the most trained and skilled to teach
- Advocates and supports teachers to go to conferences and trainings
- Ensures that there is an orderly and safe environment conducive to learning
- Supports teachers in their decisions regarding classroom management
- Supports teachers' discipline strategies
- Assists in the development, implementation and support of a school wide behavior/discipline program
- Is visible in the hallways and teachers' classrooms and at school activities
- Supports teachers' authority in enforcing policy
- Ensures that teachers have ample textbooks, supplies and equipment to teach the required curriculum
- Takes time to listen to teachers' concerns and works to problem solve with the teacher regarding the concerns

10. Please list or any additional practices that you identify as important for a building principal to use when demonstrating that he/she stands behind and supports teaching staff that enhance your level of job satisfaction:

11. Below is a list of key practices that principals use to communicate with their teaching staff. Please identify the THREE practices that impact your level of job satisfaction the most:

- Provides clear, consistent, direct and tactful communication with teaching staff
- Holds formal conferences with individual teachers
- Holds formal conferences with small groups of teachers
- Uses faculty meetings as opportunities to reinforce goals with teaching staff
- Encourages teachers and teaching staff to have informal "drop-in" meetings
- Sends e-mails to individual staff to communicate concerns or needs
- Writes individual notes to teachers to recognize their good work and thank them
- Is open and honest and provides immediate feedback when communicating with teaching staff
- Has an agenda for all meetings with teaching staff and keep summary notes from those meetings
- Writes a weekly memo to teaching staff highlighting important information, dates, things to celebrate, etc....

Heidi Hahn - Teacher Survey

12. Please list or any additional practices that you identify as important for a building principal to use when communicating with teaching staff that enhance your level of job satisfaction:

13. Building principals are assigned many duties and responsibilities to fulfill the requirements of their professional role. Below is a list of practices that principals use to meet the expectations of their professional role. Please identify the THREE practices that have the greatest impact on your level of job satisfaction:

- Provides training opportunities to reinforce goals and improve instruction
- Is visible and models the expectations that he/she has for teaching staff
- Uses authority when necessary to enforce rules and policies
- Is honest, open and consistent with his/her words and actions
- Shows concern for the teaching staff
- Allows discretion in implementation of knowledge gained through staff development
- Assists teachers in evaluating effectiveness of new teaching techniques
- Does not become so concerned with being effective, that he/she loses sight of what is affective
- Solicits input from teachers in creating policies that may be enforced through the exercise of authority
- Keeps current about new developments in curriculum and instruction and provide relevant information to teachers

14. Please list any additional practices that you identify as important for a building principal to use to fulfill his/her professional role that enhance your level of job satisfaction:

15. On a scale from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest, and 10 being the highest, please rate what you believe is the overall level of job satisfaction as a teacher:

- 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions related to you as a teacher:

Heidi Hahn - Teacher Survey

16. From the drop down menu, please select the school you currently work at:

17. Please select your gender:

- Female
- Male

18. Please select your age:

- 25-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56 plus

19. Please select the best response that describes your total experience as a teacher:

- 0-3 years
- 4-7 years
- 8-12 years
- 13-17 years
- 18 or more years

20. Please select the response that best describes the total number of years you have worked with your building principal:

- 0-3 years
- 4-7 years
- 8-12 years
- 13-18 years
- 18 or more years

21. Please identify the district that best describes where you work:

- Metro
- Suburban
- Out-State

22. Please select the response that best describes the grade level(s) you teach:

- Elementary
- Middle
- High School
- Alternative Education
- K-12

23. Select the response that best describes the size of the building where you currently teach:

- Less than 150 students
- Between 150-250 students
- Between 250-400 students
- Between 400-600 students
- Between 600-800 students
- Between 800-1,000 students
- More than 1,000 students

Heidi Hahn - Teacher Survey

24. Please identify the subject area that you teach:

- Elementary
- Reading/Language Arts/English
- Science
- Social Studies
- Math
- Special Education
- Music
- Art
- Physical Education/Health

Other (please specify)

APPENDIX C

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

Heidi M. Hahn
Doctoral Student - SCSU
PO Box 164
Brainerd, MN – 56401
(218) 839-2953 – Cell
(218) 454-5511 - Office

December 18, 2012

Principals:

My name is Heidi Hahn and I am a doctoral candidate in the Educational Administration and Leadership program at St. Cloud State University. I am contacting you to see if you would be willing to allow the principals and teachers in your district to volunteer to participate in my doctoral study. For my research, I am conducting a study that examines some of the practices that principals utilize and how these practices impact/enhance teacher job satisfaction.

