



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Dissertations

Graduate College

8-2002

Job Satisfaction and Leadership Style: A Study of Michigan High School Principals

David A. Barry
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Barry, David A., "Job Satisfaction and Leadership Style: A Study of Michigan High School Principals" (2002). *Dissertations*. 1158.
<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1158>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**JOB SATISFACTION AND LEADERSHIP STYLE: A STUDY OF
MICHIGAN HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS**

by

David A. Barry

**A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership**

**Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 2002**

JOB SATISFACTION AND LEADERSHIP STYLE: A STUDY OF MICHIGAN HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

David A. Barry, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 2002

Given the magnitude of importance in the role of the school principal, it is important to understand some of the job satisfaction factors related to the retention of current school principals particularly as it relates to leadership style.

This study focuses on the retention of current principals by analyzing the job satisfaction of Michigan high school principals and examining its relationship with the principal's leadership style. This study incorporates correlation research methods and survey procedures which include a self-administered questionnaire by the principal.

The subjects for this study were randomly selected from the target population of all Michigan public high school principals who were employed during the 2001-2002 school year. From a random sample, a total of 403 Michigan high school principals received the surveys with 173 principals responding.

First, in regard to job satisfaction, the study reveals that male high school principals tended to be more satisfied with their promotion ability than female principals, and principals in Class A schools had a higher satisfaction with promotion than those in smaller schools. Overall, male principals in class B high schools had

greater job satisfaction than principals in class C high schools and the relationship between job satisfaction with pay and with work suggested that those principals who were paid more also were more satisfied with their work.

Second, in regard to leadership style, the study reveals that principals in class A high schools scored significantly higher in transformational leadership than principals in class C high schools. Likewise, principals between the ages of 46 to 55 as well as between the ages of 56 to 65 had a greater Individualized Consideration for others than those between the ages of 36 to 45.

Third, in regard to the relationship between job satisfaction and leadership style, the study reveals that a principal's job satisfaction increased when the principal's leadership style was high in Inspirational Motivation(IM), Individualized Consideration (IC), Idealized Influence(IC), and Intellectual Stimulation (IS) (the transformational leadership styles) and low in Management by Exception (MBE) and Laizze-Faire (LF) (the transactional leadership styles).

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

UMI Number: 3065396

Copyright 2002 by
Barry, David A.

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3065396

Copyright 2002 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

**Copyright by
David A. Barry
2002**

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated with deep love and affection to the following individuals who have impacted my life profoundly. First to my parents, Richard and Shirley Barry, who instilled in me a passion for reading and learning as well as the determination to succeed. Secondly, to my lovely wife, Cindy, who has always been supportive, encouraging and understanding of my efforts to achieve various goals. I am deeply grateful for her patience, love and support through this project. Finally, to my dear children, Andrew, Katelyn, Caleb, and Lucas who are an incredible source of joy. I am sure they are happy to see Dad bring closure to this project, knowing that I will have more time to play with them.

I hope this work will serve as an example for them of what it means to dedicate oneself to a goal, commit the time and energy, and make the necessary sacrifices to achieve your goal. Through perseverance all things are possible. I hope I have been a good role model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the following individuals who were highly instrumental in assisting me with bringing this project to fruition:

- **Dr. Van Cooley, my major advisor and doctoral committee chairperson, who not only guided me but became a mentor, motivator, and inspirational leader. I will always remember and appreciate the confidence he had in me to start and complete such a massive and challenging project. His patience, thoughtfulness, experience and encouragement made this pursuit a bit smoother and the completion attainable**
- **Dr. Katharine Smith and Dr. Cheryle Crawford, committee members for their support, wisdom and encouragement throughout my period of study.**
- **Dr. Jiapeng Shen, professor, for his support, encouragement, and inspiration in my writing. His servant leadership and dedication to graduate college students is encouraging.**
- **Dr. Russell Albright, friend and mathematician, who assisted with the statistical calculations in the analysis process. His friendship throughout the years has been an encouragement to me.**
- **All the Michigan high school principals who took the time to complete the surveys and return them.**
- **Lisa Heitsch and Kathy DeYonker, staff members at Walled Lake Central High School, who supported my efforts with the mailing and scoring of survey data.**

David A. Barry

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Context of the Problem.....	5
Demographic Factors Associated with Principal Attrition.....	7
Job Satisfaction Factors Associated with Principal Attrition.....	10
Importance of this Study.....	13
Operational Research Questions.....	15
Definition of Terms	16
Assumptions	19
Limitations.....	20
Chapter Summary	20
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	22
Introduction	22
Job Satisfaction.....	22
One Dimensional Job Satisfaction Theory-Work Environment Characteristics.....	24
One Dimensional Job Satisfaction Theory-Demographic Characteristics.....	26

Table of Contents—continued

Personal and School Characteristics with Job Satisfaction.....	27
Two Dimensional Job Satisfaction Theories	29
Job Satisfaction in a School Setting	32
Leadership Style	41
One Dimensional Leadership Theories.....	44
Two Dimensional Leadership Theories	52
Three Dimensional Leadership Theories	66
Multi-Dimensional Leadership Theories	74
Positive Agency Theory	75
Strategic Leadership Theory.....	77
Transformational Leadership Theory	78
Rationale for Further Studies on Leadership Theories.....	87
Job Satisfaction and Leadership Style	90
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	95
Introduction	95
Research Design	96
Population Description and Sampling Procedure.....	97
Instrumentation.....	98
Job Descriptive Index	99
Validity and Reliability	101
Scoring of the JDI and the JIG	102
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire	103

Table of Contents—continued

Validity and Reliability	107
Scoring of the MLQ.....	107
Demographic Information Survey.....	108
Data Collection and Procedures	109
Data Analysis Procedures.....	111
Summary.....	113
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	115
Overview	115
Description of the Sample	116
Research Questions	120
Research Question #1-Job Satisfaction.....	120
Research Question #2-Leadership Style	131
Transformational and Transactional Leadership Style	141
Research Question #3-Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction	148
Transformational Leadership Variables	151
Transactional Leadership Variables	154
Job Satisfaction Variables	155
Summary.....	157
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	164
Overview	164
Purpose of the Study.....	165
Study Design	167

Table of Contents—continued

Findings	168
Research Question 1	168
Gender	169
School Size	170
Years in Position	172
Pay	174
Variable Interactions.....	175
Implications	176
Research Question 2	176
Contingent Reward.....	178
Management by Exception	179
Intellectual Stimulation	180
Inspirational Motivation	180
Individualized Consideration.....	181
Idealized Influence	182
Transformational Leadership Style.....	182
Transactional Leadership Style.....	183
Implications	184
Research Question 3	185
Job Satisfaction with Work	186
Job Satisfaction with Promotion	189
Job Satisfaction with Supervision	189

Table of Contents—continued

Inspirational Motivation	190
Individualized Consideration.....	191
Management by Exception	192
Implications	192
Recommendations	193
Action Recommendations	194
Future Research Recommendations.....	194
Closing Statement.....	195
APPENDICES	
A. Permission to use JDI.....	197
B. Job Descriptive Instrument	199
C. Permission to use MLQ	202
D. Demographic Survey.....	204
E. Cover Letter to Principals	206
F. Permission from Western Michigan University HSIRB	208
BIBLIOGRAPHY	210

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Frequency Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals-Age and Gender.....	117
2.	Frequency Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals-School Size.....	118
3.	Frequency Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals-Years of Experience	119
4.	Frequency Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals-Years in Position	120
5.	Correlations between Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals and Job Satisfaction Subscales	121
6.	Correlations between Job Satisfaction Subscales of Michigan High School Principals	123
7.	Measure of Central Tendency in Job Satisfaction Subscales.....	124
8.	Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Mean Opportunities for Promotion Job Satisfaction Subscale and Gender	125
9.	Mean Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals-School Size with Job Satisfaction	126
10.	ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals Comparing School Size and Average Job Satisfaction.....	126
11.	ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals Comparing Personal and School Characteristics with Average Job Satisfaction	128
12.	Tukey's Studentized Test for Mean Job Satisfaction with Gender and School Size Comparison.....	129
13.	Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Present Pay Job Satisfaction Subscale and School Size Comparison.....	130
14.	Tukey's Studentized Range Test for People at Work and Age	130

List of Tables—continued

15.	Correlations between Personal and Leadership Styles of Michigan High School Principals and Leadership Style Subscales	132
16.	Measure of Central Tendency in Leadership Styles.....	133
17.	Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Mean Contingent Reward and School Size	134
18.	Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Mean Management by Exception and Gender	134
19.	ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals Comparing Personal and School Characteristics and Intellectual Stimulation.....	135
20.	ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals Comparing Personal and School Characteristics and Inspirational Motivation	136
21.	ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals Comparing Personal and School Characteristics and Individualized Consideration	138
22.	ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals Comparing Personal and School Characteristics and Idealized Influence	139
23.	Mean Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals-Age with Leadership Styles.....	142
24.	ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals Comparing Age and Leadership Style	143
25.	ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals Comparing Personal and School Characteristics with Leadership Style-Transformational.....	145
26.	ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals Comparing Personal and School Characteristics with Leadership Style-Transactional.....	146
27.	Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Transformational Leadership and School Size Comparison	147
28.	Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction.....	149

List of Tables—continued

29.	Canonical Correlations between Leadership Styles (V1) and Job Satisfaction(W1) of Michigan High School Principals.....	150
30.	Multiple Regression Procedure for Job Satisfaction Dependent Variable Work on Present Job with Independent Transformational Variables	151
31.	Multiple Regression Procedure for Job Satisfaction Dependent Variable Work on Opportunities for Promotion with Independent Transformational Variables.....	152
32.	Multiple Regression Procedure for Job Satisfaction Dependent Variable Supervision with Independent Transformational Variables.....	153
33.	Multiple Regression Procedure for Job Satisfaction Dependent Variable People at Work with Independent Transformational Variables.....	154
34.	Multiple Regression Procedure for Job Satisfaction Dependent Variable Work on Present Job with Independent Transactional Variables	155
35.	Multiple Regression Procedure for Transformational Leadership Dependent Variable Inspirational Motivation and Individualized Consideration	156

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The principal is a pivotal player in either facilitating change or maintaining the status quo in a school or whatever the issue in education. The importance of this role is supported by research findings that affirm the importance of principal leadership in school success (Austin & Reynolds, 1990; Cawelti, 1987; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Donaldson, 1991; DuFour & Berkey, 1995; Ford & Bennett, 1994; Immegart, 1988; Lewis, 1993; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1986; Sergiovanni, 1991, Vandenberghe, 1995; Williams & Portin, 1996).

The Senate Select Committee on Equal Education Opportunity (1970) concluded:

In many ways the school principal is the most influential individual in any school. He is the person responsible for all of the activities that occur in and around the school building. It is his leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale of the teachers and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become. He is the main link between the school and the community, and the way he performs in that capacity largely determines the attitudes of students and parents about the school. If a school is vibrant, innovative, child-centered place; if it has a reputation for excellence in teaching; if students are performing to the best of their ability one can almost always point to the principal's leadership as the key to success. (p. 305)

Dwyer, Barnett and Lee (1987) describe the principal as:

The source of leadership that will restore the nation's confidence in the public schools. (p. 5)

Hoy and Miskal (1987) have suggested:

Principals are the prime administrative officers in the schools. They must find ways to develop teacher loyalty and trust, motivate teacher effort, and coordinate the work. The administration controls and services the technical subsystems in two important ways: first, it mediates between the teachers and those receiving the services—students and parents; and second, it procures the necessary resources for effective teaching. The teacher needs are a basic concern of the administration. (p.237)

Barth (1990) goes on to state the importance of the principal as:

Who knows in more detail and cares with greater passion about what goes on in schools than teachers and principals? (p.26)

Summarily, Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) characterize the importance of the principal as follows:

As long as we have schools and principals, if the principal does not lead changes in the culture of the school, or if he or she leaves it to others, it will normally not get done. That is, improvement will not happen. (p. 40)

Richard Riley, U. S. Secretary of Education, reiterated this theme when he discussed the importance of retaining and attracting highly qualified candidates for the principalship and said, “The principalship is a position that is absolutely critical to educational change and improvement. A good principal can create a climate that can foster excellence in teaching and learning, while an ineffective principal can quickly thwart the progress of the most dedicated reformers. In the coming years, the United States will be faced with a leadership crisis in our schools. We will need more principals than ever before” (U.S. Department of Education, 1999, p. 2).

As examples of more recent studies, representatives from the Arthur Anderson firm visited 13 elementary schools (6 of which had been identified as high performing and 7 as low performing) for the New Jersey Legislature’s Joint Committee on the Public Schools. This report very clearly summarized that the most important

component to school effectiveness was the school principal. The report reiterated the committee's findings as follow:

The one attribute of all the high performing schools we visited is a dedicated and dynamic principal. These principals are committed beyond the normal call of duty, and feel a personal responsibility to ensure the students' success. The principal is the educational leader of the school and the person who, on a day-to-day basis, ensures that students receive a quality education. The principal establishes high standards and expectations, and takes the initiative to promote consistent commitment to those standards and expectations. Moreover, the principals at these successful schools assume responsibility for the education their students received and do not entertain excuses for why students do not learn. Their belief that all students can and will learn permeates the school environment and contribute to the success of their schools. However, principals do more than just believe that students can learn. In order to obtain results, they collaborate with other stakeholders to develop initiatives that promote high academic achievement for all students (Arthur Anderson, 1997, p. 24).

Teske and Schneider (1999) supported the report in their study of eight high performing New York schools. While the schools varied in size, grade level and characteristics of management style, one common theme emerged: every high performing school had effective leadership by the principal. Teske and Schneider further concluded that schools "succeeded to a large degree because of the alert, consistent, resourceful, and sustaining energy of the principals" (p.26) and these leaders were an "essential ingredient in school success" (p. 23). Given the magnitude of the importance of the role of the school principal, it is important to understand the barriers in either the recruitment of new principals or more specifically, examine some of the factors related to the retention of current principals.

Therefore, this investigation and the purpose of this study will only examine the retention of current principals to investigate a) the job satisfaction of Michigan high school principals, b) the leadership styles of Michigan high school principals, and c) the relationship of these leadership styles to the job satisfaction level of these

same principals. The significance of job satisfaction was clearly outlined by Lawler and Procter (1972) when they concluded that job satisfaction of employees influences absenteeism and retention. The importance of retaining our current successful principals is the basis for choosing this important topic. A closer examination at the emerging problem of principal job retention becomes magnified in light of the conclusions drawn by Kathleen McCormick (1987, p. 19) concerning the pending shortage of new candidates for the principalship: "We don't have enough people to fill the jobs."

Statement of the Problem

The preliminary analysis of the contextual problems associated with principal recruitment and retention reveal two significant factors. The recruitment of people who are willing and qualified to fill the role of the principalship is increasingly difficult. There are two reasons for this difficulty in filling the principalship positions. First, candidate pools are smaller and there are more openings prompted by increased numbers of students and increased administrative retirements. Second, job satisfaction of school principals and the retention of school principals may have also had an impact on the attrition of school principals. Greater demands of the position have reduced the attractiveness of the principalship. Each of these trends is cause for concern. Both the attrition and retention of principals has resulted in a serious shortfall of well-trained, high quality, and high-energy people available and willing to serve in these important roles. The contextual framework or premise in solving the problem of a shrinking candidate pool of administrators is either in the recruitment of qualified candidates or the retention of current principals in their position. Since there is much written about the recruitment of qualified candidates, further investigations are needed in regard to retention of current principals. Shen, Cooley, & Ruhl-Smith

(1999) reported that additional research needs to be conducted on factors associated with job satisfaction and its impact on retention and recruitment of school principals. More specifically, the question of job satisfaction of the individuals in these positions and their relationship to leadership style has not been widely studied. According to Yackel (1984), job burn out or satisfaction and its relationship to leadership style among school principals is one that requires further investigation. This study is intended to contribute to the body of research around the implications of the principal's job satisfaction and the impact in the recruitment and retention of both perspectives with current principals.

Context of the Problem

Yerkes and Guaglianone (1998, p. 11) reported that the contextual concerns inherent in the principalship include the public's view of education in general. "The American high school, designed for another age and another task, is in deep trouble." However, the role of the principal is one of the most influential positions affecting school effectiveness. Better preparation, selection, induction, and evaluation of school leaders have offered an important beginning to the problems faced in education. The U.S. Department of Education's Principal Selection Guide (1987, p. 112) states, "the preparation, selection, orientation, and development of school leaders is one of the most economical options for significantly improving schools."

According to some reports from as early as 1984, there is a looming crisis in the number of qualified candidates to fill these positions (Abrell, 1984; Craven, 1989;

McCormick, 1987). Among the many news stories appearing about schools, the media has proclaimed a new problem- a leadership shortage. Newspapers from Los Angeles to New York have run headlines about the shortage of school principals. The New York Times indicated that New York City schools began the 1999-2000 school year with 195 principal vacancies and with interim or acting principals overseeing 144 schools (The New York Times, September 8, 2000, p.13). Another article attributed the mass exodus of principals from local public schools as a result of, among other things, “job pressures, thin budgets and ever-increasing challenges facing public education” (The Boston Globe, June 29, 1997, p.1, West Weekly). The article portrayed a crisis, citing an example of an affluent suburb that had only six minimally qualified applicants for a financially attractive principalship vacancy. Bess Keller, a writer for *Education Week*, addressed the critical issue of a shortage of principal candidates by saying, “Across the country, there’s not a hotter seat in all of education than the one in the principal’s office” (1998, p. 25). Not just the media is aware of the changing working conditions for school administrators; others have made similar observations (Daley, 1999; Hendrie, 1998; Houston, 1998; Keller, 1998; Marloe, 1998).

In addition to the media promulgation of the pending shortage of qualified administrators, The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), in collaboration with Educational Research Services (ERS), released findings from their 1998 study titled- *Is There a Shortage of Qualified Candidates for Openings in the*

Principalship? This study provided data that would support the premise of a potential crisis in school leadership due to attrition and recruitment of new leaders. In response to one of the survey questions, 47% of the urban districts, 45% of the suburban districts, and 52% of the rural districts reported shortages of qualified candidates for principal vacancies. This leadership shortage was reported in all school community types and at each level in the school-elementary, middle, and high school. Therefore, one of the contributing factors associated with the retention of high school principals are the factors associated with job satisfaction. Wooster (1991) reported that an increase in dissatisfaction among principals might result in a leadership void in American schools.

Demographic Factors Associated with Principal Attrition

Long (2000) would suggest that during the next five years many of the country's teachers will retire or be eligible for retirement. This trend is also reflective of the current school administrators, especially principals. One factor associated with principal attrition suggested by Dowd and Keller (1998) is that many principals are reaching retirement age (62% of principals surveyed by NAESP/NASSP). Likewise, Parkay and Currie (1992) estimated that 60% of the principals working will reach retirement age by the year 2000.

The average age of a principal in the United States is close to 50 (Long, 2000), and 40% of all U.S. principals will probably retire within the next decade (Ferrandino & Tirozzi, 2000). Other projections indicate record-breaking numbers of

retirees nationwide over the next five to ten years (Education Research Service, 1998; Leithwood, Begley & Cousins, 1994). The U.S. Department of Labor estimated that 40% of the nation's 93,200 principals are nearing retirement and that the need for school administrators from now until the year 2005 will increase 10% to 20 % (Kurtz, 2000).

The problems caused by retirements are compounded by a shortage of younger candidates to fill these principal positions when people retire and fewer teachers who desire to fill these leadership posts. Jordan (1994) studied the availability of new administrators to fill these positions upon retirement in the state of Louisiana and discovered that the number of teachers seeking administrative certification was shrinking. And for those teachers with administrative certification less than half plan to enter into administration. Nationally, the percentage of K-8 principals younger than age 35 dropped from almost 5 percent of all school leaders in 1988 to just 1.3 percent in 1998, according to figures compiled by the National Association of Elementary School Principals. Nearly half (47%) of the nation's public school teachers hold master's degrees, many in school administration (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1999). The findings of a 1998 New England School Development Council (NESDEC) seem to summarize findings from other state reports:

When approached on the basis of numbers of certified (qualified) residents per state...the supply of principals in general appears more than adequate to meet the current and future demands. However, many New England districts have experienced a reduced pool of quality applicants for administrative openings (NESDEC, 1998, p.8)

The urgency of this dilemma was reported by author Mark Stricherz reported in an article in *Education Week* (October 24, 2001) that the New York City school system has just 16 principals in its 1,100 schools who are younger than 35. Chicago's public schools have 13 under the age of 40, while Philadelphia employs 12 principals under 40. Jill S. Levy, the president of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators in New York, said the demands of the academic standards movement and the bureaucracy of large districts make it hard for young leaders to be hired. Levy further stated, "the job is so complicated and it's such an accountability position that young principals, teachers, and assistant principals aren't feeling prepared to enter the ranks of principals" (p.7).

A study conducted in Utah found that half of all surveyed districts reported principal shortages at all levels (Galvin & Sperry, 1996). The 1998 survey by ERS found that districts were already experiencing difficulty filling important principal positions that have opened because of retirements, resignations, and promotions. Fifty percent of the 403 school districts surveyed indicated problems replacing elementary and secondary school principals. Muse and Thomas (1991) stated that the projected retirements during the next decade would be half of all current school principals. Long (2000) stated that 79% of Indiana's principals will probably retire by 2009. The Iowa Department of Education (1999) reported that among principals in Iowa who are eligible to retire by 2003, an astounding 93% plan to do so. Another factor associated with the increase of openings for school principals is the number of openings created by increasing numbers of students. For example, in the years between 1986 and 2006,

school enrollment will increase by 48% in Washington State (Fotheringham, 1996). The pool of applicants for high school principals is particularly low, and the problem is widespread (Adams, 1999; Bloom & Krovetz, 2001; Bowles, King & Crow, 2000; Fenwick & Pierce, 2001; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Potter, 2001; Whitaker, 2000; Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998).

Job Satisfaction Factors Associated with Principal Attrition

Further complicating the shortage of principals due to retirements, attrition, and an increase in student population is the increased job stress and responsibilities associated with the position. Murphy and Beck (1994) concluded that the principals occupy a role with contradictory demands. Principals are expected to work actively to transform, restructure and redefine schools while they hold organizational positions historically and traditionally committed to resisting change and maintaining stability. Bowles (1990) suggested that some of the factors contributing to the scarcity of school administrators are limited administrator mobility, inequitable salaries, escalating responsibilities, and little or no job security. The difficulties most often identified with the job of principal include the following: work weeks of 60-80 hours per week (Ferrandino & Tirozzi, 2000; Rodda, 1999), workload and its complexity (Oberman, 1996), supervision of evening activities, minimal pay differential between top teachers and administrators (Asch, 1999; Carrigan, Brown & Jenkins, 1999), feeling “bombarded” with very high expectations of constituents, state and district mandates, and increasingly complex society with attendant social problems. A similar

finding by Gilman and Gilman (2001) outlined several components of the principalship that hold back promising candidates from even applying for these positions. Some of these factors included too little pay, costly and irrelevant requirements, too many pressures, too many hats to wear, not enough time, and too little authority. Symptoms of distress are building all around exasperated by the inability of educators to develop coherent remedies to schools' most pressing problems. Fenwick and Pierce (2001) summarized it best when they reported in their research on the principal shortage:

Although no comprehensive study has been done on the principal shortage, in the minds of many people and the public in general is the image of the overworked, underpaid, principal-bureaucrat tangled in a web of administrivia, unionized teachers, uninvolved parents and disinterested students. This image triggers a general reaction of sympathy and resignation: "No wonder they're leaving in droves-who would want that job?" (p. 27)

Cawelti (1994) characterized the principal as demoralized and having given up on truly educating his/her students. According to Barth (1996), the primary reason for low morale among principals was overwork and under appreciation from a public fed steady diet of school criticism. Adams (1999) cited the erosion of authority to initiate change, escalating expectations of accountability, lack of support, and a stressful political environment for school leaders as other factors that cause principals either to consider leaving the field entirely or to request classroom teaching assignments.

In another report, James Doud and Edward Keller concluded in their publication, *The K-8 Principal in 1998* that these added stresses have caused a number of principals to retire early. The authors reported that the 40% turnover rate among

principals is a significant trend in the last 10 years, and is expected to continue over the next decade. At a time when the demands of our society call for improving education and the needs of our children cry out for leadership, the pool of available candidates to fill the leadership role has been abandoned because of demographic and job satisfaction factors associated with the position. School principals found themselves in the brunt of criticism that is played out in highly public arenas. Further, principals have reported that their jobs leave little time or energy for personal lives and the financial compensation doesn't match the expectations (Houston, 2000).

One option to address the principal shortage dilemma is the selection and recruitment of new candidates to fill the administrative vacancies. Since there is a significant amount of research and information to support the effort of recruitment of new principals (Baltzell & Dentler, 1983; Bass, 1981; Cornett, 1983; Cline & Richardson, 1988; Duke, 1987; Jenson, 1986; Lindsay, 1985; Mojkowski, 1991; NASSP, 1988; NPBEA, 1989; Schmuck, 1988; U.S. Department of Education, 1987; Zakariya, 1983) and limited research on job satisfaction among school principals, this study will focus only on the job satisfaction of current principals to add to the current literature of this important topic. Demographic or job satisfaction factors aside, we need to understand what sustains principals who stay in schools long enough to make a difference. Donaldson (1997, p. 2) boldly stated the urgency of this pursuit: "As the going gets tougher for school leaders and as we see wonderful teachers increasingly choose not to become principals, the need to learn more about what is rewarding in school leadership work becomes more urgent."

Importance of this Study

A long history of research on leadership styles has resulted in many theories as to what style is and what characteristics and traits are associated with those leaders that are effective. However, research has established that leadership style is a complex phenomenon that does not lend itself to simple definitions or statements as to what style works best. One problem in trying to determine the relationship of leadership styles with a person's job satisfaction was that effective leadership style in one situation was not effective in another. The situational nature of leadership style has made it difficult to identify a single profile of skills that is best at all times (Coleman, 1981; Duke, 1982; Pitner, 1986; Pitner & Hocevar, 1987).

Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966) reported that the largest deficiencies for professional educators were satisfying esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization needs. In light of these observations and what appears to be a void of research at the secondary level, it was not clearly known which leadership style appears to be most effective as it relates to job satisfaction. Therefore, this study provides useful information for designing strategies and training programs geared to improve the job satisfaction of principals. Additionally, the research could reveal some possibilities for increasing principals' satisfaction levels as a result of knowing which leadership style appeared to be most effective or satisfying. Such information could assist them when making decisions about various organizational activities. Moreover, results of this study could provide a vehicle for educators seeking ways to discover the optimal tools for school management by critically examining different leadership styles.

Results of this study may also provide additional information that could be useful in the selection and placement of principals in appropriate positions based upon their perceptions of job satisfaction.

Therefore, this study focused on the relationship between leadership styles of Michigan high school principals with job satisfaction of those same principals. To investigate the relationships of leadership styles and leader job satisfaction, three research questions were formulated. It is the hope of the researcher that not only practicing school administrators benefit from this study but also administrator preparation programs.

The first question was to discover whether or not there was a relationship between a principal's personal and school characteristics and job satisfaction. The question asked: How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the job satisfaction level of Michigan high school principals? These variables included in this study would be used to study the effects of job satisfaction of the principal.

The second question was to discover whether or not there was a relationship between a principal's personal and school characteristics and leadership style. The question asked: How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the leadership style of Michigan high school principals? These

variables included in this study would be used to study the effects of these variables on the leadership style of the principal.

Finally, the researcher sought to explore the various leadership styles among high school principals in Michigan and their prevalence and relation to job satisfaction. In other words, it was an attempt to determine if principals' job satisfaction varies with specific leadership styles. How, then, does the leadership style of high school principals currently employed in Michigan associate with the job satisfaction of principals in general? An investigation of these questions should provide useful information to current administrators as it relates to job satisfaction levels.

Operational Research Questions

The following are operational research questions from the conceptual questions presented in the preceding section of this chapter. These operational research questions are then the basis for the literature review in the next chapter and give an outline for the purpose of the study.

Question 1: How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the job satisfaction, as measured by the *Job Descriptive Index* (revised) of Michigan high school principals? These five variables can be hypothesized using each variable as a relationship between job satisfaction of

Michigan high principals and their gender, age and years of experience, years in current position, and size of school.

Question 2: How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the principal's leadership style, as measured by the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) of Michigan high school principals? These five variables can be hypothesized using each variable as a relationship between leadership style of Michigan high principals and their gender, age and years of experience, years in current position, and size of school.

Question 3: How do the leadership style of high school principals currently employed in Michigan associate with the job satisfaction of principals? In other words: Is there is a relationship between the Michigan high school principal's leadership style, as measured by the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) and job satisfaction, as measured by the *Job Descriptive Index* (revised) in their current position?

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study:

High School Principal. The head or director of a high school (Webster, 2000, p. 1052).

High School. A school inclusive of grades 9 through 12, or any combination of those grades. (Webster, 2000, p. 1178).

Job Satisfaction. The feeling an individual has about his or her job and effectiveness in response to a situation (Locke, 1969, 1976; Smith, 1982; p. 6). It is often associated with extrinsic and intrinsic rewards (Porter, Lawler & Hackman, 1975). The five job satisfaction sub-scales as measured by the job descriptive index will be assessed to classify job satisfaction. The five classifications are defined below (Stanton & Crossley, 2000, p. 36).

Satisfaction with work. The employee's satisfaction with the work itself. The various attributes of work include the opportunity for creativity and task variety, allowing an individual to increase his or her job knowledge, changes in responsibility, amount of work, autonomy, job enrichment, and complexity.

Satisfaction with pay. Pay satisfaction is the attitude toward pay and is based on the perceived difference between actual pay and expected pay. Expected pay is based upon the value of perceived inputs and outputs of the job and the pay of other employees holding similar positions or possessing similar qualifications. Pay satisfaction is also influenced by the personal financial situation of the employee, the economy, and the amount of pay an employee has received previously.

Satisfaction with promotions. Satisfaction with promotions measures the employee's satisfaction with the company promotion policy and the administration of that policy. Satisfaction with promotions is thought to be a frequency of promotions, the importance of promotions, and the desirability of promotions.

Satisfaction with supervision. Satisfaction with supervision is based upon a supervisor's consideration and employee centered interests (praising good

performance, taking personal interest in employees, providing feedback and listening) results in greater levels of employee satisfaction with supervisors. Furthermore, the greater the supervisor's perceived level of competence on the job, the greater the levels of satisfaction.

Satisfaction with people. The degree of satisfaction with co-workers is thought to be determined by the work-related interaction among co-workers and the mutual liking or admiration of fellow employees.

Leadership style. The nine leadership style factors, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, will be assessed to classify leadership style. The nine classifications are defined below (Bass and Avolio, 2000, p. 30).

Idealized Influence (behavior/attributed). The leader provides followers with a clear sense of purpose that is energizing; a role model for ethical conduct, which builds identification with the leader and his/her, articulated vision. Also, the leader has certain personality traits that followers admire or wish to aspire.

Inspirational Motivation. The leader gets the followers to complete a goal.

Intellectual Stimulation. The leader gets the followers to question the tried and true ways of solving problems; encourages them to question the methods they use to improve upon them.

Individualized Consideration. The leader focuses on understanding the needs of the followers and works continuously to get them to develop their full potential.

Contingent Reward. The leader clarifies what is expected from followers and what they will receive if they meet expected levels of performance.

Management by Exception(active and passive). The leader focuses on monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain current performance levels. Also, the leader tends to react only after problems have become serious to take corrective action. Often times will avoid making any decision at all.

Laissez-faire. The leader does not respond to a situation or is absent when a critical situation occurs in the organization. The leader will not actively seek solutions to problems.

Assumptions

The study was developed using the following assumptions.

- 1) Principal job satisfaction can be measured by the *Job Descriptive Index* (revised) survey instrument.
- 2) Principal leadership style can be measured by the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)* survey instrument.
- 3) Principals in Michigan are using different leadership styles as defined by the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* and have varying degree of job satisfaction as defined by the job descriptive index.
- 4) Principals in the sample are representative of the general population of principals.
- 5) The responses of the principals participating represent their true opinions.

Limitations

The study has the following limitations:

- 1) The *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* and the *Job Descriptive Index* (revised) are self-report instruments. With a self-reporting questionnaire some responses may be exaggerated.
- 2) Findings of this study may not be generalized to the population as a whole. The study focused on high school public school principals which have very specific and complex job related aspects that may not apply to other people in other positions.
- 3) The study was limited to only high school principals in Michigan.
- 4) The choice of the *Job Descriptive Index* and *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* to measure job satisfaction and leadership styles excluded other instruments and may not be exhaustive or conclusive. There are several instruments that measure leadership style and job satisfaction and these two may only determine a specific component of leadership or job satisfaction.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore the retention of high school principals as it relates to the job satisfaction of Michigan high school principals and the possible relationship to leadership styles of those principals. The purpose of this chapter was to present background information to delineate contextual framework of the problem of attrition and retention of principals which provided a rationale to study job satisfaction of the principal within the given context. This led us to pose research questions as it relates to job satisfaction and leadership styles of secondary school principals.

Chapter two focuses on a review of the literature relevant to both leadership styles of school administrators and job satisfaction. Chapter three focuses on the sample population and research methods. Chapter four reviews the results of the research and chapter five summarize the research findings and discuss future research possibilities.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate a) the job satisfaction of Michigan high school principals, b) the leadership styles of Michigan high school principals, and c) the relationship of these leadership styles to the job satisfaction level of these same principals. A review of the literature and was undertaken to explore what had been written about the effects of leadership style upon the job satisfaction, and about the nature of leadership in general, especially as it relates to the high school principal. Job satisfaction is examined with attention given to characteristics of the individual and the school. Selected leadership theories were examined with attention given to trait, situational, transactional and transformational models of leadership.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been the topic of numerous studies. Locke (1976) reported the sheer volume of research on job satisfaction by estimating that over 4,000 studies have been done on it as of 1969. Stanton and Crossley (2000) suggested that the three principal reasons for the interest in researching job satisfaction are humanitarian, economic and theoretical. Therefore, a better understanding has been sought as to the

factors that have contributed to the satisfaction of the worker with the belief that job satisfaction will increase the productivity of the organization (Gruneberg, 1979). The degree of satisfaction that people derive from their work is an important consideration and is one measure of the quality of life in an organization. Lawler and Procter (1972) concluded that job satisfaction of employees influences absenteeism and retention. A recent survey found that 19% of the nation's workers were actually "actively disengaged" and disconnected from their job. These people tend to be less productive and report being less loyal to their companies, more stressed and less secure in their work (Traut, Larsen, & Feimer, 2000). The survey suggested that these workers were less satisfied with their personal lives, complained they did not know what was expected of them, did not have the materials to do their jobs, did not have a best friend at work and could not get the attention of their boss. Even more important economically, unsatisfied workers miss more days of work and were ill more often. Estimates by the Gallup survey suggested that this is approximately 300 billion dollars a year and that by shrinking the dissatisfied workforce by 5% would boost the economy by 79 billion dollars.

Different researchers have described job satisfaction in terms of various concepts. Hoppock defined job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person to say; "I am satisfied with my job" (1935, p.47). Vroom (1966) characterized job satisfaction as the affective orientations of individuals toward work roles that they are presently occupying. Locke (1976) described job satisfaction as a "pleasurable or positive

emotional state from the appraisal of one's job or experience" (p. 129). Keller and Szilagyi (1978) termed job satisfaction as the degree to which an individual's needs, desires, and expectations are fulfilled by employment in an organization. Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) labeled job satisfaction in terms of fulfillment of an individual's requirements by the work environment. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) described it as an employee's satisfaction with their supervisor, pay, work, co-workers, and promotion. Likewise, others defined it as the feeling an individual has about his or her job and effectiveness in response to a situation (Locke, 1969, 1976; Smith, 1982; p. 6). Hoy and Miskel (1987) provided a definition specifically related to educational organizations by relating it to past and present-oriented state that the teacher evaluated his or her work. They suggested that if the needs of the individual are met, then the job satisfaction of the teacher will be high. Since job satisfaction is defined as the feelings a worker has about his or her job or job experiences, we have long realized that employees can feel differently about various aspects of their job including the work itself, pay, co-workers, etc.

One Dimensional Job Satisfaction Theory-Work Environment Characteristics

The work environment is complex and is comprised of numerous dimensions (Camman, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983; Hackman & Oldham, 1974). For example, initial concern in this country about worker satisfaction was motivated exclusively by efforts to promote greater worker productivity which would indirectly increase company profits. As early as 1911, Frederick Taylor proposed selecting the

right person for the job as a key to increase the worker's satisfaction and the work assigned. This strategy, combined with improved scheduling, increased worker productivity (Taylor, 1911). Taylor's theory of management was used to study worker productivity from 1924 to 1927 at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company. In one of the experiments with physical conditions of work, the level of illumination was raised and lowered to determine if worker productivity would be affected. It was determined that worker productivity increased regardless of the level of illumination (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). In fact, the improved performance of subjects was caused by their knowledge that they were in an experimental situation, which is now called the Hawthorne effect. Later studies examined a variety of factors contributing to worker satisfaction and definitive conclusions could not be reached except that friendly supervision was a major factor in worker satisfaction. These early research findings served as the basis of the human relations theory whose primary premise is that human relations are the key to worker satisfaction (Gruneberg, 1979).

As early as 1926, Fryer studied levels of job satisfaction. In his study, 53% of all respondents enjoyed doing their present work. Fryer also concluded that as workers aged their satisfaction in their work decreased. Likewise, Lawler (1986) summarized research on job satisfaction as the individual's desire to continue to be an employee of an organization. Organizations that provide a worker with the opportunity to participate in decision making and giving them control over their work will have more highly satisfied employees.

Vroom (1966) reported that “job satisfaction was directly related to the extent to which their jobs provide them with rewarding outcomes such as; pay, variety, consideration from their supervisor, a high probability for promotion, close interaction with co-workers, an opportunity to influence decisions which have an effect on them, and control over their own pace of work” (p.174).

One Dimensional Job Satisfaction Theory-Demographic Characteristics

Maslow (1954) developed a theory that each person’s level of satisfaction with his/her life is determined by the degree to which five levels of needs are met. Maslow maintained that human desires and needs were hierarchal in nature; consequently, they must be satisfied in sequential order. Maslow’s work was based on several assumptions:

- The inner nature of human beings is definitely not evil, but rather good or at least neutral.
- A true psychology of human beings can only be attained through holistic, integrated approach.
- Human needs arrange themselves in a series of five levels which are hierarchal in prepotency: physiological, safety, social, esteem and self-actualization. (p. 20)

This hierarchy of needs included at its base the physiological needs followed by safety needs, love needs, esteem needs, and finally self actualization. Maslow’s theory postulated that the lower level needs must be fulfilled before a person can go to the next level. In his perspective, when lower needs came close to being satisfied, needs of a higher order become dominant and occupied much of the individual’s

conscious thoughts. In elaborating on the nature of each of the five needs and his hierarchy, Maslow stated that once physiological needs of food and water are satisfied, safety needs emerge. Maslow saw safety needs as a desire for a safe, orderly environment. With these two basic needs met, the need for love and affection emerge. Maslow also believed that a failure to satisfy this level of need was a common problem in maladjusted human behavior. The fourth level is esteem needs which include a desire for self respect and the esteem of others. The esteem needs must be met to produce feelings of self confidence and self worth. The fifth level is the need for self actualization and is the highest human need level. For a person to achieve satisfaction at this level, all the basic needs must be met. The person is then satisfied. Most people do not reach self-actualization.

Personal and School Characteristics with Job Satisfaction

Tenure, gender, educational level, and age have been theorized and empirically shown to be significant predictors of job satisfaction (Mobley et al., 1979; Williams & Hazer, 1986). Tenure, the length a person is in a position, had mixed results as some studies suggested a positive relationship (Grossi & Bergman, 1991; Zefane, 1994); others have found either no relationship (Curry et al., 1986; Mueller et al., 1994, or a negative relationship (Buzawa, 1994). In many organizations, the most ignored employees are often those who have been in the organization longer. Attention may be more focused on new workers because of the costs of recruitment and selection, and the immediate challenge of training these

people to be successful workers. In addition, some longer-term workers were often viewed as hindrances to organizational change. Sometimes workers stayed in their jobs not because of continued commitment to the organization but because they have no job security and it is hard to find another job. Ting (1997) attributed the job satisfaction of long-term employees to the lack of alternatives for older workers, the greater costs to older workers of leaving the organization, and the likelihood that older workers possessed more traditional values of work. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (cited in Steers & Porter, 1991) proposed a significant relationship to age and job satisfaction. The indication was that job satisfaction was high for an employee immediately after employment, dropping sharply after a few years and then rising as workers gain job security. Saleh and Otis (1964) asked 80 managers who were at least 60 years of age to reflect on their careers and indicate the age in which they had derived the most satisfaction from their work. These managers reported that their satisfaction increased up through the age of 59 and then tapered off dramatically. The authors interpreted the lower job satisfaction to a reduced professional development and advancement. The reason the results in the literature are both inconsistent and inconclusive may be because the relationship depends on the specific organization and how the length of stay is viewed.

Likewise, the impact of gender on job satisfaction has also been inconsistent, with some studies finding that females have lower job satisfaction than males (Britton, 1997), others finding that males have lower job satisfaction than females

(Martin, 1980), and many others suggesting no difference among males and females (Firebaugh & Harley, 1995; Grossi & Berg, 1991; Melamed, et al., 1995).

The findings regarding the relationship between education and job satisfaction are very inconsistent. Some researchers have found a negative relationship between education and job satisfaction (Burris, 1983; Free, 1990; Glenn & Weaver, 1982; Hodson, 1985; Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990). Other studies suggested that education has a positive relationship with job satisfaction (Martin & Shehan, 1989; Mottaz, 1984). And still other studies found no relationship with education and job satisfaction (Phelan & Phelan, 1983). Mendel (1987) found no relationship between the amount of training that a teacher had and overall job satisfaction. However, the contradictions established in the studies relating to job satisfaction and the amount of education may result in that the variable of age being contaminated by the education level.

The findings in regard to a person's age and job satisfaction suggested a positive relationship as older workers are more satisfied with their jobs than younger workers (Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976; Felton, 1987; Glenn, 1980; Hulin & Smith, 1965; Janson & Martin, 1982; Kalleberg 1977; Quinn, Staines, & McCullough, 1974; Vollmer & Kinney, 1955; Weaver, 1980; Wright & Hamilton, 1978).

Two Dimensional Job Satisfaction Theories

Research conducted by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) attempted to determine what workers, in general, wanted from their jobs. In studying a group of

engineers and accountants employed at a large manufacturing plant in Pittsburgh, the researchers asked respondents to list events in their work history about which they felt good or bad. The investigators deduced that the factors which were most important in promoting a positive attitude on the job regardless of position within an organization were these:

1. Achievement, which was explained as an advance in skill.
2. Recognition from one' superior, some other individual in management, a client, a colleague, or the general public.
3. The work itself.
4. Responsibility, which was described as working without supervision, or being responsible for one's own efforts.
5. Advancement, which was viewed as an actual change in status. (p. 24)

The factors that were of lesser importance were such factors as these:

1. Salary.
2. Possibility of growth.
3. Interpersonal relations with subordinates.
4. Status.
5. Interpersonal relations with superior.
6. Interpersonal relations with peers.
7. Supervision.
8. Company policy and administration.
9. Working conditions, which were explained as the physical conditions of the work, the amount of work and the facilities.
10. Personal life.

11. Job security. (pp. 56-58)

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) contended that the long term positive attitudes toward the job fostered by the work itself, by responsibility, and by advancement were the most important in fostering good feelings about the job. Company policy and administration were the most important factors in promoting bad feelings about the job. Herzberg concluded that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were on different continuums and arose from different types of factors with the job setting.

Frederick Herzberg (1966) developed the Motivation-Hygiene Theory which included two factors relating to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. This theory explained that there were always two factors in any job: motivators and hygiene. The motivators often thought of as the intrinsic dimensions included achievements, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement were all strong determiners of job satisfaction. Likewise, hygiene factors often thought of as the extrinsic dimensions related to the work environment and these added to job dissatisfaction. The hygiene factors included company policy, administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations with subordinates, superiors, and peers, and working conditions. Herzberg believed the way to increase job satisfaction was through the intrinsic rewards which included increasing the motivators and decreasing the hygiene factors. He concluded that eliminating the dissatisfiers did not necessarily improve an individual's job performance or satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction in a School Setting

The research on job satisfaction as it relates to school leaders is limited but extensive research has been conducted in schools as it relates to teaching. There has been extensive research as it relates to job satisfaction within a school as social scientists and school leaders have relentlessly sought to identify factors that allow teachers to enjoy their work. Hoppock (1935) was one of the first to study job satisfaction among teachers using survey methods and attitudinal scales. In his study of 500 teachers, a questionnaire was used which included a variety of aspects related to teaching. In analyzing the results of his study, he isolated the differences between the most satisfied and the least satisfied teachers and concluded that the single most contributing factor between the two was emotional maladjustment. Hoppock therefore, concluded that a relationship existed between job satisfaction and mental health (Hoppock, 1935).

Monford (1956) identified the most important factors that influenced the work of public school teachers. He concluded that the number one satisfier was a helpful principal and the number one dissatisfier was excessive paperwork. Ten years later, Plant (1966) found that teacher job satisfaction appeared to be related to sex, age, experience, marital status, involvement, academic degree, work, grade level taught, salary, and class size.

Likewise seven years later, Lacy (1973) concluded that ten factors affect teacher job satisfaction from the broad educational setting (pp. 24-30).

The ten factors are as follows:

1. Community in which teacher lives
2. Fringe benefits
3. School administrators
4. Salary
5. Students in the classes
6. Teaching load
7. Helpful supervision
8. Amount of teaching experience
9. Provisions that allow teachers to meet the needs of their students
10. Amount of college credit or education

Sergiovanni (1967) took Herzberg's theory of motivation and applied it to the school setting and confirmed that the factors listed by Herzberg were applicable to teachers as well. The factors that contributed to teacher job satisfaction included achievement, recognition, and responsibility. Factors identified as contributing to dissatisfaction of teachers included poor interpersonal relations, incompetent, inadequate, or unfair administrative and supervisory practice, and personal matters. Teachers experiencing considerable amounts of work dissatisfaction usually do not perform beyond minimal expectations. Sergiovanni (1971) considered these implications as follows:

For teachers the motivation to work depends upon the reward system which indeed provides for one's hygienic needs but focuses on one's motivational needs. From this point of view, supervisors work to provide a job environment characterized by adequate communications...pleasant working conditions, status, and security, for these are the things which will relieve teachers of the burdens of dissatisfaction. (p. 148)

There is an untapped reservoir of potential within a teaching staff as well as satisfaction. A good leader builds upon this potential by providing opportunities for teachers to experience a work environment characterized by opportunities for achievement.

Likewise, Medved (1982) found in a study of teachers using Herzberg's theory that those factors that were most important in contributing to teacher job satisfaction were also most frequently the cause for dissatisfaction among teachers. Medved pointed out that the most important factors are those identified by Herzberg as motivators. He also concluded that the factors closely associated with the higher levels of Maslow's Needs Hierarchy as well.

Neidt (1987) investigated factors which affect teacher job satisfaction with shared decision making. The study concluded that factors resulting in job satisfaction were greater with teachers who were involved in decision making. Pederson (1988) using Herzberg's theory of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction surveyed teachers as well as the personal and school characteristics of gender, tenure, and grade level to these factors. The findings of this study supported the findings of Herzberg (1966) and Sergiovanni (1967) that the predominant job satisfaction factors for teachers were achievement and recognition, while the predominant job dissatisfaction factors were unfairness, a lack of a sense of achievement, and school policy. The personal and school characteristics analyzed did not have any significant relationship to either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In a similar study, Engelking (1985) identified factors affecting job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers and analyzed these factors in

relation to the personal and school characteristics of gender, age, level of education, teaching level, and years of experience. The results of this study reinforced previous conclusions that the most important factors contributing to job satisfaction for teachers at all levels were recognition and achievement, while the factors contributing to job dissatisfaction at all levels for teachers was relations with students, and parents.

Many factors such as “advancement, autonomy, colleagues, creativity, pay, recognition, responsibility, school policies, security, supervision, work itself, and work conditions” (Lester, 1987, p. 225) have also been measured to determine the amount of job satisfaction one would have within the given context of a school. Savage (1967) studied the factors influencing teacher job satisfaction or dissatisfaction and reported that achievement, recognition, and teacher relationships with students had a great effect on teacher job satisfaction. Likewise, Savage concluded that supervision and personal life problems caused dissatisfaction in the role of a teacher. In another study, Taylor and Tashakkori (1995) reported that teacher participation in decision making and school climate were two predictors of job satisfaction and the strongest factors were the lack of obstacles to teaching and the principal’s leadership. Heller, Clay, and Perkins (1992) surmised that many teachers did not have a high level of job satisfaction but that their greatest satisfaction came by meeting the needs of the students.

Ruhl-Smith and Smith (1993) found several factors that contributed to job satisfaction. These factors were “respect for and relationships with other teachers, positive attitudes toward students, and teacher involvement in school governance”

(pp. 21-23). In another study, Bidwell (1975) described the teaching profession as lonely which limits a source of satisfaction with teachers which includes the interaction with colleagues. Since teacher job satisfaction is influenced by many variables the NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey (Schmitt & Loher, 1984) used nine categories which includes supervision, compensation, opportunities for advancement, student responsibility and discipline, curriculum and job tasks, co-workers, parents and community, school building, and communication. A brief review will follow in regard to each of these categories.

Supervision. Teacher perception of administration directly influenced job satisfaction. Principals may influence teachers' job satisfaction by the amount of involvement the teachers have in decision making in matters which directly affected them (Litt & Turk, 1985). Likewise, the principals' abilities to communicate accurate information on the status of the school are instrumental in meeting the needs of teachers. Principals who use information to influence teachers in adapting to changing environments often had higher job satisfaction (Schulz & Teddlie, 1987). The principal may also influence the job satisfaction of teachers on such policies as class size, the handling of discipline problems, and the selection of books and materials, which can all influence a teacher's feelings of satisfaction. Likewise, Carr (1971) reported that job satisfaction increased as leadership styles of the principals became more democratic.

Bass (1990) maintained that, "Overall, the satisfaction of group members is enhanced when their leaders show that they care by demonstrating their consideration

of their individual subordinates” (p. 115). This conclusion was supported by Sadler (1970) with job satisfaction being greater for group members that were fostered by a consultative style leadership on the part of the manager. Collmer (1989) determined that teacher job satisfaction was greater when the principal exhibited the integration and consideration of followers dimensions of leadership. Teachers also demonstrated greater job satisfaction when their principals were warm, caring, and sensitive to their needs and ideas. Mitchell (1989) surveyed teachers and principals in Tennessee public secondary schools that included grades 9-12. The results of the study indicated that teacher job satisfaction was the highest in large schools and with leadership styles of principals with high consideration or transformational.

Compensation. The relationship between pay and job satisfaction with work tends to have a positive relationship, although in most studies that have come to this conclusion, other factors have varied (Roth, 1989; Niehouse, 1986; Mendel, 1987). As a result it is difficult to determine the extent to which wages produced higher levels of job satisfaction or if the job satisfaction in higher paying jobs reflected the variety and autonomy that were typical of those jobs. As an example of this dilemma, Lawyer and Porter (1966) reported that the wage level was directly related to job satisfaction among 2,000 managers, even when the managerial level was held constant. Yet, a study conducted by Bowler (1979) showed that performance bonuses failed to improve job satisfaction.

Teacher dissatisfaction has been attributed to the profession’s low status and lack of compensation as compared to other occupations (Stark et al, 1980). Harris

(1985) concluded that the majority of teachers who left the profession cited compensation as one of the main reasons. Despite experiencing a significant pay increase for the average secondary teaching salary from 1980 to 1988, the majority of teachers expressed dissatisfaction with their compensation (Carnegie Foundation, 1988). However, compensation may only be a perceived area of dissatisfaction because the people who left teaching tended to fall behind in terms of average salary earned than those who taught continuously, which is in opposition to the belief that people left teaching in order to earn more money in other careers (Chapman & Green, 1986).

Opportunities for Advancement. The lack of opportunities for advancement is one reason teachers are not satisfied (Dillon, 1978; Harris, 1985; Knight, 1978). Teachers want their jobs to provide opportunities for personal and professional growth and utilize their best potential and skills. Lortie (1975) reported that men perceive teaching as a way to move into administration. For others, teaching does not provide enough opportunity for advancement, and the lack of prestige has caused many to be dissatisfied with their job (Harris, 1985; Mirabile, 1983).

Jobs may be classified in a number of different ways, such as the skills needed for the position, length of training, amount of responsibility, and attitudes of society. As early as 1960, Gurin, Veroff, and Feld found that people in high status jobs reported more satisfaction in their work than those in lower status jobs. However, Ritchie and Miles (1970) concluded that the overall job satisfaction of a worker was not attributable to the level within the organization but to the amount of participation

in the decision making process. In a study of Oklahoma public schools, Autem (1988) investigated the perceived satisfaction of randomly selected educators and sought to determine if the position held by an educator had an effect on job satisfaction. The findings revealed significant differences in job satisfaction based upon the position held by the educator. Administrators were found to be the most satisfied in terms of esteem needs which included satisfaction in public recognition, autonomy, involvement in the decision making process, the feeling of making a contribution to the organization, and the sense of accomplishment.

Student Discipline and Job Tasks. Several studies have suggested that the source of dissatisfaction among teachers is the perceived lack of student discipline and student motivation as a major reason for leaving the profession (Harris, 1987). An international comparison of sources of dissatisfaction in teaching found student behavior to be a positive influence on overall job satisfaction (Menlo et al., 1986). There is also an increase in the job satisfaction when teachers are involved with the decision making process (Katzell & Yankelovich, 1975). Holdaway (1978) studied satisfaction of teachers and those factors associated with high satisfaction were achievement, recognition and working with students and those factors that scored lower in job satisfaction were the attitudes of parents and society, status of teachers, influence on decision making, and preparation time. Young (1988) examined overall job satisfaction with various workplace characteristics of 159 teachers in a K-8 public school in California. An analysis of the data revealed that four main factors increased the job satisfaction of the teachers. These included the interactions of the students,

vacations, school climate, and resource adequacy. Those characteristics that decreased job satisfaction were any working conditions that diminished teacher effectiveness.

Kreis and Brockopp (1986) studied the relationship between teachers' perceived autonomy (i.e. control, participation, influence, and authority) and job satisfaction. Results indicated a significant relationship between autonomy and job satisfaction. In 1955, Sharma (cited in Bass, 1990) surveyed 568 teachers in 20 school systems and found that their satisfaction was related to the extent to which they reported involvement in decision-making as individuals.

Co-Workers, Parental and Community Support. The relationship that a teacher has with his/her colleagues directly influences the level of job satisfaction. Price (1977) concluded that employees in close working groups with colleagues had a higher job satisfaction than those who worked in less friendly environments. Likewise, teachers who perceive themselves and their colleagues as having good work conditions, high morale, a sense of cooperation with one another, and enthusiasm generally had high job satisfaction (Needle, Griffin, & Svendsen, 1981). Teachers who also have a peer support group for coping with stress are also more like to have a higher level of job satisfaction (Litt & Turk, 1985).

In both suburban and urban schools the majority of teachers perceive a lack of parental and community support as a contributing factor in their job satisfaction. A lack of recognition is also cited as a reason for lower job satisfaction (Farber, 1982). Teachers who enjoy favorable relations with parents are more satisfied and less likely

to consider leaving teaching. Conversely, teachers who perceive that most parents are uninterested in their child's education are more likely to contemplate leaving teaching (Harris, 1987). Similarly, McAfee and Glassman (1988) suggested that employee performance and job satisfaction was adversely affected by seemingly minor problems such as frequently broken copy machines, lack of office supplies or poor maintenance of property. The facilities in which a teacher works and the maintenance of such facilities has been associated with job satisfaction as a secondary component to teacher's job dissatisfaction. If the teacher's perceptions of the parental and community support are low, then the perception of school facilities is usually low as well. In general, teachers generally perceive the building to be associated with the amount of community support.

Leadership Style

The greatest challenge organizations are faced with is the selection of competent and effective leaders. Over the decades much has been written about the search for the core components in leadership. However, despite all of this study and attention, the true essence of leadership still appears to remain only partially discovered. Because leadership can mean different things to different people, it carries extraneous connotations that create ambiguity of meaning (Janda, 1960). According to Warren Bennis, noted author on leadership, there were over "350 definitions of leadership." Literally thousands of empirical investigations of leaders have been conducted over the last 75 years alone, but no clear and unequivocal

understanding existed as to what distinguished effective leaders from ineffective leaders (Bennis, 1985, p. 4).

Two important themes run through most of the definitions of leadership. The first is that leadership is a relationship between people in which influence and power are distributed on a legitimate basis. The second is that tasks or goals must be accomplished. The power given to the leader may be given by the consent of the followers, a work agreement, or by law, but it is the leader's to exercise. Leadership also implies that the followers must give consent to their part in this influential relationship. Tannebaum and Massarik (1968) defined leadership as "interpersonal influence exercised in a situation and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specialized goal or goals" (p. 34).

Because the principal exhibits leadership within a school organization, the topic of leadership, in general, has been a continuing interest to researchers for many years. From this leadership framework, the leadership role of the school principal is crucial to the school's success (Duttweiler, 1986). The behaviors of leaders in their interaction with members of the organization vary widely (Bass, 1981). Hartzell & Winger (1989) recognize that principals need to adjust their leadership styles to the situational demands of the school.

Because leadership styles vary, many theories and studies of leadership have been developed to improve organizations. Reduced to simple terms, a leadership style is a manner in which a leader leads. Sergiovanni (1967) spoke of the "ways in which the principal expresses leadership, uses power and authority, arrives at decisions, and

in general interacts with teachers and others” (p. 67). Put another way, leadership style might be thought of as a particular behavior emphasized by the leader to motivate his or her group to accomplish a task. Hanson (1973) noted that leadership style might be thought of as a particular behavior emphasized by the leader to motivate his or her group to accomplish some end. If a principal chooses to lead in inappropriate ways, he or she will fail to accomplish the school goals, reach long-range district goals, or maintain a positive relationship with teachers or staff. This may ultimately lead to a decrease in job satisfaction or peace of mind and a loss of position.

Historically, the relationship between the behavior of leaders and the attitudes of the followers has been extensive from the beginning of the century. Because the study of leadership styles is not new, it is intriguing to examine the theories of leadership and their significant contribution for a better understanding of the leader behavior. To fully understand the nature of leadership, it is necessary to consider the developments that have taken place in this field because the literature would suggest that leadership plays such a crucial role in any organization (Peters, 1992; Peters & Austin, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Tichy & DeVanna, 1986). Since the functions of the leader are vital to an organization, attempts to identify elements of successful leadership have been described. Although there is an interrelatedness among the theories, a broad classification system can be used that includes one, two, three, and multi-dimensional leadership theories. These dimensional theories are reported in the following sections.

One Dimensional Leadership Theories

Early leadership studies focused on the traits of a leader. These early attempts in leadership theory sought to identify traits that separated the leader from the non-leader. Initially, the primary emphasis was placed upon hereditary factors. Aristotle believed that “from the hour of birth, some were marked out of subjection, other for rule.” This approach sought to identify traits or characteristics that defined or described the successful leader. Carlyle in 1841 (cited in Stogdill, 1974) theorized that a leader had unique qualities that appeal to the masses. The “trait” theory proposed that one’s leadership style or behavior is largely predetermined by the structure of one’s psychological or physiological characteristics (Lipham, 1973). Later, Galton in 1879 (cited in Stogdill, 1974) studied heredity in order to explain leadership based upon inheritance, traits, class, or unique qualities. This theory was supported by Wiggam (1931) who suggested that biological aspects such as intermarriage among the aristocracy gave them an ability to survive, which accounted for their leadership. These inherent personal qualities were felt to be transferable from one situation to another and only those who had them would be considered potential leaders. This approach attempted to identify, isolate, and modify those personal characteristics which then made selection of a leader an easy process. During this same time period, others considered leadership more as a function of skills and abilities rather than personality. Mumford in 1906 (cited in Stogdill, 1974) maintained “that the leader emerges by virtue of abilities and skills enabling him to solve social problems in times of stress (p.18).”

In the early 1900's the most influential theory on leadership was Frederick Winslow Taylor's *Scientific Management*. Taylor contended that increased productivity could be obtained by improving the methods used by workers. He believed that management and labor could work together for mutual benefit. His idea was that if work was analyzed and broken into specific tasks with given rules and regulations, people could be trained for jobs and get good pay. There would be a division of labor with management providing the planning and monitoring. Several time and motion studies were conducted to analyze the tasks to increase efficiency of the workers. The primary focus of leadership, then, was looking at the tasks and the leader usually did not take into consideration the attitudes or feelings of the workers. He or she would select people who had particular skills for specific jobs and then train people for those jobs rather than continue the century old practice of letting people choose their own work methods. The function of leadership was to increase productivity, which in turn would increase the profitability of the company.

Taylor (1911) posited that the primary leadership goal was to meet the needs of the organization, and his scientific management emphasized the efficiency of the tasks required to increase the effectiveness or output of the worker. Taylor's belief was that human motivation behind the effort in any organization was derived from the economic nature of people. Money was the motivator, and a good leader learned how to manipulate pay in order to gain the maximum amount of incentive from it. A provision was incorporated so that the workers would share financially on the increased productivity (Britton & Stallings, 1986). Close and detailed supervision of

workers was essential to ensure that each prescribed step of a plan was followed accurately. The primary goal of any organization should be the planned production and completion of organizational tasks. This should be separated from human affairs and emotions and a good leader should strive to obtain compliance from workers to meet the organizational needs. The result was workers had to adjust to the management and not the management to the workers. The main focus of the leader was the needs of the organization and not the needs of the individual (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

These attempts to designate a set of traits that would accurately predict leadership potential resulted in mixed results. For example, Tead (1935) identified physical and nervous energy, a sense of purpose and direction, enthusiasm, friendliness and affection, integrity, technical mastery, decisiveness, intelligence, teaching skill, and faith as necessary qualities in leaders. Ralph Stogdill (1948) defined leadership as the process of influencing group activities toward goal setting and goal achievement. Similarly, Fred Fiedler (1967, p.8) stated it this way, "the leader is the individual in a group that was given the task of directing and coordinating task relevant group activities." In a comprehensive literature review, Stogdill (1948) examined 124 trait studies conducted between 1904 and 1947. From these studies Stogdill categorized these personal characteristics into five general categories:

1. Capacity: Intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality, and judgment.
2. Achievement: Scholarship, knowledge, and athletic accomplishments.

3. **Responsibility:** Dependability, initiative, persistence, and aggressiveness.
4. **Participation:** Activity, sociability, cooperation, and adaptability.
5. **Status:** Socio-economic position and popularity.

From his research, Stogdill concluded that an individual did not become a leader as a result of a possession of some combination of personality traits. Instead, the individual characteristics of the leaders should be considered with the activities and goals of the group. Stogdill (1948) summarized his conclusions by stating:

A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the patterns of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers. (p. 64)

Mann (1959) reviewed 125 trait studies confirming the conclusions drawn by Stogdill. Mann found the traits crucial in one study to be inconclusive in another. After a period of decreased interest in the trait theories of leadership, the introduction of improved methodology and instrumentation resulted in additional research in this area. So again, Stogdill (1974) reviewed an additional 163 trait studies conducted from 1949 to 1970. He concluded that there were some factors that could be identified that would separate the effective leaders from the ineffective leaders. Stogdill's research suggested that factors associated with energy, age, status, mobility, education, and intelligence were all factors to consider. The recognition of these traits was the result of improved measurement instrumentation utilized in these studies (Stogdill, 1974). There is evidence that certain characteristics or traits increase the likelihood that a leader will be effective.

Bennis (1984) completed a five year study of ninety outstanding leaders and their subordinates and determined four common traits or areas of competence shared by all ninety leaders. These four common traits are:

1. Management of attention: The ability to communicate a sense of outcome, goal, or direction that attracts followers.
2. Management of meaning: The ability to create and communicate meaning with clarity and understanding.
3. Management of trust: The ability to be reliable and consistent so people can count on them.
4. Management of self: The ability to know one's self and to use one's skills within limits of strengths and weaknesses.

Bennis further suggested that leaders empower organizations to create environments where people feel significant, continual learning and growing are important, and people feel a part of a team. There may be negative traits that may hinder a person from reaching his/her full leadership potential as well. In one such study, Geier (1988) identified three traits that kept group members from competing for a leadership role. The three traits were the perception of being uninformed, being non-participants, and being extremely rigid. Likewise, McCall and Lombardo (1983) examined the difference between leaders who went to the top of the organization but were "derailed" just before reaching their goal. Those who succeeded and those who did not had both strengths and weaknesses, but those who fell short had one or more of the following traits. McCall and Lombardo called these "fatal flaws."

1. Insensitive to others, abrasive, intimidating, or bullying leadership style
2. Cold, aloof, arrogant

3. **Betrayal of trust**
4. **Overly ambitious, thinking of next job, and playing politics**
5. **Specific performance problems with business**
6. **Micro-managing, unable to delegate or build a team**
7. **Unable to staff effectively**
8. **Unable to think strategically**
9. **Unable to adapt to a boss with a different style**
10. **Overly dependent on advocate or mentor (p. 20)**

The most frequent cause for derailment was insensitivity to others or betrayal of trust.

An application of these traits in regard to school leadership has also been studied. A study conducted by Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) concluded that not everyone could assume the role of leading an organization. The researchers stated that the character of the person involved is important and listed the following as needed characteristics of effective leaders:

1. **A propensity to set clear goals and have these goals serve as a continuous source of motivation.**
2. **A high degree of self-confidence and openness to others.**
3. **A tolerance for ambiguity.**
4. **A tendency to test the limits of interpersonal and organizational systems.**
5. **Sensitivity to the dynamics of power.**
6. **An analytical perspective.**
7. **The ability to be in charge of their jobs. (p. 216)**

These characteristics of school principals, however, do not lend to hiring of new principals nor easily translate into principal preparation systems. However, the researchers did go on to describe different labels for school principals. These labels were used to describe leadership styles that ranged from the humanist, which sought the best interest of the follower to the broker, which sought the best interest of the organization. Blumberg and Greenfield concluded that although leadership styles may be different, all of them were effective in their schools and shared the common basic elements of vision, initiative, and resources of the leader.

The Florida School Study Council (1981) conducted a study to identify the characteristics of outstanding elementary or secondary school principals. The results complemented those of Blumberg and Greenfield and added several more characteristics. These characteristics included a sense of mission and control, the art of persuasion, a commitment to high standards, the use of participatory processes, and a discontent for the status quo.

Although leadership styles varied, further studies identified common traits among leaders. Hall and Rutherford (1983) concluded that three characteristic styles were common among all leaders. These three common characteristic styles were responders, managers, and initiators. Responders typically placed heavy emphasis on allowing teachers the opportunity to take the lead. The responders also believed their primary role is to maintain a smooth running school and focus on traditional administrative tasks. Likewise, responders placed a strong emphasis on relations and have a strong desire to please others. Managers, however, demonstrated many of the

characteristics of responders but also take some initiative to change. Managers' worked with little recognition: provided basic support to staff, and when they found out what central office staff wants they make sure that they get it. Initiators have very clear goals and long range plans. The initiators have very strong beliefs about good schools and work intensely to accomplish those goals. Initiators have high expectations for students, and the accomplishment of the school goals is of high importance. Hall and Rutherford (1983) were quick to point out, however, that no principal could be described completely by any one of these styles, nor do these three classifications represent the entire universe of possibilities.

The one dimensional leadership theory proved ineffective in determining good leaders. As Jennings (1961, p. 88) stated, "fifty years of study have failed to produce one personality trait or quality that can be used to discriminate leaders and non-leaders." This does not mean that certain traits may hinder or facilitate leadership; the point is that no set of traits has been identified that clearly predicts success or failure (Hersey & Blanchard, 1984). This was also the conclusion of Yukl (1989, p. 70) when he observed, "the old assumptions that leaders are born has been completely discredited, and the premise that certain leadership traits are absolutely necessary for effective leadership has never been substantiated in several decades of trait research." It is now recognized that certain traits increase the chances that a leader will be effective, but they provide no guarantee. Further research was needed that would better explain this multi-functional role of leadership.

Two Dimensional Leadership Theories

The one-dimensional approach to leadership theory was inconclusive in finding consistent leader behaviors of effective leaders. Leaders do not function in a vacuum, and focusing on individual traits does not show how the individual behaves in a situation. In light of much confusion surrounding the trait approach, many writers and scholars explored leadership in a situational context that had relevance for leader behavior and performance (Campbell, Dunnett, Lawler, and Weick; 1970).

Researchers directed their attention to situational leadership theories, which attempt to identify characteristics of the leaders within a situational setting. Attempts are then made to isolate specific properties of the situation that have relevance for leader behaviors and performance (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

During the 1920's, an interest in the dynamics of human relationships, as it relates to worker productivity, led to new theories of leadership with a focus on human relations. Elton Mayo did not attempt to argue against the merits of the scientific management principles, but did suggest that in addition to improving production methods and worker efficiency, leaders should consider interpersonal relations as well. This human relations theory on leadership emphasized and focused on the needs of the worker, taking into account their attitudes and feelings (Mayo, 1933). The major focus of leadership under the human relationship theory was that the goals of the organization would be accomplished by enhancing cooperation among the followers and providing for their personal and developmental needs (Mayo, 1945). The primary function of a good leader was to facilitate organizational

goals while providing opportunities for personal growth and development. Followers were not viewed as lazy or unreliable. Rather, followers should be the focus of the leader and their feelings, needs, and attitudes should be taken into consideration by any good leader. The organization as a goal, then, should develop around the workers taking into consideration their feelings and attitudes. A good leader, then, would facilitate goal achievement of the organization by paying attention to the needs of the workers.

One of the most notable studies to consider this dichotomous view of leadership was conducted by Lewin, Lippett, and White in 1939. These researchers formed a number of clubs among elementary school age boys. The leaders of the clubs were adult male graduate students in psychology. Each leader was trained to behave toward the boys in his group utilizing one of three different styles: 1) democratic, in which decisions were made by a majority vote with equal participation encouraged and criticism and punishment minimal; 2) autocratic, in which all decisions were made by the leader, and the boys were expected to follow all directions or face severe discipline; and 3) laissez-faire, in which the actual leadership activity of the leader was limited allowing the boys to play essentially without supervision. The findings suggested that groups led by democratic leaders were more satisfied and participative (Lewin, Lippett, & White, 1939). Hersey and Blanchard (1982) noted this dichotomous view of leader behavior with autocratic at one end and democratic at the other. Many subsequent studies have used this same concept of a continuum of leader behaviors with an emphasis on task completion on one end and

an emphasis on people at the other end. For example, studies conducted by Campion (1968) and Morse and Reimer (1956) compared the hierarchical supervision concept or those that focused on the task (directive, structured), with the autonomous style or those that focused on the people (democratic, participative). Although the outcomes were insignificant, the hierarchal supervision concept resulted in higher profits for the company. These descriptions of leadership style included participative versus directive leadership or, in other words, "relationship versus task oriented" (Bass, 1981, p. 592).

A variety of leadership styles exist between the two extremes of this dichotomy; one needs further clarification. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) identified a number of styles along a continuum from authoritarian at one end and democratic at the other. Close to the authoritarian or task side of the continuum, Tannebaum and Schmidt posited that a leader would make a decision and announce the decision to the followers in the group. As you move through the continuum, the leader would sell the decision to the group. Towards the middle of the continuum, the leader presented ideas, invited questions, or allowed the followers know that the decision made was subject to change. Farther along on the continuum, the leader stated the problem and sought input before making a decision. Later, the leader established parameters and let the group make the decision. And at the end of the spectrum, the leader included no direction and allows subordinates to function within limits defined by leaders.

Additional studies on leadership sought to examine leader behavior to determine effective leaders (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991). One of the most famous and widely known of all leadership behavior studies was conducted at Ohio State University, which helped to differentiate between effective and ineffective leaders (Muchinsky, 1993). The Ohio State University studies began in the late 1940's and early 1950's under the direction of Stogdill, Fleishman, and others (Organ & Bateman, 1986). The major purpose of the study was to identify leadership behaviors, which affected the performance of workers, which in turn affected the productivity of the organization (Fiedler & Chemers, 1984). Researchers felt there was no satisfactory theory on leadership available (Stogdill, 1963). A list of 1800 items describing the behavior of leaders was developed and the list was reduced to 45 items in nine categories. Based upon these items, the first *Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire* was developed (Bass, 1981). The Ohio State University Leadership Studies made two significant contributions to the literature: first, they produced a number of questionnaires to measure leadership behavior; and second, they identified two dimensions of leader behavior. These two dimensions included consideration and initiation of structure, both found to be reliable and valid (Muchinsky, 1993).

The first dimension called initiation of structure included behavior such as having subordinates follow rules and procedures, maintaining high standards for performance, and making the role of the leader and follower explicit. The second dimension called consideration incorporated behavior such as helping and doing favors for subordinates, looking out for the welfare of followers, explaining

procedures, and being friendly and available. Initiation of structure involved actions which define leader and follower relationships, establishes definite standards of performance, specifies operating procedures, and determined who does what.

Consideration was related to the leader's attitude toward followers, the warmth of the relationship between the leader and followers, the leader's willingness to listen, and the degree of mutual trust between the leader and followers. Since these two dimensions were relatively independent, a leader's behavior was characterized by either or both. Subsequent research in various settings confirmed that consideration and initiation of structure are the primary dimensions of leadership (Fleishman, 1953, 1973; Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977).

Fleishman and Harris (1962) defined these two dimensions as:

Consideration. Behavior indicating mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and his group... This dimension seems to emphasize a deeper concern for group members' needs, and indicates such behavior as allowing more subordinates more participation in decision making, and encouraging more two-way communication.

Initiation of structure. Behavior in which supervisor organizes and defines group activities, and his relation to the group. Thus, he defines the role he expects each member to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead, establishes ways of getting things done, and pushes for production. (p. 43)

In an extensive study of the International Harvester Company, Fleishman and Harris (1962) found that a leadership pattern of high structure and low consideration was related to high labor turnover, union grievances, worker absenteeism, and lower satisfaction. They concluded that a leader could compensate for high structure by showing increased consideration, but a leader showing low levels of consideration could not compensate by reducing the initiation of structure. Skinner (1969) verified

the findings of Fleishman and Harris (1962) showing a strong relationship between consideration by the leader and grievances and employee turnover within the organization.

Summarily, Halpin (1966) summarized the Ohio State University Studies:

1. Initiating structure and consideration are fundamental dimensions of leader behavior.
2. Effective leader behavior tends most often to be associated with high performance on both dimensions.
3. Leaders and followers view effective leadership oppositely. Leaders emphasize initiating structure, where followers are more concerned with consideration.
4. Only a slight relationship exists between how leaders say they behave and how followers describe how they behave.
5. Different institutional settings tend to foster different leadership styles.

The behavior categories of consideration and initiation of structure have some relationship to the “employee centered” and the “job centered” behaviors, which were identified by Likert (1967). Concurrent with the Ohio State studies, a series of complimentary studies were conducted by the University of Michigan. Researchers attempted to determine the leadership characteristics that were closely related to job satisfaction, turnover, absenteeism, and productivity. Likert found that effective managers focused primarily on the human aspects of their subordinate’s problems and on building effective work teams with high performance goals. Likert (1967) proposed a management systems theory consisting of four leadership behaviors that are identified and defined as:

1. System one, called “exploitative-authoritative,” was characterized as using the motivation of economic rewards, combined with punishment and fear. This results in hostile attitudes of subordinates. There was distrust and the followers are in a subservient role. There was great dissatisfaction with their group membership, supervision, and own achievement. Communication was downward with all decisions being made at the top. Production was low and turnover and absenteeism high. This leadership style was highly structured, task oriented, and authoritarian.

2. System two, called “benevolent-authoritative,” is characterized as still using economic rewards as motivators; however, there is some consideration to appeal to a follower’s needs. Worker attitudes ranged from hostile to favorable, and they were moderately dissatisfied with their membership, supervision, and achievement. Communication was downward with policy decisions made at the top. Production was fair, but turnover and absenteeism was still high. This leadership style was structured and task oriented, and the goals of the organization still had a higher priority than the needs of the followers.

3. System three, called “consultative,” was characterized by making use of economic as well as intrinsic rewards for motivation. There was some worker involvement in decisions, and the follower’s attitudes were favorable and cooperative. Satisfaction was moderate with their membership, supervision, and achievement. Communication was down and up, with broad policy made at the top, and specific policy made at the lower levels of the organization. Production was good and turnover and absenteeism moderate.

4. System four, called “participative,” was characterized using the full range of motivation, and compensates the follower through participation. Worker attitude was strong and trustful. Satisfaction with group membership, supervision, and achievement is high. Communication goes up, down, and laterally within the organization, which results in decision making widely spread through the organization. This leadership style consisted of teamwork, trust, and open communication.

Clearly, Likert advocated for participative leadership in which:

The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to insure maximum probability that in all relationships with the organization, each member, in light of his background, values, and expectations, will view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance. (p.103)

This theoretical framework suggested that leadership is a process in which the leader must take into account the expectations, values, and interpersonal skills of those who are interacting with the leader. Leaders must involve followers in decisions that affect their work. Leaders must also use their influence to further the task completion and be sensitive to the needs of the followers. Similarly, in 1966, Bower and Seashore introduced a four-factor theory which implied that an effective leader provided psychological support, stressed group achievement, facilitated interaction, and provided resources as described below:

1. Support – behavior that enhances someone else’s feeling of personal worth and importance.
2. Interaction facilitation – behavior that encourages members of the group to develop close, mutually satisfying relationships.

3. **Goal emphasis** – behavior that stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting the group's goal of achieving excellent performance.
4. **Work facilitation** – behavior that helps achieve goal attainment by such activities as scheduling, coordinating, planning and providing resources such as tools, materials, and technical knowledge.

Likewise, Blake and Mouton (1985) conceptualized the managerial grid, a model for identifying two separate dimensions, a concern for people, and a concern for production. Five leadership styles were determined based upon concern for production (task) and concern for people (relationships). These were located in four quadrants, identified by the Ohio State studies. The grid reveals the behavior required for each style of leadership.

1. **Managerial Style 1,9:** the manager has a low concern for production but a high concern for people. Since the 1, 9 manager assumes that the attitudes and feelings of people are important, the leader endeavors to bring harmonious interpersonal relationships. Since good interpersonal relations are valued, the leader will smooth over conflict in order to promote a pleasant working situation.
2. **Managerial Style 9,1:** the underlying assumption is that people must be watched and told what to do. In such an organization the manager would be authoritarian.
3. **Managerial Style 1,1:** characterized by low involvement with people and minimum communication.
4. **Managerial Style 9,9:** a style with a high concern for people and production. The need for people to be involved is important and their ideas are elicited. (p. 30)

Although most people seemed to be predisposed to manage in one way or another, the leadership style was determined by organizational and situational factors. These dimensions were attitudinal in nature, as opposed to the behavioral dimensions

outlined by the Ohio State Studies. Blake and Mouton (1981) suggested that it is necessary for educational institutions to develop a model of excellence on certain leadership principles. These principles included these qualities:

1. Fulfillment through contribution is the motivation that gives character to human activity and supports productivity.
2. Open communication is essential for the exercise of self-responsibility.
3. Conflicts are solved by direct confrontation of their causes, with understanding and agreement as the bases of cooperation.
4. Being responsible for one's own action is the highest level of maturity and is only possible through widespread delegation of power and authority.
5. Shared participation in problem solving and decision making stimulates active involvement in productivity and creative thinking.
6. Management is by objectives.
7. Merit is the basis of rewards.
8. Learning from work experience is through critique.
9. Norms and standards that require behavior and performance support personal and organizational excellence. (p. 18)

The Harvard studies in 1947 conducted by Robert Bales (Bales, 1954), differed with the Ohio State and Michigan studies conducted during the same time period. The purpose of the Harvard studies was to study behavior through direct observation, and this was accomplished through observing small groups of participants. One of the findings was that the concept of "leader," when taken too literally could cause an individual to overlook a major fact that there was typically another leader in the group who could only be neglected at considerable peril (Hoy and Miskel, 1991). This observation suggested that in every group there might be two

leaders or a dual leadership model. The individual who was judged by group members to have the best ideas in contributing to a situation was most typically not liked the best. Bales' contention, therefore, was that two separate leadership roles existed in small task group process of problem-solving-the task leader and the social leader. The task leader would keep the group engaged in work while the social leader maintained unity in the group and kept members aware of their importance as unique individuals with unique needs. Bales proposed that both were seen as necessary for the effective operation of the group, yet only a few individuals were capable of holding both roles. However, despite the different methodology, the results were remarkably similar and consistent with the Ohio State and Michigan Studies. During this time period, a variety of dimensional leader behavior theories were developed as mentioned.

McGregor (1960) believed that leadership practices needed to be based on an accurate understanding of human nature. He was aware that actions result directly from assumptions one makes. McGregor believed that leaders who perceive most people as wanting to be directed, not wanting responsibility, were inaccurate in their assumptions. McGregor (1965) based his now classic 'Theory X-Theory Y' leadership concepts on Maslow's hierarchy of human needs. According to McGregor, traditional leadership (Theory X) made the following assumptions on human behavior:

- Work is inherently distasteful to most people.
- Most people are not ambitious, have little responsibility, and prefer to be directed.

- Most people have little capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems.
- Most people must be closely controlled and often coerced to achieve organizational objectives.

The principles of Theory X leadership were derived from certain assumptions about the nature of human beings- that they are indolent, lacking ambition, evasive of responsibility, desirous of being led, inherently self-centered, resistant to change, and indifferent to organizational needs (p. 6). Likewise, Theory Y leadership made the following assumptions about human nature:

- Work is as natural as play if the conditions are favorable.
- Self-control is often indispensable in achieving organizational goals.
- The capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems is widely distributed in the population.
- Motivation occurs at the social, esteem, and self-actualization levels, as well as psychological and security levels.
- People can be self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated.

The principals of Theory Y leadership were based upon the assumptions that people in general liked work, are responsible, and like to be challenged to grow and learn. Leadership facilitated the development of those characteristics which already existed in workers such as motivation, capacity to assume responsibility, and readiness to meet the needs of the organization. People achieved their own goals and a leader must take into the consideration of the followers' needs. In summary, according to McGregor, effective leadership was primarily a process of "creating opportunities,

releasing potential, removing obstacles, encouraging growth, and providing guidance” (p. 16).

At the University of Chicago, similar work by Getzels and Guba (cited in Getzels, 1967) identified three styles of leadership. The non-othetic style emphasizes the normative dimension of behavior, that is, the requirements of the organization, the role, and the expectations. The idiographic style stressed the personal dimensions of behavior, that is, the requirements of the individual, the personality, and the needs of the leader. The transactional approach moved from one style to another depending on the circumstances.

A study by Moser (1957) applied this theory to the leadership of principals. He interviewed school superintendents and principals in twelve school systems. His conclusion was that teachers and superintendents have different expectations for the principal depending on whether the principal was interacting with the teachers or superintendent. With superiors, the principal stressed non-othetic behaviors, and with subordinates the principal stressed idiographic behavior. There was a profusion of labels for the same basic delineation of organizational goals and leadership characteristics. Summarily, these labels included democratic/autocratic (Lewin et al., 1939), authoritarian/democratic (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1958), consideration/initiation of structure (Fleishman & Harris, 1962), employee centered/production centered (Likert, 1961), support/work facilitation (Bowers & Seashore, 1966), concern for people/concern for production (Blake & Mouton, 1964), group maintenance/goal achievement (Cartwright/Zander, 1968),

consideration/initiating structure (Stogdill and Coons, 1957), Theory X/Theory Y (McGregor, 1960), and idiographic/nomothetic (Getzels & Guba, cited in Getzels, 1967). Though varying in conceptualization, all viewed leader behavior as either from the side of human relations or from the side of task accomplishments.

Lawrence & Smith (1955) determined that the human relations dimension was most effective which was later supported by the work of Wickert & McFarland in 1967. Other studies, such as those conducted by Vroom (1960), identify the task dimension as most effective. A third group of studies (Fleishman & Peters, 1962) report that both dimensions appear to be equally effective. Taking the research on leader behavior as a whole, it is reasonable that these two dimensions which includes concern for the task and concern for interpersonal relations has a historically strong framework on leadership behavior. However, the findings on the relationship of initiation of structure and consideration are more complicated. Seven studies reviewed by Yukl (1971) suggest there was a strong relationship between consideration and follower satisfaction, which are essentially the same as “task” and “people”. In all of these studies, consideration was measured by use of leadership behavior descriptive questionnaires. In reviewing research literature related to initiation of structure and satisfaction, Yukl was not as successful in finding relationships. Yukl (1971) found some of the studies to have positive and other negative relationships as it relates to follower satisfaction. Vroom (1960) cited eight studies reporting a positive relationship between considerate behavior and productivity, two with negative relationship, and one with no relationship. It soon

became apparent that analyzing leadership in terms of situational factors alone was also inadequate. Vroom (1960) indicated that employee characteristics determine, in part, which leadership style is most effective. One might readily conclude there is no one right leadership style; instead, different types of situations dictate different leader behaviors.

Three Dimensional Leadership Theories

Consideration was next given to the interaction of the situational factors with leadership behavior, which provided the basis for the contingency approach to leadership. Several contingency theories have been developed that maintain that a leader's effectiveness depends on the fit between the personality characteristics of the leader and the situational variables such as positional power, subordinate skills, and attitudes (Fleishman, 1973). Therefore, under one set of circumstances, one type of leadership style would be effective, and under another set of circumstances, a different leadership style is may be more effective. Hoy and Miskel (1987) suggested that different types of leadership styles are effective in different situations.

Fiedler developed the first comprehensive leadership theory focusing on the situational framework of leadership with his conceptualization of leadership using a contingency model. Fiedler (1967) conceptualized leadership using three situational criteria: leader-member relations, which referred to the positive or negative interpersonal relations between the leader and his/her followers; task structure, which referred to the extent to which the follower's tasks were specified and described

clearly and in detail; and position power, which refers to the formal authority the leader has over the reward or punishment of the follower. The degree in which these three variables interact determines the degree in which a leader was allowed to exert influence on the group. Task oriented leaders were more effective in situations that require a high degree of control or in situations that require a low degree of control. Relationship oriented leaders are more effective in situations that require moderate control (Hoy & Miskel, 1991).

To identify the most effective leadership style, Fiedler (1967) developed a personality instrument called the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale. In this instrument, the respondent was asked to complete sixteen items on a continuum from task-oriented to relationship-orientated behavior. The generalization from Fiedler's work is that the situation determined a leader's behavior that determines the overall effectiveness of the leader (House & Baetz, 1979). Consequently, depending under the conditions of the situation, the leader must either favor the task-oriented style or the relationship-oriented style. Summarily, Lunenburg and Ornstein (1991) characterized this leadership theory as a proper model for several reasons:

First, it was one of the first approaches to leadership to examine situation, the people, the task, and the organization. Second, the theory implies that leadership should not be thought of as either good or bad. Instead, a more realistic approach is to view an administrator's leadership style as effective in one set of circumstances but ineffective in another. Finally, leadership is a function of the interaction of leadership style and situational dimensions within the organization. (p. 142)

Reddin (1970) proposed a similar theoretical framework with a multi-dimensional 3-D Management Model. In addition to considering a concern for task

and a concern for relations, Reddin added a third dimension called leadership effectiveness. This concept focused on the interaction between the task-related behaviors of the leader with the task maturity of the follower. Reddin (1970) suggested that the leader must adjust his or her leadership style to meet the needs of the situational circumstances such as the maturity of the follower to be able to complete the task. Effectiveness was determined by the extent the leader succeeded in achieving the organizational goal. According to Reddin, situations and matching styles must be clearly specified. There were five elements that were essential in specifying the situation-technology, organization philosophy, expectation of co-workers, subordinates and superordinates. Technology referred to the methodology used by the organization to complete its task and the demands placed upon the leader and the follower. According to Reddin, each technology demanded a different style of leadership. The organization philosophy referred to the general climate of the organization which influenced behavior. The human relations also impacted the organization and the expectations of the individuals. Styles and expectations of co-workers, subordinates, and superordinates all played a major role in defining the situation.

Another contingency theory directly related to a follower's job satisfaction, motivation, and leadership is called the Path-Goal Theory. This framework was proposed by House in 1971 and later refined by House and Mitchell in 1974. House and Mitchell (1974) explain it here:

The theory is called the Path-Goal because its major concern is how the leader influences the followers' perceptions of their work goals, personal goals and

paths to goal attainment. The theory suggests that a leader's behavior is motivating or satisfying to the degree that the behavior increases subordinate goal attainment and clarifies the paths of these goals. (p. 82)

Accordingly, this theory suggested that a leader's effectiveness was determined by his or her ability to enhance the satisfaction, motivation, and productivity of the follower. An effective leader increased the personal rewards of followers for goal attainment and helped make the path clear or easier to these rewards by clarifying or reducing roadblocks and pitfalls and increasing opportunities for personal satisfaction along the way. This theory outlined a leadership style as defined by four types of behavior as outlined by Hoy and Miskel (1991). These included (1) directive leadership specified guidelines as to what was expected, provided specific directions, and stated rules and procedures; (2) achievement oriented leadership set challenging goals, emphasized improvements in work, and stressed excellence; (3) supportive leadership reflected the leader's concern for the well-being and needs of the followers and created a friendly climate; and (4) participative leadership consulted with followers in decisions that directly affected them. The effective leader used a combination of the above styles to meet the needs of the followers, which in turn increased productivity.

The situational factors of this theory consider two types: (1) personal characteristics of the subordinates as they attempt to achieve goals and (2) environmental pressures and demands. House suggested that the personal characteristics consisted of the personal needs of the subordinates, their abilities, and personal traits. The environmental factors included the task structure, degree of

formalization, and supportive norms in accomplishing organizational goals.

According to House, leaders were considered to be effective when their behavior provided subordinates with the guidance and rewards necessary for satisfaction and performance.

Hersey and Blanchard (1984) identified their approach to the multi-dimensional theory of leadership, which relied heavily on the concepts proposed by Reddin (1970), Blake and Mouton (1985) and the Ohio State Studies (Halpin & Winer, 1957). Their premise was that leadership effectiveness depended upon the appropriate matching of leader behavior or style with the maturity level of the follower. Any style may be effective or ineffective, depending on the circumstances of the situation. The effective leadership style matched the maturity of the followers that the leader is attempting to influence (Hersey & Blanchard, 1984). The two dimensions of leader behavior identified included—task behavior and relationship behavior. These two dimensions were cross partitioned into quadrants categorizing four leadership styles. These quadrants classified leaders as (Q1) high in task and low in relationship behaviors, (Q2) high in relationship and low in task behaviors, (Q3) low in relationship and task behaviors, and (Q4) low in relationship and low in task behaviors. Each style may be considered effective depending on the situation. The situation was analyzed in the degree of maturity in the individual or group members. Maturity was defined by Hersey and Blanchard as the individual or group's capacity to set high, attainable goals, the ability and willingness to assume responsibility, and the experience level of the individual or group in relationship to a task (Hersey and

Blanchard, 1965). The appropriate leadership style was determined by both the level of maturity of the individual in a group as well as the maturity level of the group as a whole.

Hersey and Blanchard defined effectiveness in terms of how well a group accomplished a task, and leadership effectiveness was a function of both performance and productivity and the degree to which the short and long term goals were attained (Hersey and Blanchard, 1965). Therefore, the leader's goal was to provide the appropriate leader behavior while concurrently assisting the group to grow and assume more leadership role in the task accomplishment. The emphasis on the need of the leader to adapt his/her behavior was a positive contribution to the field of leadership study (Yukl, 1982). For Hersey and Blanchard, the situational context of leadership had to do with the maturity of the follower. Maturity has two components: willingness (motivation) and ability (competence). There are four combinations of these:

1. neither willing nor able to take responsibility
2. willing but not able
3. able but not willing
4. willing and able

A person who is willing and able has the highest level of maturity, and the lowest is neither willing nor able to take responsibility. Group maturity has three components. A group is mature when it sets high but attainable goals, is willing to accept responsibility, and has sufficient experience and/or education. An effective leader was

one who accurately assesses the group's maturity and adapts his/her leader behavior accordingly (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977).

Hersey and Blanchard's model had implications for school principals. Effective leadership by school principals required the ability to motivate individuals to attain educational goals (Blanchard, 1987). School principals were studied using these theoretical frameworks in a study conducted by McMurray and Bentley (1986). The purpose of the study was to (a) determine whether administrators who possessed specified leadership criteria would be identified and (b) if those leaders considered the maturity level of employees when delegating tasks. The results of the study indicated about one-third of the respondents scored above the cut-off points for high flexibility/high effectiveness categorizing them in the high performance range.

Various instruments were used to measure and assess the various leadership traits as described by the various theoretical frameworks. The Managerial Grid (Blake & Mouton, 1985) was designed to describe leadership across different situations by showing an integrated concern for production and people. The LEAD instrument (Hersey & Blanchard, 1965) in situational leadership argued aligning one's leadership style to the demands of each of the four situations based upon the maturity level of the followers and the level of the task to complete. Likewise, the Leader Match instrument (Fiedler, 1986) assumed task-oriented leadership style was better for other situations.

Over the last decade, advocates have repeatedly emphasized the need to develop leadership and that the leadership framework must include a broader range of

styles and leadership behaviors than the transactional styles emphasized in the GRID, situational leadership, or LEADER MATCH instruments. Cascio (1995) argued that individuals must have a broader range of leadership styles from which they can contribute to the development of many organizations today, to survive the changing, social, political, and economic environments. No dominant style has ever appeared; instead, various combinations are apparent (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Zigarmi (1981) maintained that there is no best style of leadership that will succeed in every type of situation. Successful leaders adapt their leadership behavior to meet the needs of their followers.

Walter, Caldwell, and Marshall (1980) suggested that the bulk of the evidence shows that no one style or leadership type is consistently more effective than another. An extensive review of the literature shows no universally accepted style of leadership, despite numerous research efforts to determine such a style. However, a flexible and balanced use of task and relationships found it “beneficial for both the organizational productivity and personal satisfaction” (p. 621). Although there appeared to be support for the situational context of leadership, some critics would suggest that the situational context has limitations. Sergiovanni (1979) suggested the approach of situational leadership fell short by oversimplifying the situational constructs that must be considered and by over estimating the leader’s ability to adjust styles at will. Likewise, Huckaby (1980) expressed similar doubts about situational models and states that they are too simplistic to adequately explain leadership behavior. Huckaby viewed the personal value of the leader, the leader’s

knowledge of various approaches, and the leader's skill in adopting various approaches, and the leader's perception of the situation as additional factors, which must be taken into consideration. Bryman (1986, p. 150) concluded, "the main contribution of situational leadership approaches is that they suggest that leaders need to be more flexible in their actions and behaviors."

Multi-Dimensional Leadership Theories

The study of leadership has received a great deal of attention over the course of many years, and several researchers have attempted to define leadership. Hersey and Blanchard (1984) described leadership as the process of influencing individual and group activities toward an organizational goal within a given situation. Tucker (1984) stated that "leadership is the ability to influence or motivate an individual or group of individuals to work willingly toward a given goal or objective under a specific set of circumstances" (p.41). Along similar arguments, Burns (1978) described leadership as a process in which "leaders and followers raise one another to a higher level of morality and motivation" (p.20). Leaders have become a very common topic in research in recent years. Empirical and theoretical treatments tended to fall in divergent categories-agency theory, strategic leadership theory, and transformational theory. In agency theory, leaders were viewed as agents of the organization with their own interests and agendas, separate from those of the workers or followers whom they are employed to represent (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Fama, 1980; Fama & Jensen, 1983a, 1983b). The agency theory characterization of leaders

tended to downplay the positive aspects of leadership and ignore the roles of success. Strategic leadership theory argued organizations were reflections of their leaders (Hambrick & Mason, 1984) and that specific knowledge, experience, value and preferences reflected in their decisions. Transformational leadership theory argues that performance is, in part determined by the leader's transformation of followers (Bass, 1981; Yukl & Vanfleet, 1992). This theory emphasized charisma, represented the ability to invoke emotional and cognitive attraction to leaders from the followers. From the literature on leadership, the reader gains a much different picture of leaders. For example, several authors noted that the agency theory view tend to vilify leaders (Donaldson, 1990; Moran & Ghoshal, 1996) while strategic leadership often glorified the leaders (Meindl, Ehrlich & Dukerich, 1985; Chen & Meindl, 1991). While transformational leadership was focused upon the follower.

Weick (1979) contended it was impossible to construct a theory that is both accurate and simple. Thus it is fitting that leadership is defined from a number of different perspectives. Because of the dilemma Weick (1979) noted that each perspective has inherent limitations. However, a review of the three leadership theories provided us with guidance for further research in leadership characteristics.

Positive Agency Theory

In the mid-1970s, Positive Agency Theory arose from financial economics providing an explanation for the dominance of the public corporation (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Fama, 1980; Fama & Jensen, 1983a, 1983b). Positive Agency

Theory focused on the relationship between the followers (shareholders) and leaders (top management). According to the theory, the followers are the risk takers, and the only concern of the leader should be the interests of the followers (Jensen, 1988). However, the leaders were presumed to have their self-interests, and if not constrained, will behave for the benefits of themselves. For example, the leaders may place growth of the company over profits, seek excess perks, or make contracts, which are difficult to get rid of the leader. The followers were able to respond with control devices such as board of directors, contracts, and corporate control, which sought the interest of the follower or shareholder. Most of the empirical research concerning Positive Agency Theory examined the efficacy of these control devices. Eisenhardt's (1989) review of agency theory suggested that control devices within an organization do indeed result in better alignment for follower's needs and leaders interests. However, there were some distracters of the agency theory of leadership. First, the followers are not the only constituency that leaders need to be concerned with and have been challenged in the literature (Donaldson & Davis, 1991; Moran & Ghoshal, 1996). Critics of the positive agency theory contended that not every decision or situation posed a conflict of interest. Rather, many decisions occurred in settings in which the leader and followers interests were the same (Meindl et al., 1985). Finally, the Positive Agency Theory presumed that a reduction in self-interests was inherently more efficient and effective which ultimately discounted the role that discretion may play in the leadership behaviors. From the limitations cited by the critics and the primary application of this theory to the corporate world, another

alternative theory will be used for the purpose of this study as it relates to leadership style of high school principals.

Strategic Leadership Theory

Child (1972) suggested forcefully that the choices of leaders were extremely effective in organizations. Management researchers were more willing to embrace the notion that the leader could influence the organization. In 1984, Hambrick and Mason argued that organizational effectiveness was a result of the leader's values rather than a result of external forces. The strategic leadership theory attributed organizational outcomes to the decisions made by leaders. Although it acknowledges that the followers can have an impact on the organization, it is the leader because of their position that potentially impacts on the organization. At the most basic level, strategic leadership theory contends that the leaders' values, cognitions, and personality affect their field of vision, selective perception of information, and their interpretation of information (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996). Therefore, Strategic Leadership Theory was a decision-making theory.

Although few in number, some empirical studies have directly examined the link between a leader's psychological makeup and organizational effectiveness (Andrews, 1971). Demographic variables such as a leader's functional background and formal education have also been associated with organizational effectiveness (Miles & Snow, 1978). Although some studies supported the notion that the psychological make-up of leaders affects organizations measuring the psychological

make-up is difficult and the number of studies investigating these constructs is small. Likewise, the Strategic Leadership Theory argued that demographic variables were easier to obtain. So the number of empirical studies on the demographic variables in Strategic Leadership Theory is much greater and primarily includes formal education, tenure, and functional background. Although these results were encouraging in describing the leadership theory, the Strategic Leadership Theory was not without its limitations. Researchers may have understated the contribution of personality in explaining leaders' choices. Second, although Strategic Leadership Theory had begun to integrate the social interactions between the leaders and followers it was never able to explain the importance of the leader's charisma and its impact upon followers. Finkelstein and Hambrick (1996) downplayed the importance of the interpersonal and inspirational aspects of the Strategic Leadership Theory. Because of these limitations, the recent developments in transformational leadership addressed some of the limitations in both the Positive Agency Theory and Strategic Leadership Theory approaches. This theory is more applicable to the leadership styles of high school principals.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Recent developments in leadership have been more closely examined in transformational and charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1988; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). Research on this transformational leadership paradigm has proven rather promising. For example, Bryman (1992) cited a variety of

organizational studies demonstrating that transformational leader behaviors are positively related to employee satisfaction, employee effort, and job performance. House (1977) proposed the charismatic leadership that focused on how a leader can create an impression among subordinates that the leader has the competence and vision to achieve success. The result is enthusiasm and commitment by subordinates to the group goals. Bass (1985) extended charismatic leadership to a theory of transformational leadership where the leader was able to inspire and activate subordinates to “perform beyond expectations” and to achieve goals beyond those normally set. Others recognized this concept in transformational leadership as well. Boal and Bryson (1998, p. 11) claimed that transformational leaders “lift ordinary people to extraordinary heights” likewise, Yukl (1989, p.272) stated that followers “do more than they are expected to do.” Bass concluded that the transformational leader achieved greater than expected performance through (a) an increased level of awareness by subordinates about the importance of designated outcomes, (b) by getting individuals to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the group, and (c) by altering the subordinate’s needs levels or expanding the set of needs. The transformational leader gained greater commitment from subordinates and induced them to achieve for the good of the group, not only with charisma but also by serving as a coach, teacher, or mentor (Bass, 1985; Yukl, 1989). The transformational leader activated higher-order needs of esteem and self-actualization among followers.

Research suggested that transformational leadership practiced in a variety of settings such as industry, the military, and students in a laboratory (Avolio & Bass,

1987; Bass, 1986; Bass, Avolio, & Goodheim, 1987; Bass, Waldman, Avolio, & Bebb, 1987; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; Roberts, 1985; Trice & Beyer, 1986; Waldman, Bass, & Einstein, 1987). Transformational leadership was also found in high performing managers of a deliver company (Hater & Bass, 1988) and the subordinates who worked under a charismatic leader to have high task performance, greater satisfaction, and greater role clarity (Howell & Frost, 1989).

In search of a clearer picture of leadership, Bennis and Nanus (1985) studied several chief executives and described those most effective as transformational leaders. This view of leaders “is one who commits people to action, who converts followers to leaders, and who converts leaders into agents of change” (p.3). Bennis and Nanus identified four strategies used by transformational leaders included (1) creating a focus through attention to vision, (2) meaning through communication, (3) trust through position, and (4) the deployment of self. It is through these strategies that transformational leadership was clearly manifested in an organization and more clearly identified. A leader led when the goals and motives of the followers were considered and significant change in the group reflected the community of interests of both the followers and leaders. This symbiotic relationship between the leader and followers was subtle yet distinctively identifiable in successful organizations and within the context of effective leadership. Burns (1978) noted that the relationship between the leader and the follower has the potential of raising “the level of human conduct and ethical aspirations of both the leader and led, and thus it has transforming

effect on both” (p. 20). Burns goes on to write about the benefits of transformational leadership for both the follower and leader:

The transforming leader recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But beyond that, the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents. (p.4)

Again, Burns (1978) reiterates this in another passage:

The premise is that, whatever separate interests’ persons might hold, they are presently or potentially united in the pursuit of higher goals, the realization of which is tested by achievement of significant change that represents the collective or pooled interests of leaders and followers. (pp. 425-426)

Transformational leadership stressed the importance of leaders’ relationships with followers. By making followers more aware of the importance and value of task outcomes, by activating their higher-order needs, and by inducing them to transcend self-interest for the sake of the organization, transformational leaders motivate followers to perform in excess of expectations (Yukl & VanFleet, 1992). The primary component of transformation leadership, charisma, was originally identified by Max Weber (1934/1947). To Weber, the charismatic was a person endowed with extraordinary gifts of divine grace that attracts the followers who believe that they are linked to the leader through transcendent powers (Trice & Beyer, 1986). Such leaders endowed with these qualities tend to radiate with confidence, dominance, a sense of purpose, and the ability to articulate goals and ideas (Fromm, 1941). Thus, charisma must be defined as a relationship between leaders and followers and can be characterized by both the qualities of leaders and followers as noted above. Bass

(1981) noted that charisma was no longer attributed to extraordinary gifts of divine grace but was now conceptually understood in leadership across a wide variety of situations. Moreover, empirical evidence for military academy graduates and executives suggested that transformational leadership was transferable across time and place and across a wide range organizations and cultures (Bass, 1997; Bass & Avolio, 2000; Yammarino & Bass, 1989). Transformational leadership competencies also have no ethnic boundaries among African-American and Anglo-European leaders (Rouse, 1998). Because of the universality of this leadership theory, provided benefits in the selection of those leadership traits which exceed the one, two, three or multi-dimensional models.

Bass (1985) came to a similar conclusion in studying transformational leadership in a variety of organizations. Through a variety of interviews with leaders and followers within an organization, leadership was articulated as inspiring others with a vision. This leadership resulted in the followers performing beyond their own expectations. Kouzes and Posner (1987) asked 1,100 managers to describe their personal best as a leader. They concluded that transformational leadership followed five practices: (1) challenging the process, (2) inspiring a shared vision, (3) enabling others to act, (4) modeling the way, and (5) encouraging the heart.

Transformational Leadership: A Profile. Pielstick (1998) completed a meta-ethnographic analysis of the leadership literature to identify the themes, patterns, and connections that define transformational leadership. These themes can be summarized by the following themes: (1) creating a shared vision, (2) communicating the vision,

(3) building relationships, (4) developing a supporting organizational culture, (5) guiding implementation, (6) exhibiting character, and (7) achieving results.

“The single defining quality of leaders is the capacity to create and realize a vision” (Bennis, 1993, p. 216). This vision sometimes originated with a leader but often consisted of a collection of ideas shared by many people. This vision was a picture of the potential in the organization. Idealistically, this vision became a source of hope, inspiration, and power for members within the organization and became a sense of purpose for the leader and followers. Characteristics of this vision include a shared meaning by the followers and leader. Many times it inspires, excites, and motivates individuals to give extra effort to achieve the vision. Likewise, this vision involved change and included components that provided direction and guidance. The shared vision helped clarify new expectations for leaders and followers and may be limited to very specific goals and priorities. This vision may also evolve and change over time as the shared thought processes of the leaders and followers changed due to circumstances.

Once the vision was established, it was developed through dialogue and communication. To keep the vision active and in focus, this vision must be articulated in many forms so that the vision instills purpose and meaning. This communication involved an interactional dialogue between followers and leaders. The transformational leader possessed the ability to communicate the shared vision. “In behavioral terms, managers are more likely to be perceived by their subordinates as leaders when they are clear about their values and beliefs, are able to articulate them

in an exciting and enthusiastic way to others” (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, p. 530). The transformational leadership inspired followers, provides encouragement, and communicates the vision. This vision was communicated using a variety of methods. The most notable was the ability of the leader to listen. The transformational leader listened carefully to the wants, needs, values, and motivations of the followers to fully understand their concerns. This required the use of questions and feedback as well as reflective thinking. Other methods of communication by the skilled leader included the use of metaphors, analogies, stories, and ceremonies to convey the meaning of the vision. The world of communication involved getting at the hearts of followers using emotional language to persuade them into action. “The world is moved by highly motivated people-people who believe very strongly or want something very much” (Gardner, 1990, p. 183). This communication included the nonverbal expressions of the leaders as well. Followers watched a leader carefully, and transformational leaders must be aware that their actions must be consistent with the vision.

The third component included building relationships because this interaction made it possible to communicate the shared vision. “Transformational leaders may foster the formation of high-quality relationships and sense of common fate with individual subordinates while in social-exchange process; these subordinates strengthen and encourage the leader” (Deluga, 1992, pp.244-245). The transformational leader treated subordinates as equals in a friendly manner, often in a supporting, nurturing environment. Trust was built through the actions of the leader

by role modeling the expected behavior, setting an example and trusting the followers. This reciprocal trust must be earned, however, from the followers. Transformational leaders are sincere, honest, personable, and caring. These leaders provided support, help, and their assistance, which included mentoring and coaching. Likewise, because these leaders encouraged risk taking and challenged followers to stretch and go beyond their boundaries, these leaders were also forgiving. Likewise, these leaders were forgiven when efforts did not succeed as expected.

Developing a supporting organizational culture comprised the shared values and beliefs of the organization and contributed to the relationships of the organization. Some key values identified with transforming leaders are treating people with dignity and respect, fairness, liberty, honesty, integrity, and equality. The organizational policies and practices were shaped by these norms. Likewise, the primary means of shaping the culture was through interactive communication.

Guiding implementation occurred when the transformational leader assisted in the implementation of the shared vision rather than relying on the delegation or exclusive action of the followers. "A great leader is usually a great teacher" (Parnell, 1988, p.2) and provides opportunities for followers to learn and grow. As a mentor, he/she will provide an open forum of communication in which the follower is nurtured and encouraged. Transforming leaders used staff development extensively as well as the pursuit of other educational opportunities to enhance the academic needs of followers. Another aspect of a transformational leader guiding implementation was the use of strategic planning, which was a systemic search for changes and trends that

would impact the group. This took the form of policies, procedures, and programs to meet the needs of all stakeholders or followers. Likewise, the transforming leader, when guiding implementation, also used team building skills and strategies. These included collaboration, conflict management, and problem solving skills.

The sixth component of transformational leadership was exhibiting character. These leaders were principle-centered with the pillars of honesty, integrity, and trust being the foundation for their walk in leadership. Transformational leaders were first and foremost considered ethical, “noble of mind and heart; generous in forgiving; above revenge or resentment” (Bennis, 1989, p. 118). Another commonly referenced adjective of transforming leaders is they are self-confident. These leaders were committed and motivated for a higher purpose as shared in the vision.

Transformational leaders were understanding and self-disciplined. Usually were identified by the need to achieve and excel with a passion toward excellence. Often this passion was seen by the time and energy placed in a project or group.

Transforming leaders were also servants to the needs of the followers. They were willing to assist in a variety of capacities as they were called to give to others.

Intelligence was often associated with a transformational leader. This intelligence was often observed when the leaders approached a situation or problem with a variety of perspectives and approaches. These leaders were reflective and creative in using multiple references in a variety of situations. Most often, transforming leaders were comfortable in a variety of contexts including the political, cultural, and technical functions within an organization. These leaders were unbiased in perspective and

dynamic in their presence. These leaders loved their work and the people they worked with.

The final component of transformational leadership was achieved results. The results of transformational leadership included a positive work environment and job satisfaction among the followers. The leaders were themselves perceived as being more effective and achieving at a high level. Product quality and effectiveness and a high level of commitment seemed to be standard practice in groups with transformational leaders. This profile of transformational leadership involved a complex web of behaviors that engage both the leader and the followers. This complexity may explain why successful leadership was still rarer than prevalent (Bennis, 1989).

Rationale for Further Studies on Leadership Theories

Most of the research conducted in schools on the effectiveness of building principals was completed at the elementary level as opposed to the secondary level. This researcher did not discover any clear empirical evidence as to why limited research had been conducted at the high school level. However, certain factors were identified which may have contributed to the limited research. First, departmentalization presented certain problems relating to communication; second, issues such as labor relations provide a difficult political environment; third, internal and external politics are complex at a high school; fourth, perception of administrative leadership were still muddled. In other words, the greater complexity

of the high school caused researchers to question their capability to control all of the variables. It is possible that Peter Blau and Richard Scott were thinking of high school's complexity when they suggested:

Groups in organizations developed their own practices, values, norms, and social relations as members interacted with each other. Informal leaders and status structures, with their unofficial norms and practices, arose side-by-side with formal leaders and structures, with their official expectations and practices. The informal organization constrained behavior in schools (Blau and Scott; 1967, p 6).

Much of the literature on school leadership suggested that the principal as occupying the key position in the school and that the principal plays an important role in educational leadership (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Edmonds, 1979; and Goodlad, 1984). The principal's leadership style set the tone for the school in which learning takes place. A review of the literature by Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan & Lee (1982) categorized the effective leadership behaviors of principals into four categories: (1) goals and production emphasis, (2) power and decision-making skills, (3) organization and coordination skills and (4) human relations skills. Several studies have been conducted to determine the most appropriate leadership style of the principal. These studies suggested that a highly directive style was most effective (Brookover & Lezzotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; and Vivian, 1983). Others suggested that a high task and high relationship leadership style is most effective (Chaffee, 1981; Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Lofton, 1985; and Stueven, 1985). Regardless of the theoretical framework used for the context on leadership, we know that the principal must provide leadership (National Commission, 1983, p. 32). Tirrill & Jones (1985) stated that leadership style must encompass a set of behaviors that will result in the

desired attitudes and behaviors of other members within the school, particularly teachers.

Lipham and Hoeh (1985) outlined six practical guidelines for improving leadership within the principalship based upon their analysis of leadership theories.

1. Principals must realize that the quality of their leadership is crucial to the success of their school.
2. Principals must be able to vary their leadership behaviors.
3. Principals should take a long-range view of leadership and examine the degree of acceptance, implementation, and effectiveness of their leadership behavior.
4. Principals should take a broad view of organizational relations.
5. Principals should understand that school situations are complex, dynamic, and interactive.
6. Principals should use multi-criteria for evaluating quality of leadership such as student achievement, staff satisfaction, and school-community relations.

A good leader should identify and solve problems, participate in regular training, give accurate direction to staff, and establish high satisfaction among the teachers (Laughlin, 1984; Ozumba, 1988). It would be easily to conclude that there is no “perfect” leadership style; instead, different situations require different leader behaviors. Yet, failure to continuously re-examine the various leadership styles and their relationship to the many variable within the organization would result in apathy. Organizations, including schools, cannot be idle in this pursuit of knowledge as it relates to the leadership styles of principals. Hersey and Blanchard (1965) suggested that knowledge about leadership style will continue to be of great concern for several

reasons, “(1) it can help improve the effective use of human resources, (2) it can help prevent resistance to change, (3) it can help reduce employee disputes, and (4) it can lead to a more productive organization” (p. 261). Because leadership style of leaders has an impact on the organization, leadership styles must be examined for a better understanding if that organization is going to improve. Summarily, as Cohen (1989) stated, leadership bestows power, commands respect, and most importantly, fosters achievement. There is no more important reason to study this than to recognize the leadership provided by the principal within a school setting and its potential impact upon learning. Therefore, the use of the Transformational Leadership theoretical framework as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire provides the parameters for such a study on principal leadership behaviors.

Job Satisfaction and Leadership Style

Much of the available literature on job satisfaction and leadership style within a school context primarily focuses on the job satisfaction of teachers as it relates to the leadership style of the principal. This relationship has been investigated in several studies (Stogdill, 1974). This research can be summarized with the following studies. Koslo (1989) investigated the effect of leadership behaviors of principals and the job satisfaction of teachers. Using a combination of questionnaires and interview techniques, Koslo concluded that the principal that was supportive of teachers’ concerns, gave positive feedback and encouragement, had a concern for school success, had visibility, involved teachers in decision making, showed consistency,

and was considerate all contributed to the overall job satisfaction of teachers.

Similarly, a principal who was not visible was unsupportive of teachers, didn't listen to teacher input, did not involve teachers in decision making, and had a lack of communication and enthusiasm added to the teacher's dissatisfaction.

Burns (1990) researched teacher job satisfaction and leadership styles of principals in randomly selected high schools. The findings indicated that the leadership style of the principal influenced teacher job satisfaction in the areas of rapport with the principal, curriculum issues, rapport with the teachers, community support, and facilities. Burns concluded that a leadership style that had a strong emphasis on the follower and was participative in nature and highly transformational had a higher level of reported job satisfaction among teachers. The lowest level of job satisfaction among teachers resulted from a leadership style that was perceived as authoritative and transactional. A similar conclusion was made in earlier studies by Halpin and Winer (1957). Their research identified leadership that was "indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth" (p.42) as having higher levels of teacher job satisfaction.

Mahrer (1985) found a high relationship between teacher job satisfaction and the teacher perceptions of the leadership style of their principals. Craig (1979) examined the relationship of leadership style of principals and teacher job satisfaction and concluded that the leadership style of the principal that was high in relations and transformational had a higher teacher job satisfaction level in the areas of achievement, responsibility, and supervision.

Collmer (1989) examined the relationship between a teacher's job satisfaction and the leadership style of principals and determined that teachers had higher job satisfaction when principals were warm, caring, and sensitive to their needs and ideas. The work itself, supervision, and participation in decision making process were all identified as positive indicators in job satisfaction. Windell (1991) in a similar study of Montana teachers found that their job satisfaction was higher with principals who were sensitive to their needs. He also concluded that a person's gender, years of teaching experience, and educational degrees did not have a significant effect on job satisfaction. Wilcox (1992) examined the relationship between a high school principal's leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The sample included 285 high school teachers employed in 29 high school districts in three counties in northeast Ohio. Principals who exhibited participatory leadership were found to have the highest level of job satisfaction among their teachers. Brodinsky (1984) suggested a similar argument when he stated, "The more opportunity and power you give employees, the more effective they will become and the more satisfaction they will get from their jobs" (p.39).

A study conducted by Morris (1981) indicated that teachers were more satisfied with their places of work when their schools were administered by principals who had a firm sense of professional autonomy and who also regarded their staff members as competent, independent professionals. While leadership appeared to be of importance to teachers' work satisfaction, other factors, including school size, expenditures per pupil, and the ratio of teachers to pupils were also important

indicators of teacher satisfaction. An earlier study (Evans & Maas, 1969) concluded that a good working relationship with the principal was considered an important source of satisfaction by 74% of the teachers surveyed, and a poor working relationship with the principal was an important source of dissatisfaction by 45% of those surveyed.

Haezebrouck (1989) analyzed the effects of school size and the leadership styles of principals on teacher job satisfaction. Using a teacher satisfaction survey developed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Haezebrouck surveyed a random sample of Michigan high school principals and discovered that the satisfaction level of teachers did vary according to the size of the district as it related to the overall satisfaction with the community and parents, but not with other satisfaction levels. Likewise, Mitchell (1989) examined the relationships among teacher job satisfaction, and rapport with the principal based upon school enrollment size. Mitchell concluded that the teacher job satisfaction was the highest in the largest schools and that the principal who demonstrated a leadership style that was sensitive to the needs of the followers and scored the highest. A study involving 846 teachers and principals of 89 schools demonstrated that teachers' job satisfaction was significantly higher when principals were described by the teachers as more transformational using the multifactor leadership questionnaire (Koh, 1990). Likewise, Niehoff, Eng, and Grover (1990) surveyed 862 employees using the multifactor leadership questionnaire and concluded that transformational leadership correlated with job satisfaction with $r = .75$.

John Goodlad (1984), in his book, *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*, remarked about the studies between teacher job satisfaction and principal leadership:

More common are studies showing the supportive conditions such as sensitive leadership by the principal, availability of help, and involvement in school-wide decisions, tend to be associated with greater enthusiasm, professionalism and career fulfillment on the part of teachers. (p. 216).

Glickman (1985) concluded, "The administrative function of a school should provide for the factors that enable teachers to reach the plateau from which supervision for improvement of instruction can proceed in a work atmosphere that is more personally satisfying" (p. 165). Similarly, Argyris (1972), in researching job satisfaction and administrative style, stated, "facets such as leadership style or supervisors and administrative controls can be sufficiently powerful to cause an employee to leave an organization even though he is intrinsically satisfied" (p. 113).

In light of all the research that has been done in the area of leadership and job satisfaction, there are very few studies which have directly examined the impact of leadership style of a principal upon his/her own job satisfaction. It was the desire of the researcher that this research effort would enhance the body of knowledge for future investigations into high school principals' leadership styles and job satisfaction. It is therefore time to focus on the direct relationship, if any, on the leadership style of high school principals and its impact on their own job satisfaction. The design and procedures applied in this research are examined in Chapter III.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The design and methodology used to conduct this research are presented in this chapter. The survey instruments selected for collecting data were examined for appropriateness. Likewise, consideration for instrument selection was determined by what other researchers stated about the various instruments. This chapter is also organized to discuss the population and sample, data collection procedures, and statistical methods used for data analysis. Finally, the purpose of this study was to investigate the leadership styles of Michigan high school principals and the relationship of these leadership styles to the job satisfaction of the surveyed principals.

Survey research was used to collect data for responding to the research questions. Specifically, the study sought to examine:

1. How high school principals' personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, level of education, and size of school related to the principal's job satisfaction?
2. How high school principals' personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, level of education, and size of school related to their leadership style?

3. How the leadership style of high school principals currently employed in Michigan was related to the job satisfaction of those same principals. In this chapter, the research design was presented with the population description and sampling procedures, research questions, hypotheses, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures?

Research Design

Fraenkel and Wallen (1993) defined correlation research as “research that involves collecting data in order to determine the degree to which a relationship exists between two or more variables” (p. 344). The advantage of correlation research is that it allows the researcher to conduct studies of several variables and their interrelationships at the same time (McMilland & Schumacher, 1993). Correlation research methods and survey procedures were used extensively in this research because these methods were the most appropriate for gathering and analyzing the data needed to answer the research questions.

A survey design was used in this study. Kerlinger (1986) described survey research as a “useful tool for educational fact-finding” (p.386) and “is best adapted to obtaining personal and social facts, beliefs, and attitudes” (p. 386). Survey research requires a systemic collection of data from a sample through questionnaires or interviews. This method was especially appropriate for making descriptive and inferential studies of large populations (Kerlinger, 1986; Miller, 1983). The research questions posed by this study required obtaining quantitative data from a sample of Michigan high school principals. A self-administered questionnaire offered the advantage of contact with a large number of subjects in a relatively short period of

time. There are other advantages in using a written survey rather than an interview (Miller, 1983). They include the factors:

1. It permits more answers to review.
2. It is more accurate if the respondent has to check the information.
3. It gives the respondent a sense of privacy.
4. It allows for greater uniformity in the presentation of the items.
5. The effects of the interviewer are removed.

There are some disadvantages to this method that should be noted:

1. There is no follow through on misunderstood items.
2. The validity depends on the willingness of respondent to provide information.
3. Individuals may not return the survey.
4. There is a possible misinterpretation of some items.
5. There may be respondent bias.
6. The respondents may differ significantly from the non-respondents. (p. 40)

Population Description and Sampling Procedure

The subjects for this study were randomly selected from the target population of all Michigan high school principals who were employed in one of the public high schools in Michigan during the 2001-2002 school year. The reason for the use of high school principals as our sample population was threefold. First, the problem statement and research question was specifically addressing the retention of school principals, and so our target population would only be school principals since the roles of other

school administrators such as assistant principals varies. Second, only public school principals were surveyed rather than include private school principals. Private school principals were excluded because private schools offer a different educational purpose, and their mission often includes religious, denominational, or similar purpose. Many principals choose to be there more out of their own value system or religious affiliation, which may have had an impact on the job satisfaction indicators the research wished to measure. Third, the research chose high school principals because, conceptually, the level of the school that a person is a principal may have had a mitigating impact on both the leadership style and job satisfaction of the principal. Since the purpose of the research was to focus on the leadership style of the principals and their job satisfaction, the researcher wanted to survey similar roles and settings of those people within those positions. Again, the research questions in this study examined the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction of principals and not the level of schooling (elementary, middle, or secondary) or type of school (private or public) as conceptual personal and school characteristics in which the research wished to measure.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used to collect data for this study: (1) the *Job Descriptive Index* (JDI) (Smith, 1997), (2) the *multifactor leadership questionnaire* (MLQ) (Bass & Avelio, 1995) and (3) a demographic data sheet. Each of these instruments is discussed in the following section.

Job Descriptive Index

The first instrument used in this study is the revised *Job Descriptive Index* (JDI) (Bowling Green State University, 1997), which was initially developed by Smith et al. (1979) and revised by Smith et al. (1997). The original *Job Descriptive Index* was developed over a ten-year period at Cornell University. It has been regarded as “the most carefully developed instrument for measuring job satisfaction available” (Gruneberg, 1969, p. 3) and the “gold standard” by others (Landy & Shankster, 1994, p.271). In the development of the original *Job Descriptive Index*, psychologists utilized a number of studies of job satisfaction to compile a list of adjectives or short phrases that apply to various aspects of a job. Factor analysis determined that at least four areas of satisfaction could be distinguished as independent from each other. The areas included the work itself, pay and promotions, supervision, and co-workers (Smith et al., 1969). Further studies indicated that pay and promotions could be separated into two distinct areas. Thus the final form of the *Job Descriptive Index* included five sub scales: satisfaction with work, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with promotions, satisfaction with supervision, and satisfaction with co-workers (Balzer & Smith, 1990). Overall satisfaction was measured by the subscale called the “Job in General,” which was added at the time the instrument was revised (Smith et al., 1987; Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989). The format of the JDI consisted of a series of objective checklists referring to various job aspects. The scale items represented descriptions associated with both satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the above six areas or sub scales. Each JDI scale was made up of a

list of descriptive phrase which respondents were asked to mark Y for yes if it described their job, or N for no if it did not describe their job. A question mark (?) was used if respondents could not decide whether it did or did not describe their job.

During the revision of the JDI, efforts focused on replacing items that were not uniformly effective or had become dated. New items were chosen to replace existing items on the job satisfaction survey if they met the following criteria: increased internal consistency or agreement with other items in scale, showed greater discrimination between high and low scores, and improved accuracy in the scale (Balzer & Smith, 1990, p. 48). Based on these criteria, 41 items were combined with the original 72 items on the JDI, and all 113 items were used with the sample of 795 people. After statistical analysis of each item, eleven items were chosen to replace items in the original JDI. The original JDI was not designed to measure the overall job satisfaction, nor can the five sub scales be summed to provide an accurate representation of overall job satisfaction (Balzer & Smith, 1990). To address this need for an overall measure of job satisfaction, a seven- year project to develop the *Job in General* (JIG) scale was undertaken. Work on this project was begun at Bowling Green State University, Ohio, and continued at the University of South Florida, Tampa (Ironson et al., 1989). Several considerations were important in the development of the jobs in general sub scale index. First, the developers wanted the scale to have multiple items for an estimate of reliability, to be simple to read, to have minimal overlap and be quick to complete, and to be compatible with the JDI (Balzer & Smith, 1990, pp. 50-51). Drawing from the literature, a collection of 42 adjectives

or short phrases addressing the global feelings of overall job satisfaction was compiled. This list was administered to over 1,000 employees to determine the best items to use on the JIG. Further analysis from previous studies resulted in the final JIG scale of 18 global terms (Balzer & Smith, 1990).

The JDI and the JIG were identical in format, with the JDI containing a total of 72 adjectives or phrases in five sub scales and the JIG containing 18 adjectives or phrases. The reading level is low, and the total administration time for both the JDI and the JIG combined is approximately ten minutes (Balzer & Smith, 1990).

Likewise, the job descriptive index met several important characteristics which is why it is such a widely used measure of job satisfaction among a diverse setting with a diverse sample population. This survey contained the following characteristics: it included various aspects of job satisfaction; it was easy to administer; it was easy to score and interpret; it applied to all jobs within an organization; and it was useful in identifying problems, choosing solutions, and evaluating changes.

Validity and Reliability

The revised *Job Descriptive Index* has been tested extensively for both discriminant and convergent validity. Tests of discriminant validity have assured that each of the five JDI sub scales distinguished satisfaction from the other sub scales of job satisfaction. Using several measures as predictors, including the five sub scales, and the JIG sub scale resulted in the coefficients alpha of .78, .81, .87, .87 and .88 for

work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-worker sub scale respectively (Ironson et al., 1989, p. 197). The internal consistency (alpha of .88) also indicated a high level of reliability (Balzer & Smith, 1990). The *Job in General* scale was also found that this sub scale accounted for 87% of the variance. Tests of the JIG resulted in coefficient alpha of .91 when the internal consistency was checked. In testing the convergent validity of the JIG against other scales of job satisfaction, correlations ranged from .66 to .80. In a test of discriminant validity, resulted in a coefficient alpha of .92 (Ironson et al, 1989).

Scoring of the JDI and the JIG

Each of the five sub scales of the JDI (revised) and the JIG scale was scored separately. Approximately half the items in each scale are worded favorably and the other half negatively. According to the instrument manual (Smith et al., 1990), each sub scale was scored by assigning numeric values to “Y”, “N” and “?”. For favorably worded items, a “Y” receives three points, an “N” receives zero points and a “?” receives one point. For unfavorably worded items, an “N” receives three points, a “Y” receives zero points, and a “?” receives one point. The scores were computed by adding the points obtained in the individual sub scales for each instrument. When a respondent failed to mark an item, the omitted response was treated as a question mark and scored one point if a total of three or fewer items were left unmarked in that particular sub scale. If a greater number of items were left unmarked, the particular scale was not scored (Balzer & Smith, 1990).

Both the *Job Descriptive Index* and the *Job in General* have withstood very strict tests of validity and reliability. Following its introduction, the original JDI was used extensively in research. In fact, the *Job Descriptive Index* has been reported to be the most frequently used measure of job satisfaction (DeMeuse, 1986; O'Conner, Peters, & Gordon, 1978; Hoy & Miskel, 1987, Zedeck, 1987). Ironson et al (1989) reported that during the ten-year period from 1977 to 1987, 454 articles were written specifically referring to the JDI. The researcher chose to use this instrument because it was a standardized instrument of proven quality, validity, and reliability. This survey has also been used extensively across many settings. Permission to reproduce the instrument was secured (Appendix A).

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

The second instrument used in this study was the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bernard Bass. In the last 15 years, there has been considerable interest in testing transformational and transactional leadership (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1994). Yet, there was no instrument or ability to capture or assess this leadership paradigm. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was the first to do so. The construction of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was a result of factor analysis, observations, interviews, and descriptions of the ideal leader that people carry around. First, descriptions of ideal leaders were gathered and converted to 141 behavioral statements. Eleven judges agreed on 73 of the statements as either transformational or transactional. These statements using

factor analysis with 196 U.S. Army colonels supported the components that emerged (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995). Additionally, diaries of Virginia Military Academy (VMI) cadets reported in unstructured logs leadership behaviors they observed during a given set of days. These logs could be reliably scored in terms of all the components noted earlier and linked to independently obtained questionnaire results (Atwater, Avolio, & Bass, 1991). A definitive conformational factor analysis was completed for 14 samples involving 3,786 (MLQ) descriptions of leaders from a variety of organizations that suggested the model of best fit included both the transactional and transformational leadership sub-scales (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1997). Subsequent revisions have redefined more precisely the constructs associated with transformational leadership and provide additional empirical support. The MLQ survey consists of 45 descriptive statements in which the leader must judge how frequently each statement fits his or her leadership style.

Bass (1985) identified four components in transformational leadership. A leader was idealistically influential (II) (often referred as charismatic) when followers had the confidence and faith in the leader. Within this scale, the leader's behavior or attributes may have influenced the followers. In this case, the followers sought to identify with leaders and emulate their behavior. A leader was admired, respected, and trusted. Followers identified with the leader and wanted to emulate them; these leaders were often endowed by the followers as having extraordinary capabilities, persistence, and determination. These leaders set high moral and ethical standards. They could be counted on for doing the right thing. A leader was inspirationally

motivating (IM) when he/she provided followers with challenges, persuasion, meaning, and understanding for shared actions. Enthusiasm and optimism were displayed. Leaders found followers involved in the vision of the organization and they clearly communicated expectations. A leader was intellectually stimulating (IS) when it enhanced followers' innovation and creativity and expanded the followers' abilities to solve a broader range of problems. A leader would approach old situations in new ways. Creativity was encouraged, and there was no public criticism of individual members' mistakes. Followers were encouraged to try new approaches, and their ideas were not criticized because they differed from the leaders' ideas. A leader was individually considerate (IC) when his/her followers had support, mentoring, and coaching demonstrated with an understanding and acceptance of individual differences among the followers. Individualized consideration was practiced when new learning opportunities were created along a supportive climate. The leader showed acceptance of individual differences and a two-way exchange of communication occurred. The leader was an effective listener.

These four components in transformational leadership are relevant to military, business, and educational settings (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Similarly, these four components were also contained in House's (1996) and Conger and Kanungo's (1988) definition of charisma. Along the range of leadership styles was the transactional leadership which also contained four components. Constructive transaction has been found to be reasonably effective. With this method, a leader assigns duties or gets agreement on what needs to be done and promises a reward for

exchange. This was contingent reward (CR). The leader specifies goals, rewards or corrects colleagues depending on performance. This transactional leadership associated the performance of the followers with a reward system and required a corrective plan of discipline when performance falls below some acceptable standard. Contingent reward leadership has been found to be effective but not as effective as transformational leadership defined earlier (Gasper, 1992; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Leadership in this range required negotiations and agreements on what needed to be done and then linked those agreements to rewards in return to the follower's achievement. The second component was management-by-exception (MBE), which may either be passive or active. In active (MBE), the leader arranged to actively monitor deviances from standards, mistakes, and errors in the follower's assignment and to take corrective action. In passive (MBE), the leader would patiently wait and be more passive in determining a follower's mistakes or errors and then take corrective action. This form of leadership may occur when the leader has a large number of subordinates who report directly to the leader. The last possibility in the full range of leadership styles was the non-transactional or laissez-faire leadership (LF). This included the possibility of the absence or avoidance of leadership. The laissez-faire leader didn't care about what happened and failed to follow up after a project or task had been delegated. This leadership style was the most inactive form of leadership, and necessary decisions were not made and actions were delayed. Often the leadership role was ignored and the leader's authority was unused.

Validity and Reliability

The revised *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) has been tested extensively for both discriminant and convergent validity. Tests of discriminant validity have assured that each of the eight MLQ sub scales distinguished a full range of leadership styles including the four components of transformational leadership and the four components of transactional leadership. Using several measures as predictors, including the MLQ sub scales with over 1,053 raters, resulted in the coefficients alpha for the transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivating, intellectual stimulating and individualized consideration) of .89, .76, .86, .89 respectively, and for the transactional leadership (contingent reward, management-by-exception active and passive, laissez-faire) of .89, .73, .73, .79 (Bass, 1998, p. 5). The reliability scores from a sample of 2,154 reported in the technical report showed a scale range from .74 to .94 with no self ratings were included in this sample. The reliabilities within the data were generally high and exceeding the standard for internal consistencies which were above .70 and recommended in the literature (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Scoring of the MLQ

The MLQ survey consisted of 45 descriptive statements in which the person taking the survey judged how frequently each of the statements fit his or her own leadership style. Each descriptive statement was followed by the numbers 0 through 4 and the responder circled a number based upon the following criteria: 0 –“not at all”,

1- “once in a while”, 2- “sometimes”, 3- “fairly often”, 4- “frequently, if not always.”

According to the instrument manual (Bass and Avolio, 1995), the leadership sub-scales were scored by assigning a numeric value. Each leadership sub-scale was assigned four different descriptor statements within the survey. To calculate the score for the leadership sub-scale, a person would add up the 4 point totals circled for the assigned descriptors and then divide by 4 to determine an average score for that particular sub-scale. For example, the descriptor statements #1, #11, #16, and #35 on the MLQ survey all had to do with the sub-scale, “contingent reward.” The scores were computed by adding the points obtained in the individual sub-scales for each instrument. When a respondent failed to mark an item for a descriptor statement, the omitted response was treated as a zero and the total sub-scale was divided by three instead of four. If a greater number of descriptor items were left unmarked, the particular scale was not scored.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) has been used in nearly 200 research programs, doctoral dissertations, and masters theses around the globe over the last four years (Bass & Avolio, 1995). After a decade, it appears that a reliable, valid instrument can be administered to either leaders or followers.

Demographic Information Survey

The third instrument used in this study included a demographic survey which gathered data about the participants’ gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, level of education, and size of school. This information was used for

descriptive statistics upon the sample of high school principals in Michigan. These personal and school characteristics were also used to determine the relationships with both the leadership style and job satisfaction of these principals using correlational statistics.

Data Collection and Procedures

Permission from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western Michigan University was obtained prior to data collection (Appendix F). A survey packet was distributed to Michigan high school principals using two communication methods. First, the survey packets were distributed at the Michigan Association of High School Principals (MASSP) annual conference on November 26-29, 2001 in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Every high school principal at the conference had the opportunity to pick up a survey packet at the information table during the conference registration. As a conference attendee, the researcher received a list of every principal registered for the conference and in attendance at the conference. A locked box was available at the conference for participants to return their surveys while at the conference. Because the survey was anonymous, the researcher did not know who at the conference completed a survey and who did not but out of the 183 high school principals at the conference, 93 principals returned the surveys.

In the second communication method, the researcher sent the same survey by United States mail to a sample of Michigan high school principals not in attendance at the conference. To do this method, the researcher gathered the secondary principals' names from the Michigan Education Directory 2002 (Michigan Education Directory,

Inc., 2002), which listed all public and private school principals in Michigan for the academic year of the publication. For every district listed in the state, the directory gave the name of the principal of the elementary, middle, and high schools. High school principals were considered to be principals in buildings designated in the directory as housing pupils in grades 9-12 or some combination of these grades. From the list of all high school principals (625 high school principals) from the Michigan Directory, the researcher subtracted all the names of the principals or representatives from those high schools (183 high school principals) who were in attendance at the MASSP principals' conference. From the remaining list of high school principals (442 high school principals), all the names of the secondary principals were numbered. Using the procedures for selecting a sample size as outlined in Isaac and Michael (1981) and Krejcie and Morgan (1970), 220 high school principals were randomly selected from the remaining population of high school principals in Michigan to participate in this study, and a survey was mailed to them. Respondents were able to return data results to the researcher by United States mail as well.

In this survey, a cover letter explaining the study and requesting participation was sent to the randomly chosen principals along with the survey instruments, which also included the demographic questionnaire. Information concerning confidentiality and notification of results was included in this packet. A reminder card was also sent to principals who had not responded after two days. Out of the 220 high school principals who were mailed the survey, 90 principals returned the surveys.

Data Analysis Procedures

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used in this research.

Descriptive analysis of the data incorporated the use of frequency distributions, percentages, measures of central tendency and dispersion when considered appropriate and reported from the demographic information obtained from the personal data sheet. Results of the surveys were compiled according to the instructions in the test manuals for each instrument. All data was coded and analyzed using the Software Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and Statistical Analysis Software (SAS). Decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were made using an alpha level of .05. To ensure accuracy of scoring and data input, the researcher had every survey that was returned scored and reviewed by two people. Likewise the data entries were entered by one person and then double-checked for accuracy by another person.

For Question 1: How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the job satisfaction, as measured by the *Job Descriptive Index* (revised) of Michigan secondary school principals? Separate one way ANOVA using T-tests were used with the five sub-scales of job satisfaction that includes work, pay, supervisor, co-workers, and opportunity for promotion as well as the job in general scale which measures overall job satisfaction as the dependant variables. The independent variables under the personal and school characteristics were

1. gender
2. age
3. years of experience
4. years in current position
5. size of school

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were also run to determine the strength of the relationship between each of the independent variables of the personal and school characteristics with the dependent variables of job satisfaction. Finally, Tukey's Studentized Range Test (similar to ANOVA) was used to determine the average mean differences among the various groups of principals.

For Question 2: How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the principal's leadership style, as measured by the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) of Michigan secondary school principals? Separate one way ANOVA using T-tests were used with the nine sub-scales of leadership style that included the dependant variables. The independent variables under the personal and school characteristics were:

1. gender
2. age
3. years of experience
4. years in current position
5. size of school

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were also run to determine the strength of the relationship between each of the independent variables of the personal and school characteristics with the dependent variables of leadership style. Tukey's Studentized Range Test (similar to ANOVA) was used to determine the average mean differences among the various groups of principals.

For Question 3: How do the leadership style of secondary school principals currently employed in Michigan associate with the job satisfaction of principals? Canonical correlations were used to determine the strength of the relationship between the 5 sub-scales of job satisfaction as well as the overall job satisfaction with the nine sub-scales of leadership style. With this question, canonical correlation was used to analyze the relationship between these two sets of variables. The one set being the job satisfaction sub-scales and the other set being the leadership style sub-scales. Multiple Regression analysis was also used to determine the predictive value of either job satisfaction or leadership style characteristics.

Summary

This chapter has presented the methods and procedures used to examine the level of job satisfaction of Michigan high school principals and to determine if the level of job satisfaction was related to their leadership styles. The chapter included a description of the target population of Michigan high school principals and method to collect the survey information. Both the JDI (revised) and the MLQ were used in this

study to examine Michigan high school principal's job satisfaction and leadership styles.

Job satisfaction was measured using the five sub scales; satisfaction with work, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with promotions, satisfaction with supervision, and satisfaction with co-workers as well as the overall job satisfaction using the sub scale Job in General index. Leadership style used the nine sub scales; Idealized Influence (attributed), Idealized Influence (behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, Active Management by Exception, and Passive Management by Exception.

The protocol that was used for this study has been described in this chapter. Included in this chapter were the research questions, sample population, survey instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis procedures. Presented in Chapter IV are the findings based on the results of data analysis with respect to each of the research questions. Chapter V contains a summary and discussion of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Overview

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between leadership styles of Michigan high school principals with the job satisfaction of those same principals. In this chapter, the results of the statistical analysis of the research questions of this research are reported. The research questions are presented and the statistical results are reported and explained.

A total of 403 high school principals out of a total population of 625 in the state of Michigan were asked to complete three survey instruments: The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) to measure job satisfaction, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to measure leadership style, and a demographic survey to measure personal and school characteristics. Of the 403 principals, 183 returned their completed surveys for a response rate of 42.9% response rate. The following descriptive information was reported that was both applicable to the job satisfaction and leadership style questions and is used to describe the sample population of Michigan high school principals.

The first research question sought to discover whether or not there was a relationship between a principal's personal and school characteristics and his/her job satisfaction. The question asked: How do a principal's personal and school

characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the job satisfaction level of Michigan high school principals? These variables included in this study would be used to study the effects of job satisfaction of the principal.

The second research question sought to discover whether or not there was a relationship between a principal's personal and school characteristics and leadership style. The question asked: How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the leadership style of Michigan secondary school principals? These variables included in this study would be used to study the effects of these variables on the leadership style of the principal.

Finally, the researcher sought to explore the various leadership styles among high school principals in Michigan and their prevalence and relation to job satisfaction. In other words, it was an attempt to determine if principals' job satisfaction varies with specific and various leadership styles. The question asked: How do the leadership style of secondary school principals currently employed in Michigan associate with the job satisfaction of principals?

Description of the Sample

The demographic survey contained both personal and school characteristics. The information provided from these characteristics was used to present a profile of Michigan high school principals. First, the respondents were asked to indicate their

age and gender. Of the 183 respondents 154 (84.2%) indicated their gender as male and 29 (15.8%) indicated their gender as female. The responding principals were also asked to report their ages using a category of age ranges. The greatest number of principals were between 46 and 55 with 109 (58.5 %), and 37 (20.2 %) reporting their ages as between 36 and 45. Two (1.1 %) of the principals were over the age of 65. Table 1 presents the summarization of these responses from the personal and school characteristics of Michigan high school principals. It should be noted that all decisions on the significance of the inferential procedures were made using an alpha level of .05.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals-Age and Gender

Age	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
26-35	16	8.7	8.7
36-45	37	20.2	29.0
46-55	107	58.5	87.4
56-65	21	11.5	98.9
over 65	2	1.1	100
Gender	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	154	84.2	84.2
Female	29	15.8	100

The responding principals were next asked to indicate their school size. Of the 183 respondents, 67 (36.6%) indicated their high school as Class A and 50 (27.3%) indicated their high school as Class B. These two school sizes contributed 63% of the respondents. Table 2 presents the summarization of these responses from the personal and school characteristics of Michigan high school principals.

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals-School Size

School Size	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Class A	67	36.6	36.6
Class B	50	27.3	63.9
Class C	44	24	88
Class D	22	12	100

Class A= more than 992 students, class B= 991-495 students, class C= 494-252 students, class D = less than 251 students

The responding principals were next asked to provide their years of experience as part of their personal characteristics. The response to this question showed the majority of principals 71 (38.8%) had over 15 years of experience. Secondly, the response to this question showed that 12 principals (6.6%) had less than two years experience. The remainder of the responding principals were equally distributed among the age sub categories between 3 to 14 years of experience. Table 3

present the summarization of these responses from the personal and school characteristics of Michigan high school principals.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals-Years of Experience

Years Experience	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0-2	12	6.6	6.6
3-5	22	12	18.6
6-8	23	12.6	31.1
9-11	28	15.3	46.4
12-14	27	14.8	61.2
> 15	71	38.8	100

From the personal and school characteristics survey, the responding principals were asked to provide the number of years in their current position as part of their personal characteristics. 49 respondents (26.8%) had been in their current position for less than 2 years and another 49 respondents had been in their current position between 3-5 years. Summarily, 52.8% of the principals surveyed had been in their current position for fewer than 5 years. Only 17 respondents (9.3%) had been in their position for more than 15 years. Table 4 present the summarization of these responses from the personal and school characteristics of Michigan High School Principals.

Table 4

**Frequency Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics
of Michigan High School Principals-Years in Position**

Years In Position	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0-2	49	26.8	26.8
3-5	49	26.8	53.6
6-8	35	19.1	72.7
9-11	19	10.4	83.1
12-14	14	7.7	90.7
> 15	17	9.3	100

Research Questions

Three research questions were developed for this study. Each of these questions was answered using inferential statistical tests using an ex post facto design with no manipulation of any independent variable.

Research Question #1-Job Satisfaction:

How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the job satisfaction level of Michigan high school principals?

There were three significant relationships between the personal and school characteristics and job satisfaction of Michigan high school principals. First, the relationship between gender and promotion had a Pearson Product Coefficient of $-.172$, which would suggest that males tend to be more satisfied with their promotion ability than females. This trend was consistent for all class size high schools. Second, the relationship between the size of school and promotion showed a Pearson Product Coefficient of $-.155$ which would suggest that principals in Class A schools had a higher satisfaction level in their ability for a promotion than those in smaller schools. Class A high schools are bigger districts and typically have more central office administrators. Finally, there was a significant relationship between years in the position and pay with a correlation of $.182$, which would suggest that a principal was more satisfied with pay the longer the longer he/she was in their position. This trend was also consistent among both genders as well at all size high schools. Table 5 presents the summarization of the correlations between these personal and school characteristics of Michigan high school principals and job satisfaction.

Table 5

**Correlations between Personal and School Characteristics
of Michigan High School Principals and Job Satisfaction Subscales**

Correlation	Job Satisfaction					
	Pay	People	Promotion	Work	Supervision	General
Age	.079	.211	-.077	.036	.098	.044
Gender	.027	.046	-.172*	.001	-.034	.079

Table 5-continued

Correlation	Pay	People	Promotion	Work	Supervision	General
Size of School	-.126	-.028	-.155*	-.124	.010	-.107
Years of Experience	.254	.138	.136	.079	.048	.143
Years in Position	.182*	.108	.124	.038	.047	.133

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level.

Significance	Job Satisfaction					
	Pay	People	Promotion	Work	Supervision	General
Age	.288	.004	.303	.629	.186	.558
Gender	.720	.540	.020	.986	.649	.289
Size of School	.090	.702	.036	.095	.898	.149
Years of Experience	.001	.062	.067	.287	.518	.054
Years in Position	.014	.146	.094	.612	.528	.072

Likewise, there were three significant relationships between each of the job satisfaction subscales. First, the relationship between pay satisfaction and work had a Pearson Product Coefficient of .153, which suggested that those principals who were paid more also scored higher in satisfaction with their work. Second, the relationship between pay satisfaction and supervision showed a Pearson Product Coefficient of .163, which indicated that principals who were more satisfied with their pay were also more satisfied with their supervisor. Finally, there was a significant relationship between a principal's satisfaction with the people they worked with and his/her satisfaction in ability for a promotion with a Pearson Product Coefficient of .188.

Table 6 presents the summarization of the correlations between the job satisfaction subscales as reported by Michigan high school principals.

Table 6

Correlations between Job Satisfaction Subscales of Michigan High School Principals

Correlation	Job Satisfaction					
	Pay	People	Promotion	Work	Supervision	General
Pay	1.00	.277	.359	.153*	.153*	.491
People	.	1.00	.188*	.287	.246	.520
Promotion			1.00	.258	.326	.322
Work				1.00	.137	.493
Supervision					1.00	.199
*Correlation is significant at the .05 level.						
Significance	Pay	People	Promotion	Work	Supervision	General
Pay	.	.000	.000	.038	.039	.000
People		.	.011	.000	.001	.000
Promotion			.	.000	.000	.000
Work				.	.064	.000
Supervision				.	.	.007

Table 7 presents the summarization of the mean satisfaction, variance, and standard deviations of the 6 subscales of job satisfaction. From the table it appears

that responding principals had the highest level of job satisfaction with their work and the lowest job satisfaction with their pay. However, further analysis using ANOVA procedure determined that the differences in means between the job satisfaction subscales as defined by the personal and school characteristics were not statistically significant and due to random probability. By using ANOVA with every combination of variables and comparing the $PR > F$ column the actual probability that the mean subscale scores were different. Since none of the probabilities were less than the required .05 level it can be concluded that any difference in mean job satisfaction scores among the personal and school characteristic groups was due to random probability.

Table 7

Measure of Central Tendency in Job Satisfaction Subscales

	Job Satisfaction					
	Pay	People	Promotion	Work	Supervision	General
Mean	38.55	44.66	33.21	48.46	44.52	46.36
S. Deviation	12.39	9.82	16.47	6.30	11.60	7.49
Variance	153.48	96.522	271.18	39.734	134.569	56.156
Minimum	0	4	0	18	1	12
Maximum	54	59	54	59	54	54
Skewness	-.601	-1.53	-.197	-1.984	-1.657	-1.857

Further analysis on the job satisfaction subscales showed the mean satisfaction score in opportunities for promotion of Michigan male high school principals was

significantly greater than Michigan female high school principals. The difference in means was 7.745. No other job satisfaction subscale showed any gender difference except this category of satisfaction in job promotion. Table 8 presents the summarization of the correlations between the job satisfaction subscales as reported by Michigan high school principals.

Table 8

Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Mean Opportunities for Promotion Job Satisfaction Subscale and Gender

Gender*	Difference Means	Simultaneous 95% Confidence Limits	
Male, Female	7.745	6.497	8.993

*comparisons significant at the .05 level.

The only statistically significant difference among high school principals in overall job satisfaction were those based upon school size. Principals from Class A and B high schools as a group had higher job satisfaction scores than those principals in Class C, and D schools. The mean job satisfaction score for Class A principals was 42.63 and the standard deviation was 6.9. The mean job satisfaction score for class D principals was 40.71 and the standard deviation was 7.52. Table 9 provides a summarization of the mean job satisfaction score and standard deviation based upon school size. Further analysis using ANOVA suggests that any difference in means among the various size high schools was statistically significant. The $PR>F$ column from table 10 suggest that only a 4.45% chance that the difference in means among

the various high school principals sorted by school size was due to random probability.

Table 9

**Mean Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics
of Michigan High School Principals-School Size with Job Satisfaction**

School Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
	42.63	6.90
Class A	43.02	7.05
Class B	44.44	6.26
Class C	40.94	6.65
Class D	40.71	7.52

Table 10

**ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals
Comparing School Size and Average Job Satisfaction**

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	R-Square	PR>F
Between	3	381.34	127.11	2.75	.044	.0445
Within	179	8288.32	46.30			
Total	182	8669.66				

There is very little variance associated to the personal or school characteristics among the respective sub-groups except the school size variable having the greatest likelihood of variance with a PR>F at .0445 closely followed by years of experience.

Likewise, very little statistical significance can be concluded by examining the relationship of the individual personal and school characteristics with the 6 sub-groups of job satisfaction. In table 11, the researcher examined the data using ANOVA with a combination of the personal and school characteristics. The reason for such analysis was based with the assumption that because of so many independent variables that these variables may interact with each other to create greater variance.

From the table, there were three interactions that had a statistical significance and showed significant variation among the mean satisfaction scores. The first interaction included school size with gender with an F value of 3.59 and $PR>F$ of .0171. The second interaction was school size with years of experience and gender with an F value of 4.48 and $PR>F$ of .0358. The third interaction was years in position with gender with an F value of 3.85 and $PR>F$ of .0515.

An argument can be made from this analysis that the size of school played a significant role in the overall job satisfaction of principals with those serving in Class A and B schools scoring higher than those in Class C and D. This overall job satisfaction was significant. The mean satisfaction scores of Michigan high school principals increased when you factor in their years of experience with the more years a person had in the principalship the higher his/her job satisfaction. Likewise, when these independent variables interacted with gender the mean job satisfaction was even greater with males showing a slight increase in overall job satisfaction.

Table 11

ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals
Comparing Personal and School Characteristics with
Average Job Satisfaction

Source (Quantitative)	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	PR>F
Age	1	26.71	26.71	.56	.4536
Gender	1	24.50	24.50	.52	.4728
Size of School	1	51.10	51.10	1.08	.3003
Yrs. in Position	1	40.67	40.67	.86	.3553
Yrs. of Experience	1	10.16	10.16	.21	.6437
Age*Gender	1	72.77	72.77	1.54	.2168
Age*Size of School	1	46.43	46.43	.98	.3234
Age*Yrs. in Position	1	3.64	3.64	.08	.7818
Age*Yrs. of Exp.	1	.439	.439	.01	.9234
Size*Gender	1	1.01	1.01	.02	.8835
Age	4	220.22	55.05	1.19	.3202
Gender	1	7.76	7.76	.17	.6828
Size of School	3	227.20	75.73	1.64	.1863
Yrs. in Position	5	345.89	69.18	1.5	.1993
Yrs. of Experience	5	141.53	28.31	.61	.6900
Age*Gender	2	32.75	16.38	.35	.7024
Age*Size of School	8	174.17	21.78	.47	.8728
Age*Yrs. in Position	9	672.71	74.75	1.62	.1233
Age*Yrs. of Exp.	10	348.39	34.84	.75	.6711
*Size*Gender	3	497.00	165.67	3.59	.0171
*Yrs. in Pos*Gender	5	542.28	108.46	2.35	.0480
Size*Yrs. of Exp.	13	666.96	51.30	1.11	.3615
Exp*Pos	10	528.42	52.84	1.14	.3401
Yrs. of Exp.*Gender	1	79.83	79.83	1.69	.1959
Age*Size*Gender	1	36.36	36.36	.77	.3820
Age*Exp*Gender	1	130.61	130.61	2.76	.0986
Age*Size*Yrs in Pos	1	34.74	34.74	.73	.3929
Age*Size*Yrs of Exp	1	60.28	60.28	1.27	.2607
Size*Pos*Gender	1	101.94	101.94	2.15	.1442
*Size*Exp*Gender	1	212.13	212.13	4.48	.0358

*correlation is significant at the .05 level

Further analysis using Tukey's Studentized Range Test (similar to ANOVA) described the specific results. From Table 12, the average job satisfaction of male principals in class B high schools is significantly greater than male principals in class C high schools. The difference in means was 4.930. No other difference was determined using school size as a comparison. Likewise, the average job satisfaction of male principals in class B high schools was significantly greater than responding female principals in class B high schools. The average difference in mean job satisfaction scores was 10.785. No other statistically significant difference was determined among genders. Similar statistical comparisons were made between genders with every size school and were not statistically significant.

Table 12

Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Mean Job Satisfaction with Gender and School Size Comparison

Gender, Size of School*	Difference Means	Simultaneous 95% Confidence Limits	
Male, class B- Male, class C	4.930	.309	9.551
Male, class B- Female, class B	10.785	1.198	20.372

* Comparisons significant at the .05 level.

From Table 13, the mean satisfaction in present pay among principals in class B high schools was significantly greater than principals in class D high schools. The difference in mean satisfaction in pay was 10.145. Statistical analysis was completed with comparisons made between every size school to determine differences in mean satisfaction with pay and no other difference was statistically significant.

Table 13

**Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Present Pay Job Satisfaction
Subscale and School Size Comparison**

Size of School*	Difference Means	Simultaneous 95% Confidence Limits	
Class B, Class D	10.145	2.113	18.178

* Comparisons significant at the .05 level.

Finally, from Table 14, the mean job satisfaction with people at work showed that Michigan high school principals in the age bracket between 56 to 65 had greater satisfaction with the people they worked with than those principals between the ages of 26 to 35. The difference between the mean job satisfaction was 9.003. Likewise, the mean job satisfaction with people at work showed that Michigan high school principals in the age bracket of 46 to 55 had greater satisfaction with the people they work with than those principals in the 26 to 35 age bracket. The average difference in mean job satisfaction with people was 8.598. The age group of principals between the ages of 26 and 35 scored the lowest in overall job satisfaction with the people.

Table 14

Tukey's Studentized Range Test for People at Work and Age

Age Bracket*	Difference Means	Simultaneous 95% Confidence Limits	
56-65>26-35	9.003	.209	17.797
46-55>26-35	8.598	1.494	15.701

* comparisons significant at the .05 level.

Research Question #2-Leadership Style:

How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the leadership style of Michigan secondary school principals?

The second research question used similar statistical methods as in question number one but the independent variables changed from the job satisfaction variables to the leadership style variables. Table 15 presented the summarization of the relationships between the individual personal and school characteristics with the 7 subscales of leadership styles. From the table, there were 9 significant relationships although none of these had a very strong linear relationship. Out of the 9 relationships, the size of school had 5 of these which were significant.

These relationships suggested a slight linear relationship as the principals in larger high schools scored higher than those in smaller high schools. Likewise, the leadership style subscale called "Individualized Consideration" had 4 significant relationships with the personal and school variables of age, size of school, years of experience and years in position. This relationship would suggest although relatively small that as a high school principal gets older he/she tended to score higher on the skill of individual consideration, which is empathy of the needs of the followers.

Table 15

**Correlations between Personal and School Characteristics
of Michigan High School Principals and Leadership Styles Subscales**

Correlation	Leadership Styles						
	CR	MBE	II-Total	IM	IS	IC	LF
Age	.05	-.126	-.027	.001	.086	.174*	-.084
Gender	.045	-.227*	.028	.054	.045	.053	.058
Size of School	-.214*	.142	-.206*	-.208*	-.338*	-.205*	.026
Years of Experience	.091	-.140	.089	.133	.126	.151*	-.043
Years in Position	.015	-.053	.058	.046	.069	.153*	-.040

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level.

Significance	Leadership Styles						
	CR	MBE	II-Total	IM	IS	IC	LF
Age	.504	.090	.715	.989	.245	.018	.258
Gender	.546	.002	.707	.468	.543	.476	.438
Size of School	.004	.055	.005	.005	.000	.005	.725
Years of Experience	.221	.058	.232	.074	.089	.041	.566
Years in Position	.842	.475	.433	.533	.533	.039	.588

Table 16 presented the summarization of mean satisfaction, variance, and standard deviations of the 7 subscales of leadership styles. From the table it would appear that the responding principals had the highest skill level in "Inspirational Motivation." Further analysis using ANOVA determined that no statistical significance of variation

between the various sub-groups was defined by the personal and school characteristics among the separate and individual leadership styles.

Table 16

Measure of Central Tendency in Leadership Styles

	Leadership Style						
	CR	MBE	II-Total	IM	IS	IC	LF
Mean	3.11	1.32	3.22	3.34	3.19	3.31	.51
S. Deviation	.51	.52	.42	.52	.51	.51	.52
Variance	.26	.28	.18	.27	.26	.26	.27
Minimum	1.5	0	1.88	1.75	1.5	1.25	0
Maximum	4	2.75	4	4	4	4	2
Skewness	-.705	.129	-.415	-.39	-.419	-.876	1.06
Kurtosis	.254	.167	.190	-.72	-.203	1.189	.546

From Table 17, the average contingent reward score of principals in class A high schools was significantly greater than principals in class C high schools. The difference in means was .297. Comparisons of mean contingent reward scores were made between every size school and were found not statistically significant.

Contingent Reward is defined as the leader clarifies what is expected from followers and what the followers will receive if they meet expected levels of performance.

Table 17

Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Mean Contingent Reward and School Size

Size of School*	Difference Means	Simultaneous 95% Confidence Limits	
Class A, Class C	.297	.047	.547

*comparisons significant at the .05 level.

Likewise using the same statistical analysis the mean "Management by Exception" score of Michigan male high school principals was significantly greater than Michigan female high school principals. The difference in means was .3254. The leadership style "Management by Exception" is characterized and focuses on monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain current performance levels. Also, the leader tends to react only after problems have become serious to take corrective action and often times will avoid making any decision at all. These results are reported in Table 18.

Table 18

Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Mean Management by Exception and Gender

Gender*	Difference Means	Simultaneous 95% Confidence Limits	
Male, Female	.3254	1.048	1.374

*comparisons significant at the .05 level.

Using ANOVA, all combinations of the leadership style subscales and the personal and school characteristics were used. From table 19, the size of school was

the only statistically significant variable to show variance in “Intellectual Stimulation” with class A principals showing greater leadership in this subscale than Class B, C, or D principals. The mean intellectual stimulation leadership score showed that principals in Class A Michigan high schools scored higher than those in Class B, C or D high schools. The difference in means ranged from a low of .2855 to a high of .4650.

Table 19

**ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals
Comparing Personal and School Characteristics
and Intellectual Stimulation**

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	R-Square	PR>F
Age						
Between	11	7.13	.648	.987		.46
Within	171	112.291	.657			
Total	182	119.421				
Gender						
Between	11	2.404	.219	1.699		.077
Within	171	22	.129			
Total	182	24.404				
Size of School						
Between	11	32.689	2.972	3.1		.001
Within	171	163.901	.958			
Total	182	196.59				
Years of Exp.						
Between	11	46.108	4.192	1.558		.115
Within	171	460.088	2.691			
Total	182	506.197				

Table 19-Continued

Years in Pos.					
Between	11	41.578	3.78	1.545	.119
Within	171	418.302	2.446		
Total	182	459.88			

From table 20, the personal and school characteristics of age, size of school, and years of experience were the only statistically significant variables to show variance in inspirational motivation with $PR>F$ values of .046, .016, and .020 respectively. A school size comparison was made between every size school and the mean "Inspirational Motivation" of principals in class A high schools was significantly greater than principals in class D high schools. The difference in means was .3891. No other school size comparison involving inspirational motivation was statistically significant.

Table 20

ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals
Comparing Personal and School Characteristics
and Inspirational Motivation

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	R-Square	PR>F
Age						
Between	9	11.075	1.231	1.965		.046
Within	173	108.345	.626			
Total	182	119.421				
Gender						
Between	9	1.080	.12	.89		.535
Within	173	23.324	.135			
Total	182	24.404				

Table 20-Continued

Size of School					
Between	9	21.332	2.370	2.34	.016
Within	171	175.258	1.013		
Total	182	196.59			
Years of Exp.					
Between	9	53.576	5.953	2.275	.020
Within	171	452.621	2.616		
Total	182	506.197			
Years in Pos.					
Between	9	20.301	2.256	.888	.537
Within	171	439.578	2.541		
Total	182	459.88			

Using the same statistical analysis, the personal and school characteristic of years of experience of the principal was the only statistically significant variable to show variance in individualized consideration with Michigan high school principals with more experience showing greater leadership in this subscale. Individualized Consideration was the leadership style in which the principal listens empathetically to the needs of the followers or teachers. The mean individualized consideration leadership score of principals in class A high schools was significantly greater than principals in class C high schools. The difference in means was .2732. Comparisons were made between every size school and no other combination was statistically significant.

Table 21

ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals
Comparing Personal and School Characteristics
and Individualized Consideration

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	R-Square	PR>F
Age						
Between	11	10.982	.998	1.574		.11
Within	171	108.439	.634			
Total	182	119.421				
Gender						
Between	11	.627	.057	.41		.95
Within	171	23.777	.139			
Total	182	24.404				
Size of School						
Between	11	19.34	1.758	1.696		.078
Within	171	177.25	1.037			
Total	182	196.59				
Years of Experience						
Between	11	61.244	5.568	2.14		.02
Within	171	444.952	2.602			
Total	182	506.197				
Years in Pos.						
Between	11	31.406	2.855	1.139		.334
Within	171	428.474	2.506			
Total	182	459.88				

Using the same analysis, the size of school in which the principal worked was the only statistically significant variable to show variance in "Idealized Influence" with class A principals showing greater leadership in this subscale than Class B, C, or

D principals. No other statistically significant relationship was found for “Idealized Influence for other class size schools as a demographic variable.

Table 22

**ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals
Comparing Personal and School Characteristics
and Idealized Influence**

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	R-Square	PR>F
Age						
Between	15	8.636	.576	.868		.601
Within	167	110.785	.663			
Total	182	119.421				
Gender						
Between	15	1.335	.089	.644		.835
Within	167	23.069	.138			
Total	182	24.404				
Size of School						
Between	15	30.27	2.018	2.026		.016
Within	167	166.32	.996			
Total	182	196.59				
Years of Exp.						
Between	15	33.229	2.215	.782		.696
Within	167	472.968	2.832			
Total	182	506.197				
Years in Pos.						
Between	15	29.7	1.98	.769		.711
Within	167	430.18	2.576			
Total	182	459.88				

Summarily, the following conclusions can be made in regard to the various leadership style subscales as compared with the personal and school characteristics of Michigan high school principals. There was a difference in variation of the leadership

style of “Intellectual Stimulation” among the principals based upon the size of school. The amount of variance of .1% was due to random probability. The principals in class A schools scored higher in “Intellectual Stimulation” than those in class B, C, and D with those principals in class D schools scoring the lowest.

Likewise, there was a difference in variation of the leadership style of “Inspirational Motivation” among the principals based upon age. The amount of variance of 4.6% was due to random probability. As principals get older they tended to score higher in inspirational motivation than the younger principals. Also, as principals gained more experience they tended to score higher in inspirational motivation than those principals with less experience. The amount of variance of 2% was due to random probability. Finally, there was a difference in variation of the leadership style of inspirational motivation among principals based upon the size of school. Principals in class A high schools scored higher than those principals in class B, C or D schools. Class D principals scored the lowest in “Inspirational Motivation.” The amount of variance of 1.6% was due to random probability.

With individualized consideration there was a difference in variation of this leadership style among the principals based upon years of experience. The amount of variance of 2% was due to random probability. As principals gained more experience they tended to score higher in individualized consideration than those principals with less experience. Finally, there was a difference in variation of the leadership style of “Idealized Influence” among the principals based upon size of school. The amount of variance of 1.6% was due to random probability. Principals in class A high schools

tend to score higher in idealized influence than those principals from class B, C, or D high schools. Principals from class D high schools scored the lowest in idealized influence.

Next, a closer analysis of the data suggested that combining intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration and total idealized influence into one variable. This variable will be called transformational leadership as suggested by the authors of the multifactor leadership questionnaire. Likewise, combine contingent reward, management by exception, and laissez faire as the other variable, which will be called transactional leader which was also suggested by the authors of the multifactor leadership questionnaire.

Transformational and Transactional Leadership Style

The mean score and standard deviations of the transformational and transactional leadership styles were subdivided by age. From the initial observation it would appear that as a principal ages he or she scores higher in the transformational leadership and lower in transactional leadership. However, the ANOVA showed no variation among the various age groups and that 76.56% of the variation in transformational leadership and 47.12% of the variation in transactional leadership was due to random probability.

Next, the mean score and standard deviations of the transformational and transactional leadership styles were subdivided by gender. From the initial observation it would appear that female principals score higher in the

transformational leadership and lower in transactional leadership. However, the ANOVA showed no variation among male or female principals and that 44.36% of the variation in transformational leadership and 33.96% of the variation in transactional leadership was due to random probability.

However, table 23 presented the mean score and standard deviations of the transformational and transactional leadership styles subdivided by school size. From the initial observation it appeared that principals score higher in the transformational leadership and lower in transactional leadership in larger high schools with principals in Class A high schools scoring the highest respectively. In table 24, the ANOVA did show variation among principals depending on the size of school and that only .02% of the variation in transformational leadership and 4% of the variation in transactional leadership was due to random probability. The conclusion was that principals in larger high schools scored higher in the transformational leadership style and lower in the transactional leadership style with principals in Class D high schools scoring the lowest in transformational leadership and highest in the transactional leadership style.

Table 23

Mean Distribution of the Personal and School Characteristics of Michigan High School Principals-School Size with Leadership Styles

School	N	Transformational		Transactional	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Class A	67	3.42	.34	1.65	.33
Class B	50	3.21	.43	1.65	.34
Class C	44	3.18	.37	1.64	.30

Table 23-Continued

Class D	22	3.08	.35	1.63	.27
---------	----	------	-----	------	-----

Table 24

**ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals
Comparing School Size and Leadership Style**

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	R-Square	PR>F
Transformational						
Between	3	2.88	.96	6.87	.10	.0002
Within	179	24.98	.14			
Total	182	27.86				
Transactional						
Between	3	.01	.004	.04	.0005	.04
Within	179	18.18	.10			
Total	182	18.19				

The mean score and standard deviations of the transformational and transactional leadership styles were subdivided by the principal's years of experience. The ANOVA showed no variation among the various principals grouped by experience and that 17.41% of the variation in transformational leadership and 64.11% of the variation in transactional leadership was due to random probability. Finally, the mean score and standard deviations of the transformational and transactional leadership styles were subdivided by the principal's number of years in current position. The ANOVA showed no variation among the various principals grouped by years in position and that 50.64% of the variation in transformational

leadership and 68.93% of the variation in transactional leadership was due to random probability.

There was very little variance among the respective sub-groups with the exception of school size variable having the greatest likelihood of variance at .0002 in transformational leadership. Very little statistical significance can be concluded by examining the relationship of the individual personal and school characteristics with the transformational leadership style except for school size with principals in class A high schools scoring higher in the transformational leadership style followed by class B, C and finally class D principals scoring the lowest in transformational leadership.

A review of the personal and school characteristics in regard to transactional leadership showed that there was very little variance among the respective sub-groups with the exception of the school size variable having the greatest likelihood of variance in transactional leadership at .04. Very little statistical significance can be concluded by examining the relationship of the individual personal and school characteristics with the transactional leadership style except that principals in class A schools scored the lowest in transactional leadership followed by class B, C and finally class D principals scoring the highest in transactional leadership.

In table 25 and table 26, the researcher examined the ANOVA when a combination of the personal and school characteristics was used with the premise that these variables interacted with each other to create greater variance in both the transactional and transformational leadership styles. From table 25, there was no

statistically significant difference among the combination of personal and school characteristics in regard to transformational leadership.

Table 25

**ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals
Comparing Personal and School Characteristics with
Leadership Style-Transformational**

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	PR>F
Age	1	.002	.002	.01	.9099
Gender	1	.000	.000	.00	.9863
Size of School	1	.071	.071	.48	.4895
Yrs. in Position	1	.074	.074	.50	.4798
Yrs. of Experience	1	.028	.028	.19	.6660
Age*Gender	1	.014	.014	.09	.7614
Age*Size of School	1	.035	.035	.24	.6258
Age*Yrs. in Position	1	.031	.031	.21	.6485
Age*Yrs. of Exp.	1	.015	.015	.10	.7488
Size*Gender	1	.016	.016	.11	.7436
Yrs. in Pos*Gender	1	.057	.057	.39	.5346
Yrs. of Exp.*Gender	1	.150	.150	1.01	.3156
Size*Yrs. in Pos	1	.140	.140	.95	.3312
Size*Yrs. of Exp.	1	.113	.113	.76	.3846
Age*Size*Gender	1	.306	.306	2.07	.1526
Age*Exp*Gender	1	.011	.011	.08	.7801
Age*Size*Yrs in Pos	1	.062	.062	.42	.5175
Age*Size*Yrs of Exp	1	.104	.104	.70	.4029
Size*Pos*Gender	1	.105	.105	.71	.4013
Size*Exp*Gender	1	.306	.306	2.07	.1526

Likewise, from table 26 there was no statistically significant difference among the combination of personal and school characteristics in regard to transactional leadership. A variety of combinations was considered to determine if the variables had an interaction which may then impact the leadership style variables.

Table 26

ANOVA Results for Michigan High School Principals
Comparing Personal and School Characteristics with
Leadership Style-Transactional

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	PR>F
Age	1	.007	.007	.06	.8001
Gender	1	.154	.154	1.48	.2251
Size of School	1	.054	.054	.52	.4728
Yrs. in Position	1	.009	.009	.09	.7698
Yrs. of Experience	1	.196	.196	1.88	.1724
Age*Gender	1	.280	.280	2.70	.1027
Age*Size of School	1	.017	.017	.17	.7014
Age*Yrs. in Position	1	.015	.015	.15	.7014
Age*Yrs. of Exp.	1	.140	.140	1.34	.2480
Size*Gender	1	.060	.060	.57	.4500
Yrs. in Pos*Gender	1	.163	.163	1.57	.2120
Yrs. of Exp.*Gender	1	.010	.010	.10	.7573
Size*Yrs. in Pos	1	.065	.065	.63	.4296
Size*Yrs. of Exp.	1	.364	.364	3.49	.0634
Age*Size*Gender	1	.254	.254	2.44	.1201
Age*Exp*Gender	1	.151	.151	1.45	.2296
Age*Size*Yrs in Pos	1	.000	.000	.00	.9798
Age*Size*Yrs of Exp	1	.308	.308	2.96	.0872
Size*Pos*Gender	1	.296	.296	2.85	.0935
Size*Exp*Gender	1	.017	.017	.16	.6872

Summarily from table 25 and 26, there were no interactions that had statistical significance or showed a variation when the personal and school variables interacted with each other. The closest interaction to show variance was school size and years of experience with an F value of 3.49 and PR>F of .0634 as it related to transactional leadership. The second interaction was school size with years in position and gender with an F value of 2.85 and PR>F of .0935 as it related to transactional leadership.

A statistical procedure, called Tukey's Studentized Range Test, was used to determine the difference between the various school sizes and the mean transformational scores of the responding principals. From table 27, class A high school principals scored the highest in transformational leadership and the scores were significantly different than those principals in class B, C, and D. The mean transformation scores of principals in class B, C, and D were inconclusive.

Table 27

Tukey's Studentized Range Test for Transformational Leadership and School Size Comparison

Size of School*	Difference Means	Simultaneous 95% Confidence Limits	
A-B	.21719	.03612	.39825
A-C	.24026	.05226	.42826
A-D	.34026	.10219	.57833

* comparisons significant at the .05 level.

Again, an argument can be made from this analysis that the size of school plays a role in overall leadership style of principals with those serving in Class A schools scoring higher than those in Class B, C and D. It should also be noted that transformational leadership increased the variance when you factored in years of experience as the more years a person had in the principalship the higher his/her transformational leadership. Likewise, transactional leadership varied as it related to size of school, years in position and gender.

Earlier analysis examined the transformational leadership style defined by the summation of the four leadership styles of intellectual stimulation, inspirational

motivation, individualized consideration, and idealized influence and the transactional leadership style defined by the summation of the three leadership styles of contingent reward, management by exception, and laissez-faire.

Research Question #3-Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction:

How, then, do the leadership style of secondary school principals currently employed in Michigan associate with the job satisfaction of principals?

A canonical correlational procedure was used to test for the relationship among Principal's leadership style and job satisfaction. Several of the leadership style subscales had a negative relationship with the satisfaction with work variable while others had a positive relationship. From table 28, the canonical relationships showed two sets of canonical relationships that were statistically significant. The correlations are listed anything greater than .30 in the chart. The first relationship was Michigan high school principals who scored high on "Inspirational Motivation" and "Idealized Consideration" and low on "Management by Exception" tended to value work on present job and opportunities for promotion more than other principals who didn't score similarly in those leadership characteristics. Both inspirational motivation and idealized consideration are transformational leadership characteristics and the management by exception is a transactional characteristic. The second statistically significant relationship was Michigan high school principals who scored low in "Contingent Reward" and "Intellectual Stimulation" but scored higher on

“Management by Exception” valued the work on present job less but had more job satisfaction with supervision and the people they worked with.

Table 28

Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction

<u>Leadership Style</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficients</u>				
	1	2	3	4	5
C. Reward		-.55			.82
I. Stimulation		-.69		-.83	-.46
MBE	-.47	.33	-.65		
Laizze-Faire			.55	.65	
I. Motivation	.70		-.68	.57	-.60
I. Consideration	.30				.55
I. Influence			.40		.49
<u>Job Satisfaction</u>					
Work	.69	-.61			-.46
Present Pay				.89	-.62
Promotion	.32		-.33	.34	.99
Supervision		.76	-.55		-.46
People at work		.45	.89		.35

Similarly from table 29, the canonical analysis suggested a statistically significant relationship with Michigan high school principal's job satisfaction with work when the principal when a scores high in “Contingent Reward” and low on “Management by Exception.” Likewise, there was a statistically significant relationship between a high score in the leadership style of contingent reward when a principal scores high on job satisfaction with work and low on job satisfaction with pay. The canonical correlation determines the interaction of many variables upon single independent variables.

Table 29

Canonical Correlations between Leadership Styles(V1) and Job Satisfaction(W1) of Michigan High School Principals

	Canonical Variates and Loadings									
	Leadership Style					Job Satisfaction				
	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5
C. Reward		-.50			.75					
I. Stimulation	.43			-.57						
MBE	-.55	.32	-.57							
Laizze-Faire	-.36		.40	.58						
I. Motivation	.80		-.37			.31				
I. Consideration	.59	.44		-.44	.36					
I. Influence	.56				.46					
Work	.33					.86	-.41			
Present Pay									.89	
Promotion						.58			.49	.56
Supervision						.47	.74	-.42		
People at work						.52	.44	.72		

Related to canonical correlations is a statistical procedure called multiple regression, which is a statistical method to determine the line of best fit from several independent variables and one dependent variable. Multiple regression analysis was used because there were several independent variables contributing to the variation of the dependent variable and one cannot control all of them. This analysis was used to make more accurate predictions for the dependent variable. Using SAS software for the calculations the following regression equations were computed and found to be

statistically significant for the prediction of job satisfaction variables and transformational variables.

Transformational Leadership Variables

The first equation of the line of best fit, which predicts the value of job satisfaction with work variable using the transformational leadership variables of the principal was determined. The equation is $(\text{work}) = .837(\text{IS}) + 2.686(\text{IM}) + -.13(\text{IC}) + .547(\text{II}) + 35.492$. This was determined from the numbers generated from table 30. Inspirational motivation makes a significant factor in determining the job satisfaction with work which was closely followed by intellectual stimulation. Likewise, individualized consideration has a negative contributing score on the overall job satisfaction with work.

Table 30

Multiple Regression Procedure for Job Satisfaction Dependent Variable Work on Present Job with Independent Transformational Variables

Independent Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T Value	PR>T
Intercept	35.492	3.929	9.03	<.0001
IS	.837	1.262	.66	.5079
IM	2.686	1.133	2.37	.0188
IC	-.130	1.174	-.11	.9118
II	.547	1.436	.38	.7038

F Value = 3.76, PR>F = .0058, R-Square = .0572

From table 31, the second equation of the line of best fit, which predicts the value of job satisfaction in promotion variable using the transformational leadership variables of the principal was determined. The equation is $(\text{promotion}) = -5.186(\text{IS}) + 7.867(\text{IM}) + 2.423(\text{IC}) + 1.389(\text{II}) + 10.95$. From the equation the intellectual stimulation variable has a negative influence on the overall satisfaction in promotion. Inspirational motivation has a large positive impact on overall job satisfaction with promotion. Likewise, individualized consideration and idealized influence also have a positive impact on satisfaction with promotion although not as great as inspirational motivation.

Table 31

Multiple Regression Procedure for Job Satisfaction Dependent Variable Work on Opportunities for Promotion with Independent Transformational Variables

Independent Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T Value	PR>T
Intercept	10.95	10.349	1.06	.2914
IS	-5.186	3.323	-1.56	.1204
IM	7.867	2.983	2.64	.0091
IC	2.423	3.092	.78	.4343
II	1.389	3.782	.37	.7139

F Value = 2.99, PR>F = .0202, R-Square = .0630

From table 32, the third equation of the line of best fit, which predicts the value of the work satisfaction variable using the transformational leadership variables of the principal was determined. The equation is $(\text{supervision}) = -5.512(\text{IS}) + 4.223(\text{IM}) + 6.286(\text{IC}) + -1.161(\text{II}) + 30.915$. Intellectual stimulation and idealized influence have a negative effect on overall job satisfaction with supervision. Where

the variables of inspirational motivation and individualized consideration have a positive effect on job satisfaction with supervision.

Table 32

Multiple Regression Procedure for Job Satisfaction Dependent Variable Supervision with Independent Transformational Variables

Independent Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T Value	PR>T
Intercept	30.915	7.21	4.29	<.0001
IS	-5.512	2.316	-2.38	.0184
IM	4.223	2.079	2.03	.0437
IC	6.286	2.155	2.92	.004
II	-1.161	2.636	-.44	.6602

F Value = 4.03, PR>F = .0038, R-Square = .0830

Finally, from table 33, the equation of the line of best fit which predicts the value of the people at work satisfaction variable using the transformational leadership variables of the principal was determined. The equation is (people) = -1.896(IS) + -.536(IM) + 4.755(IC) + 2.038(II) + 30.19. The variable intellectual stimulation has a negative impact on job satisfaction with people and the variables of Inspirational Motivation, Individualized Consideration, and Idealized Influence have a positive effect on overall job satisfaction with people. This equation can be used as a predictor of job satisfaction with people given the known principal's leadership style.

Table 33

Multiple Regression Procedure for Job Satisfaction Dependent Variable People at Work with Independent Transformational Variables

Independent Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T Value	PR>T
Intercept	30.190	6.215	4.86	<.0001
IS	-1.896	1.996	-.95	.3433
IM	-.53554	1.791	-.30	.7653
IC	4.755	1.857	2.56	.0113
II	2.038	2.271	.90	.3708

F Value = 2.37, PR>F = .0543, R-Square = .0506

Transactional Leadership Variables

Likewise a similar method was used to determine the line of best fit for the independent transactional variables. Only one equation was found to be statistically significant from the table. From table 34, the equation of the line of best fit which predicts the value of the work satisfaction variable using the transactional leadership variables of the principal was determined. The equation is (work) = 1.671(CR) + -2.669(MBE) + -.955(LF) + 47.278. The leadership styles Management by Exception and Laissez-Faire had a negative effect on overall job satisfaction with work and Contingent Reward had a positive effect. This equation may be used to predict the overall job satisfaction with work given a principal's leadership style.

Table 34

Multiple Regression Procedure for Job Satisfaction Dependent Variable Work on Present Job with Independent Transactional Variables

Independent Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T Value	PR>T
Intercept	47.278	3.0247	15.63	<.0001
CR	1.671	.893	1.87	.063
MBE	-2.669	.889	-3.00	.0031
LF	-.955	.899	-1.06	.2896

F Value = 5.36, PR>F = .0015, R-Square = .0824

Job Satisfaction Variables

Using the same multiple regression techniques from table 35, the equation of the line of best fit which predicts the value of the inspirational motivation (IM) variable using the job satisfaction variables of the principal was determined. The equation is $(IM) = .019(\text{work}) + -.00079(\text{Pay}) + .0045(\text{Promotion}) + .0045(\text{Supervision}) + -.0014(\text{People}) + 2.169$. In this case, job satisfaction with pay and with people had a negative impact on the overall leadership style of Inspirational Motivation. The second equation of the line of best fit, which predicts the value of the Individualized Consideration (IC) variable using the job satisfaction variables of the principal was determined. The equation is $(IC) = .0068(\text{work}) + -.0041(\text{Pay}) + .0012(\text{Promotion}) + .0062(\text{Supervision}) + .0088(\text{People}) + 2.4348$. In this case only job satisfaction with pay had a negative impact on the individualized consideration. Finally, the equation of the line of best fit, which predicts the value of the Management by Exception (MBE) variable using the job satisfaction variables of the

principal was determined. The equation is $(MBE) = -.0171(\text{work}) + -.0009(\text{Pay}) + -.0005(\text{Promotion}) + .0046(\text{Supervision}) + -.0071(\text{People}) + 2.3105$.

Table 35

Multiple Regression Procedure for Transformational Leadership Dependent Variable Inspirational Motivation and Individualized Consideration

Independent Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T Value	PR>T
Intercept	2.169	.318	6.82	<.0001
Work	.019	.006	3.02	.0029
Pay	-.00079	.00326	-.24	.8101
Promotion	.0045	.0026	1.77	.0793
Supervision	.0045	.0034	1.33	.1865
People	-.0014	.0041	-.34	.7345
F Value = 4.27, PR>F = .0011, R-Square = .1076				
Intercept	2.4348	.3158	7.71	<.0001
Work	.0068	.00619	1.09	.2771
Pay	-.0041	.0032	-1.27	.2060
Promotion	.0012	.0025	.48	.6352
Supervision	.0062	.0034	1.81	.0718
People	.0088	.0041	2.15	.0326
Intercept	2.3105	.3277	7.05	<.0001
Work	-.0171	.0064	-2.66	.0086
Pay	-.0009	.0034	-.26	.7969
Promotion	-.0005	.0026	-.18	.8536
Supervision	.0046	.0035	1.3	.1957
People	-.0071	.0042	-1.67	.0972
F Value = 2.98, PR>F = .0132, R-Square = .0775				

In this case the only job satisfaction variable to have a positive impact on the Management by Exception leadership variable was that with supervision. All the other variables had a negative impact.

Summary

Chapter IV presented the results of the data analyses that were used to describe the sample population and answer each of the research questions. One hundred and eighty three Michigan high school principals responded to this survey. From the sample population of Michigan high school principals indicated that (84.2%) of the 183 respondents were male and the greatest number of principals (58.5%) were between the ages of 46 and 55. Likewise, of the 183 respondents, many (36.6%) indicated their high school as Class A and (27.3%) indicated their high school as Class B. Finally, the majority of responding principals (38.8%) indicated that they had over 15 years of experience and only (6.6%) of the principals had less than two years of experience. Yet, despite the significant number of years of experience among the responding high school principals, many (26.8%) also reported being in their current position less than two years and (9.3%) have been in their position for at least 15 years.

The first research question sought to discover whether or not there was a relationship between a principal's personal and school characteristics and job satisfaction. The question asked:

How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and

size of school relate to the job satisfaction level of Michigan high school principals?

There were three significant relationships between the personal and school characteristics and job satisfaction of Michigan high school principals. First, the relationship between gender and promotion had a Pearson Product Coefficient of $-.172$, which would suggest that males tend to be more satisfied with their promotion ability than females. This trend was consistent for all class size high schools. Second, the relationship between the size of school and promotion showed a Pearson Product Coefficient of $-.155$ which would suggest that principals in Class A schools had a higher satisfaction level in their ability for a promotion than those in smaller schools. Class A high schools have bigger districts and typically have more central office administrators. Finally, there was a significant relationship between years in the position and pay with a correlation of $.182$, which suggested that principals, in general, the longer they are in their position. This trend was also consistent among both genders as well at all size high schools.

Similarly a review of the job satisfaction subscale showed the mean satisfaction score in opportunities for promotion of Michigan male high school principals was significantly greater than Michigan female high school principals. The difference in means was 7.745 . No other job satisfaction subscale showed any gender difference except this category of satisfaction in job promotion. In terms of overall job satisfaction, the only statistically significant difference among high school principals in are those based upon school size. Principals from Class A and B high

schools as a group had higher job satisfaction scores than those principals in Class C, D schools.

Since there was very little variance among the personal and school characteristics, ANOVA was used with a combination of the personal and school characteristics with the assumption that these independent variables may interact with each other to create greater variance. There were three interactions that had a statistical significance and showed significant variation among the mean satisfaction scores. The first interaction includes school size with gender. The second interaction was school size with years of experience and gender. The third interaction was years in position with gender. An argument was made from this analysis that the size of school plays a role in overall job satisfaction of principals with those serving in Class A and B schools scoring higher than those in Class C and D. The mean satisfaction score also increased when you factored in years of experience with the more years a person had in the principalship the higher his/her job satisfaction. Likewise, when these variables interacted with gender the mean job satisfaction was even greater with males showing a slight increase. In terms of pay, statistical analysis was completed with comparisons made between every size school to determine differences in mean satisfaction with pay and no difference was statistically significant except the mean satisfaction in present pay among principals in class B high schools was significantly greater than principals in class D high schools. Finally, the mean job satisfaction with people at work showed that Michigan high school principals in the age bracket between 56 to 65 had greater satisfaction with the people they worked with than those

principals between the ages of 26 to 35. No other difference in satisfaction between the age groups was statistically significant.

The second question sought to discover whether or not there was a relationship between a principal's personal and school characteristics and leadership style. The question asked:

How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the leadership style of Michigan secondary school principals?

From the statistical analysis, there were 9 significant relationships between the personal and school characteristics and leadership styles although none of these had a very strong linear relationship. The size of school had 5 of these significant relationships which would suggest a slight linear relationship as the principals in larger high schools scored higher in leadership styles than those in smaller high schools. Likewise, the leadership style subscale called "Individualized Consideration" had 4 significant relationships with the variables of age, size of school, years of experience and years in position. This relationship suggested, although relatively small, that as a high school principal gets older he/she tended to score higher on the skill of individual consideration which was empathy of the needs of the followers.

In terms of the leadership style subscales, the average contingent reward of principals in class A high schools was significantly greater than principals in class C high schools. The difference in means was .297. Likewise using the same statistical analysis the mean management by exception leadership score of Michigan male high school principals was significantly greater than Michigan female high school

principals. The size of school was the only statistically significant variable to show variance in intellectual stimulation with class A principals showing greater leadership in this subscale than Class B, C, or D principals. The mean intellectual stimulation leadership score showed that principals in Class A Michigan high schools scored higher than those in Class B, C or D high schools. The difference in means ranged from a low of .2855 to a high of .4650. Similarly, a school size comparison was made between every size school and the mean inspirational motivation of principals in class A high schools was significantly greater than principals in class D high schools. The difference in means was .3891. Using the same statistical analysis, the years of experience of the principal was the only statistically significant variable to show variance with individualized consideration as Michigan high school principals with more experience showing greater leadership in this subscale. The mean individualized consideration leadership score of principals in class A high schools was significantly greater than principals in class C high schools. Finally using the same analysis, the size of school in which the principal worked was the only statistically significant variable to show variance in idealized influence with class A principals showing greater leadership in this subscale than Class B, C, or D principals.

Finally, class A high school principals scored the highest in transformational leadership and the scores were significantly different than those principals in class B, C, and D high schools. An argument can be made from this analysis that the size of school plays a role in overall leadership style of principals. It should also be noted that transformational leadership increased the variance when factored with years of

experience as the more years a person had in the principalship the higher his/her transformational leadership.

The third sought to explore the various leadership styles among high school principals in Michigan and their prevalence and relation to job satisfaction. The question asked:

How do the leadership style of secondary school principals currently employed in Michigan associate with the job satisfaction of principals?

A canonical correlational procedure was used to test for the relationship among the principal's leadership style and job satisfaction. Two sets of canonical relationships were statistically significant. The first relationship was Michigan high school principals who scored high on inspirational motivation and idealized consideration and low on management by exception tended to value work on present job and opportunities for promotion more than other principals who didn't score similarly in those leadership characteristics. Both inspirational motivation and idealized consideration are transformational leadership characteristics and the management by exception is a transactional characteristic. The second statistically significant relationship is Michigan high school principals who scored low in contingent reward and intellectual stimulation but scored higher on management by exception valued the work on present job less but had more job satisfaction with supervision and the people they worked with. Finally, related to canonical correlations is multiple regression, which is a statistical method to determine the line of best fit from several independent variables and one dependent variable. Multiple regression analysis was used because there were several independent variables

contributing to the variation of the dependent variable and one cannot control all of them. The following equations were statistically significant in predicting the independent variable.

- $(\text{work}) = .837(\text{IS}) + 2.686(\text{IM}) + -.13(\text{IC}) + .547(\text{II}) + 35.492.$
- $(\text{promotion}) = -5.186(\text{IS}) + 7.867(\text{IM}) + 2.423(\text{IC}) + 1.389(\text{II}) + 10.95.$
- $(\text{supervision}) = -5.512(\text{IS}) + 4.223(\text{IM}) + 6.286(\text{IC}) + -1.161(\text{II}) + 30.915.$
- $(\text{people}) = -1.896(\text{IS}) + -.536(\text{IM}) + 4.755(\text{IC}) + 2.038(\text{II}) + 30.19.$
- $(\text{work}) = 1.671(\text{CR}) + -2.669(\text{MBE}) + -.955(\text{LF}) + 47.278.$
- $(\text{IM}) = .019(\text{work}) + -.00079(\text{Pay}) + .0045(\text{Promotion}) + .0045(\text{Supervision}) + -.0014(\text{People}) + 2.169.$
- $(\text{IC}) = .0068(\text{work}) + -.0041(\text{Pay}) + .0012(\text{Promotion}) + .0062(\text{Supervision}) + .0088(\text{People}) + 2.4348.$
- $(\text{MBE}) = -.0171(\text{work}) + -.0009(\text{Pay}) + -.0005(\text{Promotion}) + .0046(\text{Supervision}) + -.0071(\text{People}) + 2.3105.$

Chapter V will take these findings from chapter IV and summarize them. It will also present conclusions to this research and offer recommendations for future study.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

In Chapter V, the purpose of the study, study design, findings, conclusions and recommendations of this research are presented. The purpose of the study was to investigate the job satisfaction of current high school principals in Michigan and examining the relationship to the high school principal's leadership style. This study was also intended to contribute to the body of research around the implications of the principal's job satisfaction and the impact in the recruitment and retention with current principals. More specifically, this study sought to answer the following three questions. The first question was to discover whether or not there was a relationship between a principal's personal and school characteristics and job satisfaction. The question asked: How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the job satisfaction level of Michigan high school principals? The second question was to discover whether or not there was a relationship between a principal's personal and school characteristics and leadership style. The question asked: How do a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the leadership style of Michigan high school principals? Finally, the

principals in Michigan and their prevalence and relation to job satisfaction. In other words, it was an attempt to determine if principals' job satisfaction varies with specific leadership styles. How, then, does the leadership style of high school principals currently employed in Michigan associate with the job satisfaction of principals in general? Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of the three research questions, and recommendations for further research.

Purpose of the Study

This study was drawn from the past research relating to the role of the building principal as leader. Earlier studies on the principalship have generated great insight into the principal's behavior and the positive effects on teacher morale and student achievement (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; and Edmonds, 1982) and those principals were considered to be leaders with the role and perspectives they brought to the school were fundamental relative to the direction of their teacher's behavior. Even though researchers took different approaches to addressing the issues related to leadership and job satisfaction, many researchers (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Muchinsky, 1993) in the field tended to support the idea that leadership behavior could be explained in two categories-task orientation and concern for people. Principals were expected to be able to successfully address both dimensions.

This study was embarked upon as a result of the appearance of a void of research in the area of secondary school principal's leadership style and job satisfaction. The literature revealed several studies (Collmer, 1989; Mahrer, 1985;

Windell, 1991; Wilcox, 1992) pertaining to principal's leadership style at the elementary level as well as the leadership style of managers in business and industry but very little at the high school level. Much of the research was on the leadership style of the leader and relationship to the job satisfaction of the teachers. Very few studies, examined the job satisfaction of the principal as it related to their own job satisfaction. Because of the growing evidence of a principal shortage in the United States, a better understanding of the principal's job satisfaction as it relates to his/her own leadership style warranted further study for many reasons.

First, the reason for such research on the topic of job satisfaction and leadership styles of high school principals was to provide useful information for designing strategies and training programs geared to improve the job satisfaction of principals. Second, the research could reveal some possibilities for increasing principals' satisfaction levels as a result of knowing which leadership style appeared to be most effective or satisfying. Such information could also assist principals when making decisions about various organizational activities. Third, results of this study could provide a vehicle for educators seeking ways to discover the optimal tools for school management by critically examining different leadership styles. Finally, results of this study also provided additional information that could be useful in the selection and placement of principals in appropriate positions based upon their perceptions of job satisfaction or leadership styles. Since there was some research concerning school principals self perception of leadership (Blasé, 1987; Coladorci,

1992; Kirby, 1992; and Short & Spincer, 1990), this study provided insight and valuable information in regard to the role of the principal.

Study Design

From the review of the literature, a basic assumption was made about leadership style and job satisfaction. This study incorporated a non-experimental, descriptive and inferential research design. The independent variable was not manipulated and the subjects did not receive a treatment. Three survey instruments were used in this study: The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) to measure job satisfaction, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to measure leadership style, and a demographic survey to measure personal and school characteristics.

Many researchers in the field of organizational behavior (Peters, 1992; Peters & Austin, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Tichy & DeVanna, 1986) have suggested that leadership was about making things happen. They attended to agree that in order for this to occur, leaders must empower and motivate people to work collectively together to achieve common goals and aspirations. Job satisfaction also played a factor in the performance of followers.

In accordance with the research design, 403 principals in the state of Michigan were given the surveys with 183 returning them for data analysis. This provided adequate power in the statistical analysis and also ensured that the sample was representative. Both of the instruments performed well in capturing the two concepts of job satisfaction and leadership style. Both instruments were selected as being

reliable and the results of this research support this claim. This researcher is confident that the results of the study are valid. However, if this study were to be replicated in the future, the researcher would suggest either a different type of instrument to collect job satisfaction or leadership style or both be used.

Findings

Research Question 1:

How does a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the job satisfaction level of Michigan high school principals?

The degree of satisfaction that people derive from their work is an important consideration and is one measure of the quality of life in an organization. Lawler and Procter (1972) concluded that job satisfaction of employees influences absenteeism and retention. If the job satisfaction was determined to be low then a principal tended to be less productive and report being less loyal to their companies, more stressed and less secure in their work (Traut, Larsen, & Feimer, 2000). There were three significant relationships between the personal and school characteristics and job satisfaction of Michigan high school principals. These relationships are reported categorically by using the personal and school characteristics.

Gender

From this study, the job satisfaction with the ability for promotion varied among males and females. More specifically, the relationship between gender and job satisfaction with promotion suggested that males tended to be more satisfied with their promotion ability than females although this is not a real strong relationship. A review of the job satisfaction subscale showed the mean satisfaction score in opportunities for promotion of Michigan male high school principals was significantly greater than Michigan female high school principals. The difference in mean scores was 7.745. No other job satisfaction subscale showed any gender difference except this category of satisfaction in job promotion. Also, the overall average job satisfaction of male principals in class B high schools was significantly greater than principals in class C high schools. Finally, the average job satisfaction of male principals in class B high schools is significantly greater than responding female principals in class B high schools.

Other comparisons were made between genders with every size school and were not statistically significant. The impact of gender on job satisfaction has been inconsistent, with some studies finding that females have lower job satisfaction than males (Britton, 1997), others finding that males have lower job satisfaction than females (Martin, 1980), and many others suggesting no difference among males and females (Firebaugh & Harley, 1995; Grossi & Berg, 1991; Melamed, et al., 1995). As cited in the literature, the lack of opportunities for advancement is one reason teachers were not satisfied (Dillon, 1978; Harris, 1985; Knight, 1978). Teachers wanted their

jobs to provide opportunities for personal and professional growth and utilize their best potential and skills. Comparatively, Lortie (1975) reported that men perceive teaching as a way to move into administration. For others, teaching did not provide enough opportunity for advancement, and the lack of prestige has caused many to be dissatisfied with their job (Harris, 1985; Mirabile, 1983).

There are several implications as to why male high school principals tended to have higher satisfaction in the ability for job advancement than female high school principals. First, many of the females who responded to the survey were also from smaller schools and, in general, those principals in smaller schools reported less job satisfaction in the ability for promotion. This would make sense since larger schools have more administrators at the central office level so more positions usually provides more opportunities for advancement. Second, the number of female principals responding to the survey is significantly smaller than the males reporting and it is quite possible that those female principals responding are not indicative of the total female population. And finally, it is quite possible that females believe that a glass ceiling exists for females to move up within an organization and a self-fulfilling prophecy occurs.

School Size

The relationship between the size of school and job satisfaction with promotion suggested that principals in Class A schools had a higher satisfaction level in their ability for a promotion than those in smaller schools although this was not a

real strong relationship. Class A high schools have bigger districts and typically have more central office administrators. In terms of overall job satisfaction, the only statistically significant difference among high school principals in are those based upon school size. Principals from Class A and B high schools as a group had higher job satisfaction scores than those principals in Class C, D schools. From the literature, Haezebrouck (1989) analyzed the effects of school size and the leadership styles of principals on teacher job satisfaction. Using a teacher satisfaction surveyed developed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Haezebrouck surveyed a random sample of Michigan high school principals and discovered that the satisfaction level of teachers did vary according to the size of the district as it related to the overall satisfaction with the community and parents, but not with other satisfaction levels. Likewise, Mitchell (1989) examined the relationships among teacher job satisfaction, and rapport with the principal based upon school enrollment size. Mitchell concluded that the teacher job satisfaction was the highest in the largest schools and that the principal who demonstrated a leadership style that was sensitive to the needs of the followers and scored the highest.

Similarly, the relationship between pay and job satisfaction with work tends to have a positive relationship (Roth, 1989; Niehouse, 1986; Mendel, 1987). As a result it is difficult to determine the extent to which wages produced higher levels of job satisfaction or if the job satisfaction in higher paying jobs reflected the variety and autonomy that were typical of those job. Lawyer and Porter (1966) reported that the wage level was directly related to job satisfaction among 2,000 managers, even when

the managerial level was held constant. Yet, a study conducted by Bowler (1979) showed that performance bonuses failed to improve job satisfaction. In this study, further statistical analysis and comparisons were made between every size school and job satisfaction with the mean job satisfaction in pay among principals in class B high schools was significantly greater than principals in class D high schools. This may be an economic issue with the potential amount of revenue generated at smaller schools and their ability to pay principals more money with fewer students in the building.

There are several implications as to why principals in larger high schools have higher satisfaction with pay than those principals in smaller schools. First, larger districts, which typically have larger high schools have a higher per pupil foundation grant than those district with smaller schools. This provides the district the financial resources to pay more for these positions. Likewise, since larger high schools are typically in urban and suburban settings the cost of living of those districts is usually higher which necessitates the district paying more to fill those positions. And finally, some would argue that the demands of operating a larger building are more difficult because of the increased supervisory responsibilities and sheer number of students your working with which school districts needed to increase the pay for these positions to attract quality candidates.

Years in Position

This study suggested that there was a significant relationship between years in the position and satisfaction with pay which made sense since people tend to make

more money the longer they are in a position. Many positions within a school district offer salary increases by steps. This trend was also consistent among both genders as well at all size high schools. Finally, the mean job satisfaction with people at work score showed that Michigan high school principals in the age bracket between 56 to 65 had greater satisfaction with the people they worked with than those principals between the ages of 26 to 35. No other difference in satisfaction between the age groups was statistically significant in regard to their job satisfaction with the people they work.

From the literature review, tenure, the length a person is in a position, had mixed results as some studies suggested a positive relationship (Grossi & Bergman, 1991; Zefane, 1994); others have found either no relationship (Curry et al., 1986; Mueller et al., 1994, or a negative relationship (Buzawa, 1994). The most ignored employees are often those who have been in the organization longer because attention may be more focused on new workers because of the costs of recruitment and selection, and the immediate challenge of training these people to be successful workers. In addition, some longer-term workers were often viewed as hindrances to organizational change. Sometimes workers stayed in their jobs not because of continued commitment to the organization but because they have no job security and it is hard to find another job. Ting (1997) attributed the job satisfaction of long-term employees to the lack of alternatives for older workers, the greater costs to older workers of leaving the organization, and the likelihood that older workers possessed more traditional values of work. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (cited in

Steers & Porter, 1991) proposed a significant relationship to age and job satisfaction. The indication was that job satisfaction was high for an employee immediately after employment, dropping sharply after a few years and then rising as workers gain job security.

There are several implications as to why principals who have been in their positions longer are more satisfied with their pay and also more satisfied with the people they work with. First, they would typically make more money than those principals who are new to their position. Second, the longer a principal is in a position the longer he/she had time to get to know the people that work at the building. Relationships develop over the years and the principal develops a sense of loyalty to that building and the people he/she works with. Finally, as the principal approaches retirement age, the principal is typically not looking to move to another position or switch jobs, whereas someone younger in the position may have a higher priority in completing tasks, making a name for themselves which would help that person move to another position at a larger school as part of his/her career advancement.

Pay

In terms of pay, statistical analysis was completed with comparisons made between every size school to determine differences in mean satisfaction with pay and no difference was statistically significant except the mean satisfaction in present pay among principals in class B high schools was significantly greater than principals in class D high schools. Second, the relationship between job satisfaction with pay and

job satisfaction with work suggested that those principals who were paid more also scored higher in satisfaction with their work. Third, the relationship between job satisfaction with pay and job satisfaction with supervision suggested that principals who were more satisfied with their pay were also more satisfied with their supervisor. Finally, there was a significant relationship between a principal's job satisfaction with the people they worked with and job satisfaction with the ability for a promotion. Although, all of these relationships in regard to job satisfaction were not real strong.

Variable Interactions

Since there was very little variance among the personal and school characteristics, a combination of the personal and school characteristics were analyzed with the assumption that these independent variables may interact with each other to create greater variance. There were three interactions that had a statistical significance and showed variation among the mean satisfaction scores. The first interaction included school size with gender. The second interaction was school size with years of experience and gender. The third interaction was the number of years in the position with gender. An argument was made from this analysis that the size of school plays a role in overall job satisfaction of principals with those serving in Class A and B schools scoring higher than those in Class C and D. The mean satisfaction score also increased when you factored in years of experience with the more years a person had in the principalship the higher his/her job satisfaction. Likewise, when

these variables interacted with gender the mean job satisfaction was even greater with males showing a slight increase.

Implications

The results of this study would suggest that in terms of overall job satisfaction among Michigan High School principals there were two trends that need further analysis. First, the only gender difference among Michigan high school principals in terms of job satisfaction is the job satisfaction with promotion where males tended to be more satisfied with their ability for promotion. Likewise, in terms of average job satisfaction principals in class A high schools were the most satisfied and this satisfaction decreased to its lowest level among class D schools. It appears that larger high schools offer more for a principal in regard to several of the job satisfaction variables that were measured with this instrument. This includes satisfaction with the people they work with, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with the ability for advancement, and satisfaction with the supervisory. Given that larger high schools seem to offer more of the job satisfaction factors to principals it would seem that there would be a greater number of school principal openings in smaller high schools. Further analysis would need to be completed to examine this suspected trend.

Research Question 2:

How does a principal's personal and school characteristics as measured by the variables of gender, age, years of experience, years in current position, and size of school relate to the leadership style of Michigan secondary school principals?

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire used in this study had 7 leadership subscales (3 that were transactional and 4 that were transformational) to fully describe the leader's style. The initial study examined the correlations of the principals personal and school characteristics with each of the 7 leadership style subscales. From these correlations there were there were 9 significant relationships although none of these had a very strong linear relationship. Out of the 9 correlations, the size of school had 5 of these significant relationships which would suggest a slight linear relationship as the principals in larger high schools scored higher in the transformational subscales than those principals in smaller high schools. Likewise, the leadership style subscale called "Individualized Consideration" had 4 significant relationships with the personal and school variables of age, size of school, years of experience and years in position. This relationship suggested although relatively small that as a high school principal gets older he/she tended to score higher on the skill of individual consideration, which is empathy of the needs of the followers.

The greatest challenge organizations are faced with is the selection of competent and effective leaders. Over the decades much has been written about the search for the core components in leadership. However, despite all of this study and attention, the true essence of leadership still appears to remain only partially discovered. Because leadership can mean different things to different people, it carries extraneous connotations that create ambiguity of meaning (Janda, 1960).

The process of selecting high school principals is often tedious and involves a close inspection of a variety of factors in determining a good fit with the potential candidate and the school. When attempting to determine if a prospective candidate would be willing to accept the challenges of the position, information on their leadership style may prove useful. There may be good reasons to inspect experiences of the candidate as a means of matching the best candidate with a particular school. The results indicated that a subtle balance exists between those principals who exhibit transformational leadership styles and those who exhibit transactional leadership styles. Because the principal exhibits leadership within a school organization, the topic of leadership, in general, has been a continuing interest to researchers for many years. From the leadership framework, the leadership role of the school principal was crucial to the school's success (Duttweiler, 1986). The behaviors of leaders in their interaction with members of the organization varied widely (Bass, 1981). Finally, Hartzell & Winger (1989) recognized that principals needed to adjust their leadership styles to the situational demands of the school. Given the research, the leadership styles were analyzed using the leadership sub-scales.

Contingent Reward

This study determined that among the Michigan high school principals responding to the survey the average leadership style subscale Contingent Reward score of principals in class A high schools was significantly greater than principals in class C high schools. In Contingent Reward, the leader clarifies what is expected

from followers and what they will receive if they meet expected levels of performance. Comparisons of the mean Contingent Reward scores were made between every size school and were found not statistically significant except for the one mentioned. One reason to explain the discrepancy is that principals from larger schools may have to rely on more formal policies and procedures to complete the tasks required of the building operation although no explanation why this discrepancy did not appear between class A high schools and class D high schools except that the sample population of class D principals was relatively small compared to those from class A high schools.

Management by Exception

The variance of leadership styles among the Michigan high school principals in this study determined that male high school principals scored higher than female high school principals in average leadership style subscale Management by Exception. In Management by Exception, the leader focuses on monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain current performance levels. This leadership style is typically viewed as a negative trait. This would suggest that female principals tend to be more willing to confront a problem or issue and deal with it rather than ignore it. Typically, females scored higher in the ability to develop relationships and network but males tended to place a higher priority on the task completion.

Intellectual Stimulation

This study determined that principals in class A high schools had a higher mean score in Intellectual Stimulation than those principals in class B, C, or D high schools. In Intellectual Stimulation, the leader gets the followers to question the tried and true ways of solving problems; encourages them to question the methods they use to improve upon them. Comparisons were made between every school size and only those three mentioned were statistically significant. The implications of this result would suggest that principals in class A high schools spend greater time and appear to be more skilled in developing the intellectual growth of teachers. This may be a result of the formal training provided by universities and the emphasis on academics and learning and the willingness to explore contemporary issues with the monetary ability to carry out such initiatives. Also, given the size of the school, the principal may have more freedom to explore different operating procedures than those principals from a small school where the status quo may be encouraged.

Inspirational Motivation

This study determined that the mean Inspirational Motivation of Michigan high school principals in class A high schools are significantly greater than principals in class D high schools. In Inspirational Motivation, the leader gets the followers to complete a goal. Comparisons were made between every school size and this one was the only statistically significant one. Likewise, principals between the ages of 46 to 55 had a greater mean Inspirational Motivation score than those between the ages of

36 to 45. Comparisons were made between every age category for differences in mean Inspirational Motivation and this was the only significant one. There are several implications as to why principals from class A high schools scored higher than those from class B, C, and D high schools in Inspirational Motivation. First, because class A high schools pay more it would seem logic that the quality of the candidates for the principalship would be greater. Likewise, as a person ages they tend to learn many life skills and other valuable leadership knowledge that would enhance a principals leadership style.

Individualized Consideration

In Individualized Consideration, the leader focuses on understanding the needs of the followers and works continuously to get them to develop their full potential. This study determined that the mean Individualized Consideration scores of Michigan high school principals in class A high schools is significantly greater than principals in class C high schools. Comparisons were made between every school size and this was the only one that was significantly different. Similarly, principals between the ages of 46 to 55 as well as between the ages of 56 to 65 had a greater mean Individualized Consideration score than those between the ages of 36 to 45. Comparisons were made between every age category for differences in mean Individualized Consideration and these were the only significant ones. From this analysis, it can be generalized that as high school principals age, they tended to

develop or demonstrate to a greater degree individualized consideration of the followers.

Idealized Influence

In Idealized Influence, the leader provides followers with a clear sense of purpose that is energizing; a role model for ethical conduct, which builds identification with the leader and his/her, articulated vision. This study determined that the mean Idealized Influence of Michigan high school principals in class A high schools was significantly greater than principals in class B, C, or D high schools. Principals from class D high schools scored the lowest in mean Idealized Influence. Comparisons were made between every school size and this was the only one that was significantly different.

Transformational Leadership Style

Transformational leadership style consisted of the four subscales of Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Individualized Consideration, and Intellectual Stimulation. Further statistical analysis using did show variation among principals depending on the size of school and that only .02% of the variation in transformational leadership was due to random probability. The finding then was that principals in larger high schools scored higher in the transformational leadership style with principals in Class D high schools scoring the lowest in transformational leadership. Very little statistical significance could be concluded by examining the

relationship of the individual personal and school characteristics with the transformational leadership style except for school size mentioned above with principals in class A high schools scoring higher in the transformational leadership style followed by class B, C and finally class D principals scoring the lowest in transformational leadership. Transformational leadership also increased the variance when you factored in years of experience as the more years a person had in the principalship the higher his/her transformational leadership.

Another noted conclusion is that there was no gender difference in transformational leadership style, which would seem to contradict the studies by Bass, Avolio, & Atwater (1996) which suggested that females scored higher in transformational leadership.

Transactional Leadership Style

Transactional leadership style consisted of the three subscales of Management by Exception, Contingent Reward and Laizze-Faire. Variation among principals did occur depending on the size of school and that only 4% of the variation in transactional leadership was due to random probability. The conclusion then was that principals in larger high schools scored lower in the transactional leadership style with principals in Class D high schools scoring the highest in transformational leadership. By examining the relationship of the individual personal and school characteristics with the transactional leadership style scores, principals in class A high

schools scored lower in the transactional leadership style followed by class B, C and finally class D principals scoring the highest in transactional leadership.

The results of this study suggested that in terms of overall leadership style among Michigan high school principals there are three trends. First, the only gender difference among Michigan high school principals in terms of leadership style is in the subscale Management by Exception in which male principals tended to score high than female principals. Second, in terms of the age of the principal, there was a difference in two subscales of Inspirational Motivation and Individualized Consideration with the trend that as the principals get older they tend to score higher in this leadership style subscales. Finally, school size made a difference in mean leadership style subscale scores in Contingent Reward, Intellectual Stimulation, Idealized Influence, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward and transformational leadership, with principals in class A high schools scoring the highest and those principals in class D high schools scoring the lowest.

Implications

Regardless of the theoretical framework used for the context on leadership, we know that the principal must provide leadership (National Commission, 1983, p. 32). Tirrill & Jones (1985) stated that leadership style must encompass a set of behaviors that will result in the desired attitudes and behaviors of other members within the school, particularly teachers. It would be easily to conclude that there is no “perfect” leadership style; instead, different situations require different leader behaviors. Yet,

failure to continuously re-examine the various leadership styles and their relationship to the many variable within the organization would result in apathy. Organizations, including schools, cannot be idle in this pursuit of knowledge as it relates to the leadership styles of principals. Hersey and Blanchard (1965) suggested that knowledge about leadership style will continue to be of great concern for several reasons, “(1) it can help improve the effective use of human resources, (2) it can help prevent resistance to change, (3) it can help reduce employee disputes, and (4) it can lead to a more productive organization” (p. 261). Because leadership style of leaders has an impact on the organization, leadership styles must be examined for a better understanding if that organization is going to improve. There is no more important reason to study this than to recognize the leadership provided by the principal within a school setting and its potential impact upon learning.

Research Question 3:

How, then, does the leadership style of secondary school principals currently employed in Michigan associate with the job satisfaction of principals?

From this study, the relationship between the leadership style of Michigan high school principals and their job satisfaction was examined using canonical correlations. Similarly, multiple regression analysis was used to determine predictors for job satisfaction or the leadership style variables. Multiple regression is a statistical method to determine the line of best fit from several independent variables and one dependent variable. Multiple regression analysis was used because there were

several independent variables contributing to the variation of the dependent variable and one cannot control all of them. This analysis was used to make more accurate predictions for the dependent variable. The conclusions are reported by leadership styles and job satisfaction variables.

Job Satisfaction with Work

From this study, the canonical correlations suggested that a principal's job satisfaction with work increased when the principal's leadership style scored high in Inspirational Motivation(IM), Individualized Consideration (IC), Idealized Influence(IC), and Intellectual Stimulation (IS) (which are the transformational leadership styles) and low in Management by Exception (MBE) and Laizze-Faire (LF) (which are primarily the transactional leadership styles). It appears that principals who score high in the transformational leadership styles had a high degree of satisfaction with their work. A similar conclusion was made in earlier studies by Halpin and Winer (1957). Their research identified leadership that was "indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth" (p.42) as having higher levels of job satisfaction. This study on Michigan high school principals leadership styles had similar conclusions as the overall satisfaction a principal had with work was significantly related to the transformational leadership styles exhibited by the principal. Those principals who scored higher in the transformational leadership styles scored higher in overall job satisfaction.

Although, this study didn't ask this question it is likely that those principals who scored higher in the transformational leadership styles may also impact the job satisfaction of the teachers they work with. From the literature review, Burns (1990) researched teacher job satisfaction and leadership styles of principals in randomly selected high schools. The findings indicated that the leadership style of the principal influenced teacher job satisfaction in the areas of rapport with the principal, curriculum issues, rapport with the teachers, community support, and facilities. Burns concluded that a leadership style that had a strong emphasis on the follower and was participative in nature and highly transformational had a higher level of reported job satisfaction among teachers. The lowest level of job satisfaction among teachers resulted from a leadership style that was perceived as authoritative and transactional.

Likewise, Craig (1979) examined the relationship of leadership style of principals and teacher job satisfaction and concluded that the leadership style of the principal that was high in relations or transformational had a higher teacher job satisfaction level in the areas of achievement, responsibility, and supervision.

Similar research by Collmer (1989) examined the relationship between a teacher's job satisfaction and the leadership style of principals and determined that teachers had higher job satisfaction when principals were warm, caring, and sensitive to their needs and ideas. All of these traits are evident in the transformational leadership style. Further analysis using multiple regression, the equation of the line of best fit which predicts the value of the work satisfaction variable using the transformational leadership variables of the principal was determined. The equation is (work) =

.837(IS) + 2.686(IM) + -.13(IC) + .547(II) + 35.492. The largest influence on the satisfaction with work is the score in the Inspirational Motivation subscale. This is weighted positively along with Intellectual Stimulation and Idealized Influence. It appears that when a principal uses his/her abilities to encourage, inspire, and motivate people either through speeches or their example to others they tend to have the higher job satisfaction with their job. Likewise, the equation of the line of best fit, which predicts the value of the work satisfaction variable using the transactional leadership variables of the principal was determined. The equation is (work) = 1.671(CR) + - 2.669(MBE) + -.955(LF) + 47.278. In this case, Management by Exception is weighted negatively to have an impact with the principal's work. When a principal scores high in this leadership style they tend to not have as much satisfaction. This equation was the only one that was statistically significant in regard to the transactional variables. This may be an important consideration when interviewing candidates for a principal's position. A leadership style survey could be given and then be used to predict a person's potential overall job satisfaction, which has a correlation with retention of principal's in their current position. Given the shortage of available candidates it would be good information for a district to have and consider when hiring a person for the position. A person who is satisfied in his/her job is likely to be more content with the position and less likely to seek employment elsewhere. This may provide some stability in the position and reduce turnover.

Job Satisfaction with Promotion

From this study, the canonical correlations suggest that a principal's job satisfaction with promotion increased when the leadership style subscales of Contingent Reward, Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation, and Laizze-Faire and decreased with the leadership styles of Management by Exception and Individualized Consideration. Although, it should be noted that these correlations were relatively small. It appears that both the transformational and transactional variables have both a positive and negative effect on the job satisfaction of promotion. Using multiple regression, the equation is $(\text{promotion}) = -5.186(\text{IS}) + 7.867(\text{IM}) + 2.423(\text{IC}) + 1.389(\text{II}) + 10.95$. From the equation, the Intellectual Stimulation leadership style has a negative influence on the overall satisfaction in promotion and the Inspirational Motivation leadership style has a positive impact on job satisfaction with promotion. Many roles and responsibilities associated with a central office position require a person to be charismatic, out-going, and the work sometimes deals extensively with the public. Given the context of these job duties perhaps a principal who views themselves high in the area of Inspirational Motivation would then believe that his/her chances to fill available positions would be significantly enhanced.

Job Satisfaction with Supervision

From this study, the canonical correlations suggest that a principal's job satisfaction with supervision increased with the leadership style subscales Contingent

Reward, Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation, and Individualized Consideration and decreased with the leadership styles of Management by Exception and Laizze-Faire. Although, it should be noted that these correlations were relatively small. Again, those principals who scored higher in the transformational leadership styles had a higher satisfaction level with heir supervisor than those who exhibited higher score in the transactional leadership styles. Using multiple regression, the equation of the line of best fit which predicts the value of the job satisfaction with supervision variable using the transformational leadership styles of the principal was determined. The equation is $(\text{supervision}) = -5.512(\text{IS}) + 4.223(\text{IM}) + 6.286(\text{IC}) + -1.161(\text{II}) + 30.915$. Intellectual Stimulation and Idealized Influence have a negative effect on overall job satisfaction in supervision. Whereas, the leadership styles of Inspirational Motivation and Individualized Consideration had a positive effect on job satisfaction with supervision.

Inspirational Motivation

From this study, the canonical correlations suggested that the leadership style subscale of Inspirational Motivation had a positive correlation with all job satisfaction subscales except Supervision. The correlation with pay was the largest. It appears that Michigan high school principals who score high in the leadership style Inspirational Motivation are the most satisfied with their pay. This is likely as a result of those principals serving in larger districts which predominately pay more salary. Using multiple regression, the equation of the line of best fit which predicts the value of the

Inspirational Motivation (IM) variable using the job satisfaction variables of the principal was determined. The equation is $(IM) = .019(\text{work}) + -.00079(\text{Pay}) + .0045(\text{Promotion}) + .0045(\text{Supervision}) + -.0014(\text{People}) + 2.169$. In other words, a district could survey existing principals in their job satisfaction and use this equation as a predictor for that principal's score for Inspirational Motivation.

Individualized Consideration

Similarly, the canonical correlations suggested that the leadership style subscale of Individualized Consideration had a positive correlation with all job satisfaction subscales except with people. Although, this doesn't make sense since Individualized Consideration is having empathy with people and taking care of the individual person's needs. Likewise, the relationship between Individualized Consideration and job satisfaction with pay was also positive. So those principals who scored high in the leadership style of Individualized Consideration also were paid well or were at least more satisfied with their pay than those who scored lower. This conclusion follows closely with those principals who scored high in the other transformational leadership styles as well. The study suggested that principals who scored high in the transformational leadership styles also were in larger school districts. And those principals in larger districts were typically paid more. Using multiple regression, the equation of the line of best fit which predicts the value of the Individualized Consideration (IC) variable using the job satisfaction variables of the

principal was determined. The equation is $(IC) = .0068(\text{work}) + -.0041(\text{Pay}) + .0012(\text{Promotion}) + .0062(\text{Supervision}) + .0088(\text{People}) + 2.4348$.

Management by Exception

Finally, the canonical correlations suggested that the leadership style subscale of Management by Exception had a positive correlation with only the job satisfaction subscale of pay and a negative correlation with all other job satisfaction subscales. Using multiple regression, the equation of the line of best fit which predicts the value of the management by exception (MBE) variable using the job satisfaction variables of the principal was determined. The equation is $(MBE) = -.0171(\text{work}) + -.0009(\text{Pay}) + -.0005(\text{Promotion}) + .0046(\text{Supervision}) + -.0071(\text{People}) + 2.3105$.

Implications

Much of the available literature on job satisfaction and leadership style within a school context primarily focused on the job satisfaction of teachers as it related to the leadership style of the principal. For example, a study involving 846 teachers and principals of 89 schools demonstrated that teachers' job satisfaction was significantly higher when principals were described by the teachers as more transformational using the multifactor leadership questionnaire (Koh, 1990). Although this study did not ask the question of job satisfaction of the teachers, this study did support the idea that the principal's themselves had higher job satisfaction.

Likewise, Niehoff, Eng, and Grover (1990) surveyed 862 employees using the multifactor leadership questionnaire and concluded that transformational leadership correlated with job satisfaction. From the literature review, John Goodlad (1984), in his book, *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*, remarked about the studies between teacher job satisfaction and principal leadership. He noted:

More common are studies showing the supportive conditions such as sensitive leadership by the principal, availability of help, and involvement in school-wide decisions, tend to be associated with greater enthusiasm, professionalism and career fulfillment on the part of teachers. (p. 216).

Given the complexities of the role of the school principal and the importance of this position to the overall success of the school, information about the job satisfaction of the principal should provide for the factors that enable principals to use their leadership styles to reach the plateau from which the supervision for improvement of instruction can proceed in a work atmosphere that is more personally satisfying. It is clear from this study that several leadership styles impact the job satisfaction of the principal in a variety of ways that are both positive and negative. A better understanding of these leadership styles or the job satisfaction of the principals will allow for a better understanding of this complexity.

Recommendations

Two types of recommendations are presented and discussed in this section. First, action recommendations which the researcher found to be relevant to the study

and applicable to a variety of settings and second, future recommendations, which the researcher believes will expand and enhance this study are presented.

Action Recommendations

The action recommendations from this study are:

1. School districts should develop hiring processes for the selection of their administrators where they determine if the applicants are high in transformational leadership.
2. School districts should carefully consider not hiring administrators who are high in transactional leadership because of the overall job satisfaction of these principals.
3. School districts should mandate continuous job satisfaction assessments of their administrators and make periodic leadership development workshops and seminars to improve leadership behavior and development.
4. University and college principal preparation programs should include leadership style assessments of potential applicants as a screening process to admissions into their programs.
5. During the screening process of principal selection, the use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire may be used in predicting overall job satisfaction of the principal within the position.

Future Research Recommendations

The researcher's recommendations for future research are as follows:

1. A replication of this study should be conducted using a larger sample of principals to determine if the findings of this study remain consistent.
2. A replication of this study should be conducted using the Job Descriptive Index and a different leadership style survey instrument.

3. A replication of this study should be conducted using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and a different job satisfaction survey instrument.
4. A replication of this study should be conducted using a different leadership style instrument and a different job satisfaction instrument.
5. Determine the perceptions of the principal's leadership style from parents', students', and staff perspective and see if they match a principal's self perception.
6. The study should be expanded to incorporate a comparison variable between urban, rural, and suburban school principals leadership style and job satisfaction.
7. This study should be replicated in other school settings such as charter and private schools as well as levels of schools such as elementary or middle.
8. A replication of this study should focus on the size of school as a mitigating variable in both leadership style and job satisfaction of high school principals.
9. Given that only two gender differences in Michigan high school principal's was the job satisfaction for promotion and those principals in Class B schools, further analysis could explore possible reasons for these differences.
10. Further analysis could explore possible reasons for this difference in job satisfaction with pay of class B principals greater than class D principals.

Closing Statement

In light of all the research that has been conducted in the area of leadership and job satisfaction, there were very few studies which had directly examined the impact of leadership style of a principal upon his/her own job satisfaction. It was the desire of the researcher that this research effort would enhance the body of knowledge for future investigations into high school principals' leadership styles and

job satisfaction. It is therefore time to focus on the direct relationship, if any, on the leadership style of high school principals and its impact on their own job satisfaction.

In this study, the researcher investigated the relationship between high school principal's leadership styles and job satisfaction. Two distinct dimensions of leadership emerged: task orientation and concern for people. The researcher's study supported these two dimensions and added supportive research conducted at the high school level in public schools. There is a need to promote more research such as this in different settings of the secondary school setting so that a bridge from the world of research can meet the everyday application in the principal's role in a school.

It is the position of this researcher, that the power of leadership is important within any organization and more so within a school. Consequently, the more we know about the role of the principal the more we will have an impact on the education of students. Finally, it is hoped that this study will assist high school principals with the assessment of their individual leadership style and their own job satisfaction and will enhance the body of knowledge currently available on this important topic.

Appendix A
Permission to use JDI



Bowling Green State University

198

Department of Psychology
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403-0228
(419) 372-2301

Fax: (419) 372-6013

Web Page: <http://www.bgsu.edu/departments/psych/>

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) is copyrighted by Bowling Green State University. The Job in General (JIG) Scale is a sub-scale of the Job Descriptive Index and is also copyrighted by Bowling Green State University. The purchaser is granted permission to reproduce the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General Scale. The number of copies that the purchaser can make is listed below. The rights to reproduce additional copies must be purchased through Bowling Green State University (see below).

The notation "Copyright Bowling Green State University, 1982, 1985, 1997" must be included on each copy of the JDI and JIG.

Date: 10/16/01

Purchaser: David Barry

Address: 8656 W. Ave

White Lake MI

48386

Permission to reproduce: 500 copies

To obtain copyright information for the JDI and JIG contact :

The JDI Research Group
Department of Psychology
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43404
(419) 372-8247

City Group

Appendix B
Job Descriptive Instrument

Job Descriptive Survey

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? Circle:

1	for "Yes" if it describes your work
2	for "No" if it does not describe it
3	for "?" if you cannot decide

	Yes	No	?
Fascinating.....	1	2	3
Routine.....	1	2	3
Satisfying.....	1	2	3
Boring.....	1	2	3
Good.....	1	2	3
Gives sense of accomplishment.....	1	2	3
Respected.....	1	2	3
Uncomfortable.....	1	2	3
Pleasant.....	1	2	3
Useful.....	1	2	3
Challenging.....	1	2	3
Simple.....	1	2	3
Repetitive.....	1	2	3
Creative.....	1	2	3
Dull.....	1	2	3
Uninteresting.....	1	2	3
Can see results.....	1	2	3
Uses my abilities.....	1	2	3

PRESENT PAY

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay?

	Yes	No	?
Income adequate for normal expenses	1	2	3
Fair	1	2	3
Barely live on income.....	1	2	3
Bad.....	1	2	3
Income provides luxuries.....	1	2	3
Insecure.....	1	2	3
Less than I deserve.....	1	2	3
Well paid.....	1	2	3
Underpaid	1	2	3

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your opportunities for promotion?

	Yes	No	?
Good opportunities for promotion	1	2	3
Opportunities somewhat limited.....	1	2	3
Promotion on ability	1	2	3
Dead-end job.....	1	2	3
Good chance for promotion	1	2	3
Unfair promotion policy.....	1	2	3
Infrequent promotions.....	1	2	3
Regular promotions.....	1	2	3
Fairly good chance for promotion.....	1	2	3

SUPERVISION

Think of your supervisor and the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your supervision?

	Yes	No	?
Asks my advice.....	1	2	3
Hard to please.....	1	2	3
Impolite.....	1	2	3
Praises good work.....	1	2	3
Tactful.....	1	2	3
Influential.....	1	2	3
Up-to-date	1	2	3
Doesn't supervise enough.....	1	2	3
Has favorites.....	1	2	3
Tells me where I stand.....	1	2	3
Annoying.....	1	2	3
Stubborn.....	1	2	3
Knows job well.....	1	2	3
Bad	1	2	3
Intelligent.....	1	2	3
Poor planner.....	1	2	3
Around when needed.....	1	2	3
Lazy.....	1	2	3

PEOPLE AT WORK

Think of the majority of people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people?

	Yes	No	?
Stimulating.....	1	2	3
Boring.....	1	2	3
Slow.....	1	2	3
Helpful.....	1	2	3
Stupid.....	1	2	3
Responsible.....	1	2	3
Fast.....	1	2	3
Intelligent.....	1	2	3
Easy to make enemies.....	1	2	3
Talk too much.....	1	2	3
Smart.....	1	2	3
Lazy.....	1	2	3
Unpleasant.....	1	2	3
Gossipy.....	1	2	3
Active.....	1	2	3
Narrow interests.....	1	2	3
Loyal.....	1	2	3
Stubborn.....	1	2	3

JOB IN GENERAL

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? For each of the following words or phrases, circle:

	Yes	No	?
Pleasant.....	1	2	3
Bad.....	1	2	3
Ideal.....	1	2	3
Waste of time.....	1	2	3
Good.....	1	2	3
Undesirable.....	1	2	3
Worthwhile.....	1	2	3
Worse than most.....	1	2	3
Acceptable.....	1	2	3
Superior.....	1	2	3
Better than most.....	1	2	3
Disagreeable.....	1	2	3
Makes me content.....	1	2	3
Inadequate.....	1	2	3
Excellent.....	1	2	3
Rotten.....	1	2	3
Enjoyable.....	1	2	3
Poor.....	1	2	3

© Bowling Green State University, 1982, 1985

Appendix C
Permission to use MLQ

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

Web Permission Set

Leader Form, Rater Form, and Scoring Key for MLQ Form (5x-Short)

Permission to reproduce the purchased
number of copies for one year
starting from the date of purchase.

by

Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio

Published by Mind Garden

1690 Woodside Road Suite 202 Redwood City CA 94061 USA

Phone: 650-261-3500 Fax: 650-261-3500

info@mindgarden.com

www.mindgarden.com

Copyright © 1995 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio. All rights reserved.

It is your legal responsibility to compensate the copyright holder of this work for any reproduction in any medium. If any part of this Work (e.g., scoring, items, etc.) is put on an electronic or other media, you agree to remove this Work from that media at the end of this license. The copyright holder has agreed to grant permission to reproduce the purchased number of copies of this work for one year from the date of purchase for non-commercial use only. Non-commercial use means that you will not receive payment for distributing this document. If you need to make additional copies than the above stated, please contact Mind Garden.

Appendix D
Demographic Survey

Michigan High School Principal Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction Survey Demographic Information

Please mark an X or a check mark next to each of the appropriate categories that best describe your personal or school characteristics.

- **Gender** ☐ Male ☐ Female

- **Age** ☐ 26-35 ☐ 36-45 ☐ 46-55 ☐ 56-65 ☐ over 65

- **Years of administrative experience**
☐ 0-2 ☐ 2-5 ☐ 5-8 ☐ 8-11 ☐ 11-14 ☐ 14 or more

- **Years in current position**
☐ 0-2 ☐ 2-5 ☐ 5-8 ☐ 8-11 ☐ 11-14 ☐ 14 or more

- **Size of school based upon MHSAA definitions**
☐ Class A ☐ Class B ☐ Class C ☐ Class D

- **Number of hours worked per week**
☐ 35-40 ☐ 40-45 ☐ 45-50 ☐ 50-55 ☐ 55 or more

Appendix E
Cover Letter to Principals

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
H. S. I. R. B.
 Approved for use for one year from this date:

NOV 15 2001

x Mary Lagerwey
 HSIRB Chair

To Principals,

I am working on my dissertation that examines the relationship between leadership styles of high school principals and their own job satisfaction. As a high school principal, I am asking for your help in completing the accompanying surveys. Your assistance is greatly appreciated and your responses are very important in getting results which accurately reflect the total population of principals.

Procedures

Three instruments called the (JDI) which is unlabeled, the (MLQ), and a short demographic survey ask you about your perceptions as it relates to your own leadership style and job satisfaction. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. The total time to complete all three instruments is about 20 to 25 minutes.

Confidentiality and voluntary participation

Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the surveys. If you choose not to participate in this survey you may simply discard it. Returning the survey, however, indicates your willingness to participate in the study.

Questions

If you have questions or problems arise during this study, you may contact, Dr. Van Cooley at 616-387-3891, David A. Barry at 248-956-4724, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 616-387-8293, or the vice-president for research at 616-387-8298.

This consent has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. You should not participate in this project if the corner does not have a stamped date and signature.

Again, thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to participate in this study. I appreciate your help in this project.

Please return this survey within five working days in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope by United States mail.

David A. Barry

David A. Barry
 Principal
 Doctoral Candidate

Appendix F
Protocol Clearance From the Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001-5432
616 387 6233

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Date: November 15, 2001

To: Van Cooley, Principal Investigator
David Barry, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Mary Lagerwey, Chair



Re: HSIRB Project Number 01-11-07

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "The Relationship between Michigan High School Principals Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction" has been **approved** under the **exempt** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may **only** conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: November 15, 2002

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrell, R. (1984). Leading by stepping down (problem of burnout in school administrators). *The clearinghouse*, 57, 351-352.
- Adams, J. (1999). Good principals. good schools. *Thrust for Educational Leadership* 29, 1 (September/October): 8-11. EJ 592 962.
- Andrews, K.R. (1971). *The concepts of corporate strategy*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Argyris, C. (1972). *The applicability of organizational sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Arthur Anderson. (1997). *Annual Report on the Jersey City and Paterson Public Schools* (prepared for the New Jersey Legislature Joint Committee on the Public Schools).
- Asch, K. (1999, January 8). Schools finding it hard to find new principals. *Washington Times*, p. A9.
- Atwater, L.E., Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1991). *A retrospective/prospective view of leadership development, emergence, and performance*. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Austin, G. & Reynolds, D. (1990). Managing for Improved School Effectiveness: An International Survey. *School Organisation* 2(1990): 167-78.
- Autem, W.D., Jr. (1988). Educator's job satisfaction and attitudes toward school reform analyzed by position level. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 30A. (University Microfilms No. 89 00 391)
- Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1987). "Charisma and beyond." In J.G. Hunt (Ed.), *Emerging leadership vistas*, 29-49. Boston: Lexington.
- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D.I. (1997). *Replicated confirmatory factor analyses of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies, Binghamton University.

- Avolio, B.J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Bales, R.F. (1954). In conference. *Harvard Business Review*, 34, 425.
- Bales, R.F. (1970). *Personality and interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.
- Baltzell, C. & Dentler, R. (1983). *Selecting American School Principals: A Sourcebook for Educators*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, January, 1983. 68 pages ED 236 811.
- Balzer, W.K., & Smith, P.C. (1990). *Users' Manual for the job descriptive index (JDI) and the job in general (JIG) scales*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University.
- Balzer, W.K., Kihm, J.A., Smith, P.C., Irwin, J.L., Bachiochi, P.D., Robie, C., Sinar, E.F., & Parra, L.F. (2000). *Users' manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; 1997 version) and the Job in General scales*. In J.M. Stanton and C.D. Crossley (Eds.), *Electronic resources for the JDI and JIG*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- Barth, R. (1990). *Improving Schools from Within*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.
- Barth, R. (1996). *The principal learner: A work in progress*. Cambridge, MA: The Internal Network of Principals' Centers.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). "Leadership Training and Management Development" Chapter 33 in *Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, edited by Bernard M. Bass, New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. (3rd rev. ed.) New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1997). "Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?" *American Psychologist*, 52, 2, 130-139.
- Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. NJ: SAGE.
- Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied Psychology, An International Review*, 45, 5-34.
- Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., & Goodheim, L. (1987). "Quantitative description of world-class industrial, political, and military leaders." *Journal of Management*, 13, 7-19.
- Bass, B.M., Waldman, D.A., Avolio, B.J., & Bebb, M. (1987). "Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect." *Group and organization studies*, 12, 73-87.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Technical Report*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden Publishing.
- Bennis, W.B. (1989). *Why leaders can't lead: The unconscious conspiracy continues*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bennis, W.B., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bidwell, C.E. (1975). The school as a formal organization. In J.G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 972-1022.
- Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1981). *Productivity: The human side*. New York: Amacom.
- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1985). *The managerial grid III*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Blase, J. (1987). Dimensions of effective leadership: The teacher's perspective. *American Educational Research Journal*, 24 (4), 589-610.
- Blau, P.M., & Scott, W.R. (1962). *Formal organizations: A comparative approach*. San Francisco: Chandler, 6-7.

- Bloom, G. & Krovetz, M. (2001). A step into the principalship. *Leadership*, 30, 1 (January/February), 12-13.
- Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1986). *The effective principal: Perspective on school leadership*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Boal, K.B., & Bryson, J.M. (1988). Charismatic leadership: A phenomenological and structural approach. P. 528 in J.G. Hunt, B.R. Baliga, H.P. Dachler & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Bossert, S.T., Dwyer, D.C., Rowan, B., Lee, G.V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18, 34-64.
- Bowers, D.G., & Seashore, S.E. (1966). "Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership." *Educational administration quarterly*, 11(2), 238-268.
- Bowler, Q.T. (1989). Job satisfaction as it relates to the career ladder concept implementation in rural school districts. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 1940A. (University Microfilms No. 8 92 228).
- Bowles, B.D. (1990). The silent crisis in educational leadership, *The educational digest*, 55, 12-14.
- Bowles, B., King, D. & Crow, G. (2000). *Viable principal candidates: Superintendents' perspective*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 24-28 April, New Orleans, La.
- Britton, D. (1997). Perceptions of the work environment among correction officers: Do race and sex matter? *Criminology*, 35, 85-105.
- Britton, P.R., & Stallings, J.W. (1986). Leadership is empowering people. *University Press of America*, 309.
- Brodinsky, A. (1984). Teacher morale: What builds it, what kills it. *Instructor and Teacher*, 93 (8), 36-44.
- Brookover, W., & Lezzotte, L. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement*. East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University. ED 181 0051.
- Bryman, A., & Kegan, P. (1986). *Leadership and Organizations*. London: SAGE.

- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership organizations*. London: SAGE.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper.
- Burns, P.J. (1990). Teacher morale as related to the perceived administrative leadership style of principals in selected group IV high schools in the state of New Jersey. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 51 (7), 2207-A.
- Burris, V. (1983). The social and political consequences of over education. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 434-467.
- Buzawa, E. (1994). The role of selected sociodemographic and job-specific variables in predicting patrol officer job satisfaction: A reexamination ten years later. *American Journal of Police*, 13, 71-75.
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R.D., & Allen, J.S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 468-478.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G., & Klesh, J. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. Seashore, E. Lawler, P. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.) *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices*, (pp. 71-138). New York: John Wiley.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P., & Rodgers, W. (1976). *The Quality of American Life*. New York: SAGE.
- Campbell, J.P., Dunnette, M.D., Lawler, E.E., III and Weick, K.E., Jr. (1970). *Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness*. New York: McGraw Hill, 385-414.
- Campion, J.E., Jr. (1968). *Effects of managerial style on subordinates' attitudes and performance in a simulated organizational meeting*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Carlyle, T. (1841). Heroes and hero worship. In R.M. Stodgill, *Handbook of Leadership: A survey of theory and practice*. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). *The condition of teaching: A state by state analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Carr, R.W. (1971). *A study of the job satisfaction of High School Principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

- Carrigan, J., Brown, C. & Jenkins, K. (1999). *Principals' salaries: Incentives or deterrents to professional advancement*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Finance Association, March, Seattle, Wash.
- Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (1968). Leadership and performance of group functions. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics: Research and theory* (3rd ed.). (pp. 301-315). New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Cascio, W.F. (1995). "Whither industrial and organizational psychology in a changing world of work." *American Psychology*, 50, 928-934.
- Cawelti, G. (1987). Why Instructional Leaders are Scarce. *Educational Leadership* September, 1987): 3.
- Cawelti, G. (1994). *High school restructuring: A national study*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Chaffee, F.H. (1981). A study of leadership styles of elementary school principals and school climate in the Jefferson County public schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 4217A. (University Microfilms No. 8201 773).
- Chapman, D.W., & Green, M.S. (1986). Teacher retention: A further examination. *Journal of Educational Research*, 19, 93-105.
- Chen, C.C., & Meindl, J.R. (1991). The construction of leadership images in the popular press: The case of Donald Burr and People Express. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 521-551.
- Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment, and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6, 1-22.
- Cline, D. & Richardson, M. (1988). *The Reform of School Administrators Preparation: The Kentucky Principal's Internship Model*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Kalamazoo, MI, August 1988. 27 pages. EA 021 595.
- Cohen, S.S. (1989, August). How to be a leader. *Reader's Digest*, 98-100.
- Coleman, D. G. (1981). *Leadership style assessment*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Missouri Professors of Educational Administration.

- Collmer, J. (1989). A correlational study of principals' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 30A. (University Microfilms No. 8 78 291).
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-647.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1988a). *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organization effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1988b). Training charismatic leadership: A risky and critical task. In J.A. Conger & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic Leadership*, 309-323, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Craig, L.V. (1979). *The effects of organizational climate and leadership behavior on teacher job satisfaction in selected schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University.
- Craven, L. (1989). *The supply and demand trends of public secondary school administrators in South Carolina from 1978 through 2002*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Columbia SC (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 313 799).
- Cularci, T. (1992). Teachers' sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 60 (4), 323-327.
- Curry, J., Wakefield, D., Price, J., & Mueller, C. (1986). On the casual ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 847-858.
- Daley, B. (1999, June 22). Principal shortage looms for school districts. *Boston Globe*, p. A12.
- Deal, T. & Peterson, K. (1990). *The Principal's Role in Shaping School Culture*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education.
- DeMeuse, K.P. (1986). A compendium of frequently used measures in industrial/organizational psychology. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 23, (2), 53-59.

- Dillon, R. (1978). Identification factors influencing vocational agricultural teachers to leave teaching. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture*, 19(3), 34-39.
- Donaldson, G. (1991). *Learning to lead: The dynamics of the high school principalship*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- _____. *Hiring Capable Principals: How School Districts Recruit, Groom, and Select the Best Candidates*. OSSC Bulletin Series. Eugene Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon, May 1988, 40 pages. ED 297 436.
- Donaldson, G. (1997). On being a principal: The rewards and challenges of school leadership. *New directions for school leadership*, 5 (fall). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Donaldson, L. (1990). The ethereal hand: Organizational economics and management theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, (3): 369-381.
- Doud, J. & Keller, E. (1998). *A ten-year study: The K-8 principal in 1998*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.
- DuFour, R., & Berkey, T. (1995). The principal as staff developer. *Journal of Staff Development*, 16, (4), 2-6.
- Duke, D. (1982). What can principals do? Leadership functions and instructional effectiveness. *NASSP Bulletin*, 66, 1-12.
- Duttweiler, P.C. (1986). Educational excellence and motivating teachers. *Clearinghouse*. 59 (8), 371-374.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for urban poor, *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-24.
- Educational Research Service, National Association of Elementary School Principals, & National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1998). *Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the principalship? An exploratory study*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Services.
- Educational Research Service, National Association of Elementary School Principals, & National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1998). *The Principal, Keystone of a High-Achieving School: Attracting and Keeping the Leaders we need*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Services.

- Engelking, J.L. (1985). Identification of satisfying and dissatisfying factors in staffs of elementary and secondary public school teachers from two states. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 46 (12), 3547-A.
- Evans, G.A., & Maas, J.M. (1969). *Job satisfaction and teacher militancy: Some teacher attitudes*. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.
- Fama, E.F. (1980). Agency problems and the theory of the firm. *Journal of Political Economy*, 88, 288-307.
- Fama, E.F., & Jensen, M.C. (1983a). Agency problems and residual claims, *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26: 327-349.
- (1983b). Separation of ownership and control, *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26: 301-325.
- Farber, B.A. (1982). *Teacher burnout: Assumptions, myths, and issues*. Chicago: Spencer Foundation.
- Felton, B.J. (1987). Cohort variation in happiness: Some hypotheses and exploratory analyses. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 25, 27-42.
- Fenwick, L. & Pierce, M. (2001) The Principal Shortage: Crisis or opportunity?, *Principal*, March, 25-32, Educational Research Service, Monograph available from The Harvard Graduate School of Education, [Online] Available: gseweb.harvard.edu/principals
- Ferrandino, V.L. & Tirozzi, G.N. (2000, February 23). *Our Time has come*. NAESP ONLINE [Online]. Available: www.naesp.org/misc/edweek_article_2-23-00.htm
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Fiedler, F.E. & Chemers, M.M. (1984). *Improving leadership effectiveness: The leadership match concept* (2nd ed). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1986). The contribution of cognitive resources and leader behavior to organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 532-548.
- Finkelstein, S. & Hambrick, D.C. (1990). Top management team tenure and organizational outcomes: The moderating role of managerial discretion. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 484-503.

- Firebaugh, G., & Harley, B. (1995) Trends in job satisfaction in the United States by race, gender, and type of occupation. *Research in the Sociology of Work*, 5, 87-104.
- Fleishman, E.A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 37, 1-6.
- Fleishman, E.A. & Harris, E.F. (1962). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 15, (1), 43-56.
- Fleishman, E.A. (1973). Twenty years of consideration and structure. In E.A. Fleishman & J.G. Hunt (Eds.), *Current developments in the study of leadership* (pp. 1-40). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Fleishman, E.A. & Peters, D.R. (1962). Interpersonal values, leadership attitudes, and managerial success. *Personnel Psychology*, 15, 127-143.
- Florida School Study Council. (1981, November). *Competencies of outstanding elementary and secondary school principals* (1), 3 Tallahassee, FL: Florida State Department of Education.
- Ford, D., & Bennett, A.L. (1994). The changing principalship in Chicago. *Education and Urban Society*, 26, (3), 238-247.
- Fotheringham, J. (1996). Washington State School Enrollment to Continue Fast Growth. *Quality Education Through Quality Leadership*, September.
- Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N. (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Free, M.D. (1990). A multivariate investigation of work attitudes in academe: The case of a university admissions office. *The Wisconsin Sociologist*, 27, 22-32.
- Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from freedom*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart.
- Fryer, D. (1926). Industrial dissatisfaction. *Industrial Psychology*, 1, 25-29.
- Fullan, M. & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Galton, F. (1879). English men of science: Their nature and nurture. In R.M. Stodgill (Ed.) *Handbook of Leadership: A survey of theory and practice*. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

- Galvin, P. & Sperry, D. (1996) *Educational Leadership in Utah public schools; Results of the Utah school administrator survey*. Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah, Utah Consortium for Educational Leaders.
- Gardner, J.W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Gasper, S. (1992). *Transformational leadership: An integrative review of the literature*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University.
- Gilman, D.A. & Lanman-Givens, B. (2001). Where have all the principals gone? *Educational Leadership*, May, 72-74.
- Geier, J.G. (1988, December). A trait approach to the study of leadership in small groups, *Journal of Communications*, 2(3), 81-93.
- Getzels, J. W. (1967). Administration as social process. In A.W. Halpin (Ed.), *Administrative theory in education* (pp.150-165), New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Glenn, N. (1980). Attitudes, beliefs and values. In O. Brim & J. Kagan (Eds.), *Change and continuity in human development* (pp. 596-640). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glenn, N.D., & Weaver, C.N. (1982). Future evidence of education and job satisfaction. *Social Forces*, 61, 46-55.
- Glickman, C. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Goodnough, A. (2000, September 8). Mrs. Clinton proposes grants for principals. *New York Times* p.A16.
- Grossi, E., & Berg, B. (1991). Stress and job satisfaction among correctional officers: An unexpected finding. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 35, 73-81.
- Gruneberg, M.M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.

- Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. (1960). *Americans view their mental health*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1974). *The job diagnostic survey: An instrument for diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign project*: Technical report number 4. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Haezebrouck, J.C. (1989). *The effects of school size and leadership style on teacher job satisfaction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University.
- Hall, G.E., & Rutherford, W.L. (1983). *Three change facilitator styles: How principals affect improvement efforts*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Halpin, A.W. (1966). *Theory and research in administration*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Halpin, A.W., & Winer, B.J. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. (pp. 39-51). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Hambrick, D.C., & Mason, P. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 9: 193-206.
- Hanson, E.M. (1973). The emerging control structure of schools. *Administrator's Notebook*, 21, 16-19.
- Harris, L. (1985). *Former teachers in America: The MetLife Survey*. New York: Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.
- Harris, L. (1987). *The American teacher 1987: Strengthening links between home and school: The MetLife survey*. New York: Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.
- Hartzell, G & Winger, M. (1989, November). Manage to keep teachers happy! *The School Administrator*, 26, 24-25.
- Hater, J.J., & Bass, B.M. (1988). Superiors evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 695-702.

- Heller, W.H., Clay, R., & Perkins, C. (1993) The relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal leadership style, *Journal of School Leadership*, 3, 74-86.
- Hendrie, C. (1998, March 4). Tenured principals: An endangered species. *Education Week*, p. 40.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1965). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1984). *The management of organizational behavior* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: World.
- Hodson, R. (1985). Corporate structure and job satisfaction: A focus on employee characteristics. *Sociology and Social Research*, 69, 22-49.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.
- House, R.J., & Mitchell, T.R. (1974). Path-Goal Theory and leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 81-97.
- House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*. 189-207, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R.J. (1996). Leadership in the twenty-first century: A speculative inquiry. In A. Howard (Ed.) *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- House, R.J., & Baetz, M.L. (1979). Leadership: Some empirical generalizations and new research directions. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 341-423.
- House, R.J., Spangler, W.D., Woyke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364-396.
- Houston, P. (1998, June 6). The ABC's of administrative shortages. *Education Week* pp. 44-45.

- Houston, P. (2000). Not a Great job but a Wonderful Calling. *The School Administrator* (June), p. 44.
- Howell, J.M., & Frost, P.J. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational behavior and human Decision processes*, 43, 243-269.
- Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1987). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). New York: Random House, Inc.
- Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc 239-299.
- Huckaby, W. (1980, May). Integrating Style and Purposes in Leadership. *Leadership*, 613-616.
- Hulin, C.L., & Smith, P. (1965). A linear model of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 209-216.
- Iowa Department of Education. (1999, November). Administrator shortage looms. *The Dispatch* [Online]. Available www.state.ia.us/educate/publicationjs/dispatch/199911/page1.html
- Immegart, G. (1988). Leadership and Leader Behavior. *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, edited by N.J. Boyan. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Ironson, G.H., Smith, P.C., Brannick, M.T., Gibson, W.M., & Paul, K.B. (1989). Construction of a job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74 (2), 193-200.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W.B. (1981). *Handbook in research and development* (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Edits.
- Janda, K.F. (1960). Towards the explication of the concept of leadership in terms of power. *Human Relations*, 6 (2), 34-42.
- Janson, P., & Martin, J.M. (1982). Job satisfaction and age: A test of two views. *Social Forces*, 60, 1089-1102.
- Jensen, M. (1986). *Recruiting and Selecting the Most Capable Teachers*. OSSC Bulletin Series. Eugene Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon, May, 1986. 22 pages. ED 269 885.

- Jensen, M.C. (1988). The takeover controversy: Analysis and evidence." In J.C. Coffee, L. Lowenstein & S. Rose-Ackerman (Eds.), *Knight, raiders & targets*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, M.C., & Meckling, W.H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3, 305-360.
- Jordan, D.W. (1994). *The supply and demand trends of public school principals and administrators in Southwestern Louisiana: 1993-1997*. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. 375 525).
- Kalleberg, A.L. (1977). Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 124-143.
- Katzell, R.A., & Yankelovich, D. (1975). *Work, productivity, and job satisfaction*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Psychological Corporation.
- Keller, B. (1998, March 18). Principals' shoes are hard to fill. *Education Week*, p. 3.
- Keller, B. (1998, November 11). Principal Matters. *Education Week*, pp. 25-27.
- Keller, T.F., & Szilagyi, A.D. (1978). A longitudinal study of leader regard behavior, subordinate expectancies and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 31, 119-129.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). *Foundations of behavioral research* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Knight, J.A. (1978). Why vocational agriculture teachers in Ohio leave teaching. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture*, 19(3), 11-17.
- Koh, W.L. (1990). *An empirical validation of the theory of transformational leadership in secondary schools in Singapore*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.
- Koslo, R.D. (1989). The relationship between leadership behaviors of the principal and the morale of the teaching staff. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50 (5), 1159-A.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (1988). Relating leadership and credibility, *Psychological Reports*, 63, 527-530.
- Kreis, K., & Brockopp, D.Y. (1986). Autonomy: A component of teacher job satisfaction. *Education*, 107, 110-115.
- Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Kuhnert, K.W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 648-657.
- Lacy, A. (1973, August). Teacher job satisfaction: Factors and implications. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 15 (4), 24-30.
- Landy, F.J., & Shankster, L.J. (1994). Personnel selection and placement. *American Review of Psychology*, 45, 261-296.
- Laughlin, S.J. (1984). Attitudes, administrative styles, and outcomes. *American Association of University Administrators*, 5, (2), 3.
- Lawler, E.E., & Porter, L.W. (1972). The effects of performance on job satisfaction, *Industrial Relations*, 7, 20-28.
- Lawler, E.E. (1986). *High involvement management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawrence, L.C., & Smith, P.C. (1955). Group decision and employee participation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 39, 334-337.
- Leithwood, K., & Montgomery, D. (1986). *Improving Principal Effectiveness: The Principal Profile*. Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1986.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P.T., & Cousins, J.B. (1994). *Developing expert leadership for future schools*. London: Falmer Press.
- Lester, P.E. (1987). Development and factor analysis of the teacher job satisfaction questionnaire. *Educational and Psychologicals*.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-299.

- Lewis, A. (1993). *Changing the odds: Middle School Reform in Progress 1991-1993*. New York: The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: It's management and value*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Lincoln, J.R., & Kalleberg, A.L. (1990). *Culture, control, and commitment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lindsay, J. (1985, February). Groom Your Assistants for the Big Time. *The Executive Educator* 7, 2. pp. 41-48. EJ 313 654.
- Lipham, J.M., & Hoeh, J.A. (1985). *The principalship: Concepts, competencies, and cases*. New York: Longman.
- Lipham, J.M. (1973). Leadership: General theory and research. In L. Cunningham and W. Gephart (Eds.). *Leadership: The science and the art today* (pp. 1-15). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Litt, M., & Turk, D. (1985). Sources of stress and dissatisfaction in experienced high school teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 78(3), 178-185.
- Locke, E.A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 390-336.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnet (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing.
- Lofton, M.N. (1985). The relationship of matched leadership style and faculty maturity to teacher preference for the principal as instructional leader, frequency of teacher and principal communication, and organizational health. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 2150A (University Microfilms No. 8 21 708)
- Long, A. (2000, May) *Administrative shortage: Perception/reality/solutions*. IPLA Special Edition, 13(4), 3.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lowe, K., Kroeck, K.G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effective correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425.
- Lunenburg, F. & Ornstein, A.C. (1991). *Educational administration: Concept and practices*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Mahrer, R.G. (1985). Morale scores of selected groups of teachers compared according to their perceptions of their principal's leadership style. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46 (9), 2505-A.
- Mann, R.D. (1959). A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological bulletin*, 56, 241-270.
- Marloe, L. (1998, July 23). School principals in short supply. *The Patriot Ledger*. P. 1.
- Martin, T. (1980). Modeling the turnover process. *Journal of Management Studies*, 17, 261-274.
- Martin, J.K., & Shehan, C.L. (1989). Education and job satisfaction: The influence of gender, wage-earning status, and job values. *Work and Occupations*, 16, 184-199.
- Mayo, E. (1933). *Human problems of an industrial civilization*. New York: MacMillan.
- Mayo, E. (1945). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. Boston: Harvard Business School.
- McAfee, R.B., & Glassman, M. (1988). Job satisfaction: It's the little things that count. *Management Solutions*, 33, 32-38.
- McCormick, K. (1987). The Vaunted School Executive Shortage: How Serious is it? *The Executive Educator*. 9, 18-21.
- McCall, M.W., & Lombardo, M.M. (1983). *Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed*. (Tech Report No. 21). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (1993). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

- Medved, J. (1982). The applicability of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. *Educational Leadership*, 39(7), 555.
- Meindl, J.R., Ehrlich, S.B., & Dukerich, J.M. (1985). The romance of leadership, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78-102.
- Melamed, S., Ben-Avi, I., Luz, J. & Green, M. (1995). Objective and subjective work monotony: Effects on job satisfaction, psychological distress and absenteeism in blue collar workers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 29-42.
- Mendel, P.C. (1987). An investigation of factors that influence teacher morale and satisfaction with work conditions. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 2779A. (University Microfilms No. 88 00 538)
- Menlo, A., et al. (1986). *A cross-cultural comparison of the sources of professional enthusiasm and discouragement in teaching in England, West Germany, and the United States*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, San Francisco.
- Miles, R.E., & Snow, C.C. (1978). *Organizational strategy, structure, and process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Miller, D.C. (1983). *Handbook of research design and social measurement: A text and reference book for the social and behavioral sciences* (4th ed.). New York: Longman, Inc.
- Mirabile, R.J. (1983). Teachers in transition: Making the move from academe to business. *Journal of College Placement*, 44, 43-46.
- Mitchell, J.B., Jr. (1989). Teacher job satisfaction and teacher rapport with the principal in relationship to principals' leadership styles and school enrollment size in Tennessee public secondary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 1512A (University Microfilms No. 89 21 997)
- Mobley, W., Griffeth, R., Hand, H., & Meglino, B. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 493-522.
- Mojkowski, C. (1991). *Developing Leaders for Restructuring Schools: New Habits of the Mind and Heart*. A report of the National Leadership Network Study Group on Restructuring Schools. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, March, 1991. 72 pages.

- Monford, I. (1956). *Factors influencing the work of teachers in Fairfax County, Virginia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Moran, P., & Ghoshal, S. (1996). Theories of economic organization: The case for realism and balance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 58-72.
- Morris, M.B. (1981). *The public school as workplace: The principal as a key element in teacher satisfaction. A study of schooling in the United States* (Technical Report Series No. 21). ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 055 038.
- Morse, N.C., & Reimer, E. (1956). The experimental change of a major organizational variable. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 52, 120-129.
- Mottaz, C.J. (1984). Education and work satisfaction. *Human Relations*, 37, 985-1004.
- Muchinsky, P.M. (1993). *Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. (4th ed.) Pacific Grone, CA: Books/Cole Publishing.
- Mueller, C., Boyer, E., Price, J., & Iverson, R. (1994). Employee attachment and noncoercive conditions of work. *Work and Occupations*, 21, 179-212.
- Muller, J. (2000, September 7). *Who's in charge? U.S. facing serious shortage of school principals* [Online]. Available: http://more.abcnews.go.com/onair/closerlook/wnt000905_principal_shortage_feature.html
- Mumford, E. (1906). The origins of leadership. In R.M. Stodgill (Ed.) *Handbook of Leadership: A survey of theory and practice*. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
- Murphy, J., & Beck, L.G. (1994). Restructuring the principalship: Challenges and possibilities. In J. Murphy and K.S. Louis (Eds.) *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Muse, I., & Thomas, G.J. (Winter 1991). The rural principal: Select the best. *Journal of Rural and Small Schools*.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. Improving the Selection of Principals: An analysis of the Approaches. *NASSP Bulletin* 72, 508 (May: 35-38. EJ 371 971.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). *The condition of education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: the imperative for educational reform*. Washington DC: Author.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. *Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An agenda for Reform*. Charlottesville, Virginia: NPBEA, May. 33 pages ED 310 493.
- Needle, R.H., Griffin, T., Svendsen, R. (1981). Occupational stress: Coping and health problems of teachers. *Journal of School Health*, 51, 175-181.
- Neidt, W.A. (1987). Factors contributing to teacher satisfaction with shared decision making. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, (10), 2504-A.
- New England School Development Council. 1988. *Administrative Shortage in New England: The Evidence, the Causes, and the recommendations*. Sudbury, MA: Author.
- Niehoff, B.F., Eng, C.A., & Grover, R.A. (1990). The impact of top management actions on employee attitudes and perceptions. *Group and organizational studies*, 15, 337-352.
- Niehouse, O.L. (1986). Job satisfaction: How to motivate today's workers. *Supervisory Management*, 31, 8-12.
- Norusus, M.J. (1990). *SPSS Introductory statistics: Student guide*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.
- Oberman, G. (1996). *A report on principal turnover in the Chicago Public Schools*. Unpublished manuscript, Chicago Public Schools.
- O'Conner, E.J., Peters, L.H., & Gordon, S.M. (1978). The measurement of job satisfaction: Current practices and future considerations. *Journal of Management*, 4, 17-26.
- Organ, D., & Bateman, T. (1986). *Organizational behavior* (3rd ed.). Texas: Business Publications, Inc.
- Ozumba, A.E. (1988). *Administrative leadership style and teacher job satisfaction: A study of secondary schools in Imo State, Nigeria*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Southern University.

- Parkay, F.W., & Currie, G. (1992). Sources of support for beginning principals. In G.W. Parkay and G.E. Hall (editors) *Becoming a principal: The challenges of beginning leadership*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Pedersen, L.R. (1988). *Teachers' perceptions of factors which affect job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University.
- Peters, T.J. (1992). *Liberation management: Necessary disorganization for the nanosecond nineties*. New York: Knopf.
- Peters, T.J., & Austin, N.K. (1985). *A passion for excellence*. New York: Random House.
- Peters, T.J., & Waterman, R.H. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Phelan, R.J., & Phelan, J.C. (1983). Higher education and early life outcomes. *Higher Education*, 12, 665-680.
- Pitner, N.J. (1986). Substitutes for principal behavior: An exploratory study. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22, 23-42.
- Pitner, N.J., & Hocevar, D. (1987). An empirical comparison of two-factor versus multifactor theories of principal leadership: Implications for the evaluation of school principals. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1, 93-109.
- Pfeiffer, S. (1997, June 29). As principals leave, successors are few. *Boston Sunday Globe*, A. 1.
- Plant, R.E. (1966). An introduction of some correlates of teacher job satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.
- Potter, L. (2001). Solving the principal shortage. *Principal*, March, 34-37.
- Price, J.L. (1977). *The study of turnover*. Ames; Iowa State University Press.
- Quinn, R. P., Staines, G.L. & McCullough, M.R. (1974). *Job satisfaction: Is there a trend?* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Random House Webster's College Dictionary*. 2000. 2nd revised edition. New York: Random House.
- Reddin, W.J. (1970). *Managerial effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

- Ritchie, J.B., & Miles, R.E. (1970). An analysis of quantity and quality of participation as mediating variables in the participative decision-making process. *Personnel Psychology*, 23, 347-359.
- Roberts, N.C. (1985). Transforming leadership: A process of collective action, *Human Relations*, 38, 1023-1046.
- Rodda, C. (1999, May 24). *Meeting demands: principals find their jobs rewarding but fraught with change*. EdCal, 28(36), 1, 10.
- Roethlisberger, F.J., & Dickson, W.J. (1939). *Management and the worker*. Chicago: Harvard University Press.
- Roth, W.F., Jr. (1989). *Work and rewards: Redefining our work-life reality*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Rouse, L.L. (1998) *A comparison of African-American and Anglo-European community college leaders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University.
- Ruhl-Smith, C., & Smith, J.M. (1993). *Teacher job satisfaction in rural schools: A view from the Texas panhandle*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 362 371).
- Sadler, P.J. (1970). Leadership style, confidence in management and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 6, 3-19.
- Saleh, S.D., & Otis, J.L. (1964). Age and level of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 17, 425-430.
- Savage, R.M. (1967). *A study of teacher satisfaction and attitudes: Causes and effects*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn AL.
- Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. (1970). *Toward equal educational opportunity: The report of the Senate Select Committee on equal educational opportunity*. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Sergiovanni, T. M. (1967). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 5, 66-82.
- Sergiovanni, T. M. (1991). *The Principalsip: A Reflective Practice Perspective*. 2d. ed. Boston, Ma: Allyn & Bacon, 1991.

- Schmitt, N., & Loher, B. (1986). *Teacher Satisfaction Survey*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Schmuck, R. (1988). *Beyond Academics in the Preparation of Educational Leaders*. OSSC Report 28, Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon, 3 spring: 1-11.
- Schriesheim, C.A., & Kerr, S. (1977). Theories and measures of leadership: A critical appraisal of current and future directions. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*. (pp. 9-45). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Schulz, I.L., Teddlie, C. (1987). The relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and their perceptions of principals' use of power and school effectiveness. *Education*, 109, 461- 467.
- Shen, J., Cooley, V., Ruhl-Smith, C. (1999). Entering and leaving school administrative positions, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, (2), 4, 353-367.
- Short, P.M., & Spencer, W.A. (Winter, 1990). Principal instructional leadership. *Journal of Research and development in education*, 23(2), 117-122.
- Skinner, E. W. (1969). Relationships between leadership behavior and organizational situational variables. *Personnel Psychology*, 22, 489-494.
- Smith, P. C. (1982). *Scoring the job descriptive index. Job descriptive index research kit*. Ohio: Bowling Green State University.
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Smith, P.C., Balzer, W.K., Brannick, M., Chia, W., Eggeleston, S., Gibson, W., Johnson, B., Josephson, H., Paul, K.B., Reilly, C., & Whalen, M. (1987). The revised JDI: A facelift for an old friend. *Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 24, (1), 31-33.
- Stark, J.S., Austin, A.E., Lowther, M.A., Chapman, D.W., & Hutchinson, S.M. (1980). *Teacher certification recipients at the University of Michigan 1946 through 1976: A 1980 follow-up study* (Report No. SP 019 031). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Steers, R.M., & Porter, I.W. (1991). *Motivation and work behavior* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

- Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership. A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1963). *Manual for the leader behavior descriptive questionnaire-form XII*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1974). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Stricherz, M. (2001, October 24). Despite Retirements, 'baby busters' scarce in principals' positions. *Education Week*. p.6-7.
- Stueven, G.L. (1985). Elementary school principal leadership style: Its relationship to school climate. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 1476A. (University Microfilms No. 85 17 847)
- Tannenbaum, R., & Massarik, R. (1968). Leadership: A frame of reference. In D.E. Porter and P.B. Applewhite (Eds.) *Organizational Behavior and Management*. Scranton, PA: International Textbook.
- Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W.H. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, 36 (2), 95-101.
- Taylor, F. M. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Taylor, D.L., & Tashakkori, A. (1995). Decision participation and school climate as predictors of job satisfaction and teachers' sense of efficacy. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 63 (3), 217-230.
- Tead, O. (1935). *The art of leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Teske, P., & Schneider, M. (1999). *The Importance of Leadership: The Role of School Principals*. Arlington, VA: The PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment for the Business of Government.
- Tichy, N.M., & DeVanna, M.A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York: Wiley.
- Ting, Y. (1997). The determinants of Job satisfaction of Federal employees, Public Personnel management, 313-335.
- Tirrill, N.T., & Jones, F.B. (1985). Leadership and supervision: Is there a difference? *Planning and changing*.

- Traut, C.A., Larsen, R., & Feimer, S.H. (2000). Hanging on or fading out? Job satisfaction and the long term worker, *Public Personal Management*, 29, 343.
- Trice, H.M., & Beyer, J.M. (1986). Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizations. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.) *Research in organizational behavior*, 8, Greenwich, Ct: JAI Press, pp. 113-164.
- Trusty, F.M., & Sergiovanni, T.J. (1966). Perceived need deficiencies of teachers and administrators: A proposal for restructuring teacher roles. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 2, 168-180.
- Tucker, A. (1984). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers* (2nd ed.) New York: Macmillan.
- U.S. Department of Education. 1999. *School Leadership: Principals at the Center*. Transcript of a Satellite Town Meeting (June 15, 1999).
- Vandenberghe, R. (1995). Creative management of a school: A matter of vision and daily interventions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 33(2), 31-51.
- Vivian, T.P. (1983). The relationships between perceived leadership style, size of school and non-instructional time on teacher job satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 44 1659A. (University Microfilms No. 83 19 284)
- Vollmer, M.H., & Kinney, J.A. (1955). Age, education, and job satisfaction. *Personnel*, 32, 38-43.
- Vroom, V.H. (1960). *Some personality determinants of the effects of participation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Vroom, V.H. (1966). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley & sons, Inc.
- Waldman, D.A., Bass, B.M., & Einstein, W.O. (1987). Effort, performance, and transformational leadership in industrial and military settings, *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60, 177-186.
- Walter, J.E., Caldwell, S.D., & Marshall, J. (1980). Evidence for validity of situational leadership theory. *Educational Leadership*, 37(5), 618-621.
- Weaver, C.N. (1980). Job satisfaction in the United States in the 1970's. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 364-367.

- Weber, M. (1924/1947) *The theory of social and economic organization*. (T. Parsons, Trans.) New York: Free Press.
- Weick, K. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center.
- Wickert, F., & McFarland, D. (1967). *Measuring Executive effectiveness*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Wiggam, A. (1931). The biology of leadership. *Business Leadership*. New York: Pitman.
- Wilcox, H.D. (1992). The relationship between the teachers' perception of the high school principal style and the correlates job satisfaction and morale (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Akron, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Publication No. AAC9236175.
- Williams, L., & Hazer, J. (1986). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment in turnover models: a re-analysis using latent variable structure equation models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 219-231.
- Williams, R.C., & Portin, B. (1996). *The changing role of the principal in Washington State*. (Available from the Association of Washington School Principals, 1021 8th Ave. S.E., Olympia, WA 98501-1500).
- Windel, R.E. (1991). Elementary principal leadership style: Some factors related to job satisfaction of teachers in randomly selected Montana elementary schools (Doctoral dissertation, Montana State University, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Publication No. AAC9124373.
- Whitaker, K. (2001, May). Where are the Principal Candidates? Perceptions of Superintendents. *NASSP Bulletin*, 85, (625), 82-91.
- Wooster, M.W. (1991). First principals: The leadership vacuum in American schools. *Policy Review*, 57, 55-61.
- Wright, J.D., & Hamilton, R.F. (1978). Work satisfaction and age: Some evidence for the job change hypothesis. *Social Forces*, 56, 1140-1158.

- Yackel, I. (1984). *An analysis of leadership styles and stress in the rural principalship* (Report No. 100). Regina, Saskatchewan: Saskatchewan School Trustees Association Research Centre.
- Yammering, F.J., & Bass, B.M. (1989). Long term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In K.E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Yerkes, D.M., & Guaglianone, C.L. (1998, November/December). Where have all the high school administrators gone? *Thrust for Administrative Leadership*, 28(2), 10-14.
- Young, B.J. (1988). Teacher job satisfaction: A study of overall job satisfaction and work facet satisfactions of k-8 teachers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49, 1665A. (University Microfilms No. 88 22 197).
- Yukl, G. A. (1971). Toward a behavior theory of leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 6, 414-440.
- Yukl, G.A. (1982). *Managerial Leadership and the Effective Principal*. Paper prepared for the National Conference on the Principalship. Albany, NY: SUNY School of Business.
- Yukl, G.A. (1989). *Leadership in organizations* (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G.A., & VanFleet, D.D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, volume 3. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, pp. 17-197.
- Zakariya, S. (1983). How to Add Snap, Crackle, and Pop to Principal Selection. *The Executive Educator*, 5, 11 November: 20-23. EJ 288 173.
- Zedeck, S. (1987, October). *Satisfaction in union members and their spouses*. Paper presented at the Job Satisfaction: Advances in Research and Practice Conference, Bowling Green, Ohio.
- Zefane, R. (1994). Job satisfaction and work redesign: Findings from Australia. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, XXXV, 1-2.
- Zigarmi, D. (1981). Leadership and school climate: A data-based approach to administrative training. *Journal of Staff Development*, 2(1), 93-115.