Research consistently identifies the building principal as a key factor in influencing teacher job satisfaction (Blocker & Richardson, 2002). However, there have been few studies conducted that identify specific strategies or practices principals use that can actually improve teacher job satisfaction. Therefore, the purpose of my study is to identify which practices building principals use to improve teacher job satisfaction and how effective those practices are as perceived by teaching staff.

Based on the work of Kirby and Blasé (2009) and Whitaker et al, (2009) I have developed two survey tools. One survey tool is for principals asking them to identify the top practices they use to improve teacher job satisfaction. The second survey tool is for teachers asking them to identify which practices used by building principals have the greatest impact on their levels of job satisfaction. I have attached a copy of both of the survey tools for your review.

Should you choose to participate, I will send you an e-mail with a survey monkey link for both the principals in your district, and the teachers in your district. In addition to the survey link, the e-mail will contain basic information regarding the purpose of the study, a review of informed consent and confidentiality of their responses. I would ask that the e-mail be forwarded to your staff, and once the e-mail with survey link is sent to your staff, they will have one week to complete the survey before the link closes. the teachers in your district.

Once the surveys are completed, I will gather and analyze the data for your district, and provide you with a written summary of the findings. The hope and intent would be that you and your administrative staff would learn from the teachers in your district what practices impact their levels of job satisfaction the most. Imagine what your building principals could do knowing this information. In addition, I would like to use your districts data in my overall study. I can assure you that your district will not be identifiable in the study findings. All data collected will be reported out by groups, not by individuals or individual districts.

I am excited and passionate about my topic of study. The climate around public education is fairly tumultuous. Given the current state of No Child Left Behind, high stakes testing, merit pay and the continuous slashing to educational funding, one can only begin to wonder about the level of job satisfaction among teachers. Principals have a direct impact on a teachers' level of job satisfaction and this study would allow you to have specific feedback regarding practices that can improve job satisfaction for the teachers in your district.

I would love to visit more with you about this study. If you are interested in learning more or participating, please contact me. You can contact me at 218-839-2953 or 218-454-551. My e-mail is Heidi.hahn@isd181.org. Thank you for your time and your consideration.

Sincerely,

Heidi M. Hahn
Doctoral Candidate
St. Cloud State University

APPENDIX D

School Name
School Address
School City and Zip Code
School Phone Number

November 5, 2012

I, Superintendent _____, give my permission for the study regarding Principal Practices and Their Impact on Teacher Job Satisfaction to be conducted in _____ School District.

By agreeing to participate in this study, I understand that the principals and teachers that work within _____ School District will be asked to voluntarily complete a survey regarding Principal Practices and Their Impact of Teacher Job Satisfaction. I understand that all data will be confidential and that the data will be reported in group format so that no individual teacher or principal can be identified. I understand that I can withdraw consent to participate at any time.

I have met with the doctoral candidate for this study, Heidi Hahn, and I have reviewed the survey instruments and understand the protocol for the study. I give permission for the survey window to be open the week of _____.

Superintendent

Date

Heidi Hahn – Doctoral Candidate

Date

Dr. John Eller – Chair of Dissertation Committee

Date

APPENDIX E

School Name: _____

School Address: _____

School Phone Number: _____

January 7, 2013

I, Principal _____, give my permission for the study regarding Principal Practices and Their Impact on Teacher Job Satisfaction to be conducted in my school

_____.

By agreeing to participate in this study, I understand that the principals and teachers that work within _____ will be asked to voluntarily complete a survey regarding Principal Practices and Their Impact of Teacher Job Satisfaction. I understand that all data will be confidential and that the data will be reported in group format so that no individual teacher or principal can be identified. I understand that I can withdraw consent to participate at any time.

I have met with the doctoral candidate for this study, Heidi Hahn, and I have reviewed the survey instruments and understand the protocol for the study. I give permission for the survey window to be open the week of _____.

Number of Certified Teachers in Building: _____

Principal

Date

Heidi Hahn – Doctoral Candidate

Date

Dr. John Eller – Chair of Dissertation Committee

Date

PRINCIPAL PRACTICES AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION