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Abstract

In recent times, political, economic and societal reforms have prompted fundamental shifts in educational policies and the manner in which schools are governed and led. Educational leadership and teacher performance across Australian government and independent schools have been under great scrutiny and national and state government reforms have been implemented to improve educational outcomes, teacher performance and the overall quality of leadership. With greater leadership autonomy, school principals will, inevitably, hold greater accountability and responsibility for the planning and implementation of educational goals, school improvement, professional development, resourcing levels, systematic evaluations and more (Scott, 1990). It is clear from the existing literature that a principal’s role is no longer straightforward and subsequently the expectations of teachers have intensified and become more complex.

While various connections between leadership and job satisfaction have previously been recognised both internationally and across larger organisations, few empirical studies have related teachers’ perceptions of leadership styles and job satisfaction in the context of educational settings. This study aims to narrow the existing gap and shortage of literature pertaining to teachers’ perspectives of leadership behaviour in relation to their own job satisfaction in Australian educational settings.

The independent (non-government) school context was chosen for this study due to its autonomous leadership approach, governance structure and increasing student enrolment. In particular, the aim of this study was to examine transformational and transactional styles
of leadership in relation to several measures of job satisfaction, including: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition.

The participants were 211 NSW independent primary school teachers. The study used a quantitative methodology and data were collected using two survey instruments: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ). A demographic survey with a general comments section was also included.

Findings from the study revealed that participants perceived their leaders as being more transformational than transactional in their styles of leadership. The majority of participants were found to be satisfied in their jobs, and the results determined a very strong positive relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was considered 26.12 times higher when led by a principal using a transformational style of leadership rather than a transactional style of leadership. These findings add to the current dearth of theoretical and empirical literature pertaining to teachers’ perspectives of leadership behaviour in relation to their own job satisfaction. The findings strongly suggest that teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership styles are significantly related to teacher job satisfaction, therefore, raising high interest for future research development and practical application in educational settings.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

The educational environment world over is undergoing relentless change, transformation and reform. Student populations are more diverse, single parent and disadvantaged families are on the rise, numbers of special needs students are increasing and educational policies and societal changes have placed more demands and pressures on teachers and principals (ABS, 2011). Almost every aspect of a school’s management, leadership and governance structure has become increasingly complex, dynamic and demanding. As a result of the evolution of education in the 21st Century, a teacher’s role, a principal’s responsibilities and the overall expectations on students have been transformed. Today's schools are not as they used to be.

Initiatives, such as the Gillard Government’s 2012 national reform ‘Empowering Local Schools’ has instigated major national and state changes to improve educational outcomes, teacher performance and the overall quality of leadership in schools. While it can be said that Australian government schools deliver good educational outcomes at a reasonable cost, government school student numeracy and literacy achievements are declining, student numbers are dropping, and students attending these schools have increased by less than two per cent in the same amount of time as their non-government school counterparts (ABS, 2011). Comparatively, in all states and territories across Australia, the number of students attending non-government schools has risen and the proportion of the workforce employed in that sector is increasing at a far greater rate than government schools (Productivity Commission, 2011). Catholic and independent schools have had the largest
overall proportional increase in student numbers over the last five years, with a 20 per cent increase (ABS, 2011).

In the past, non-government and independent schools have benefitted from far greater leadership autonomy than most government schools, although as a result of the above-mentioned findings, the national and state reforms will see New South Wales Government schools taking on greater leadership autonomy, similar to that currently being practised in independent schools.

Of the states in Australia, Victorian schools have previously had the most overall leadership autonomy in the government sector (ABS, 2011; Productivity Commission, 2011). Western Australian government schools are currently implementing an Independent Public Schools Program (IPS) and the Gillard Government’s 2012 national reform Empowering Local Schools, means that New South Wales government schools are progressively following suite. This new initiative will see the implementation of leadership standards concerning assessment, accountability and a decentralization of responsibilities across government schools nation-wide (Caldwell & Spinks, 1998; De Nobile & McCormick, 2006; Productivity Commission, 2011).

Despite the fact that non-government and independent schools have traditionally implemented greater leadership autonomy, very little, if any empirical research can be found on the ‘leadership styles’ being carried out in these schools. Of particular importance, the success of these schools in terms of leadership has not been thoroughly examined, particularly when related to a set of teacher job satisfaction variables and the overall success of these schools as organisations.
Additionally, various connections between leadership variables and measures of job satisfaction have been recognised internationally and across larger organisations. However, few empirical studies have related transformational and transactional leadership styles against job satisfaction measures in the context of educational settings, as perceived by teachers themselves. Educational research advocates such as Leithwood, Begley and Cousins (1998), Scott and Dinham (1998, 1998b; 2003), Crum and Sherman (2008), Sherman, Beaty, Crum et al., (2010), believe that the job role of a principal in today’s society is poorly understood, and deeper research in the area is required if a broader understanding of the job role in all its facets is to be achieved.

It is clear that managerial responsibilities, resultant accountabilities, increased workload and the day-to-day role of a school principal and a classroom teacher are becoming increasingly multifaceted (Crum & Sherman, 2008; Sherman, Beaty, Crum et al., 2010). In many situations, both principals and teachers may not have had the appropriate training or relevant professional development to equip themselves with the many challenges they are currently expected to undertake. “The factors that once influenced a teacher’s job satisfaction are no longer confined to the microcosm of the school” (Sergiovanni, 1967, Herzberg, et. al., 1959), and instead, encompass factors at the system level, as well as including wider social forces (Dinham & Scott, 2000, p. 4).

By strengthening the leadership, and promoting quality teaching at a school level, student outcomes could be improved (Clinton, 2008; Hattie, 2009). Currently, each independent school sector and jurisdiction pursues various strategies to improve the quality and depth of school leaders’ skills. Of critical importance, however, is the extent to which the centralised ‘control’ of these school sectors and jurisdictions may be limiting the capacity
of principals to exercise leadership, and the effects these limitations have on a principal’s
time and ability to improve the overall quality of teaching and learning in their schools.

It is imperative for educational organisations to start examining principal leadership in
their organisations as a means to making positive improvements to teachers’ perceptions
that may contribute to building successful learning environments (Adamowski, Therriault
& Cavanna, 2007). Recent and foreshadowed policies facilitating greater school autonomy
and support from central agencies on matters such as training, teacher standards, and
curriculum are needed (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Adamowski, Therriault & Cavanna, 2007;
Eck & Goodwin, 2010).

The aim of this study was to investigate the independent school sector, where leadership
autonomy, accountability and a decentralization of responsibilities has long been
implemented and is well established. Of key interest was the nature and style of leadership
currently being practised in these schools and the relationship that these leadership styles
have against job satisfaction measures such as: supervision, colleagues, working
conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition.

In particular, transformational and transactional leadership styles were reviewed.
Advocates in educational research and policy-making believe that transformational styles
of leadership could assist principals in addressing the emergent demands of the
aforementioned policy and structural reforms. Leithwood and Jantzi (1990; 1992; 2000),
Steinbach (1999) and Silins (1994), suggest that a transformational leadership approach
could contribute to a range of positive organisational outcomes and assist leaders in their
endeavours to improve school policies and practices, whilst aiming to become more effective leaders and managers of teachers (and people in general).

The study used a quantitative methodology that examined the transformational and transactional styles of leadership in relation to a set of job satisfaction variables, as previously mentioned. Data were collected using a survey utilising two instruments and comprising four sections: a demographic survey, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire and a general comments section. Descriptive and inferential procedures such as t-tests, Chi-Squares, correlations and multiple regressions were used for data analysis and to test the hypotheses. A total of 211 NSW independent primary school teachers, from all-girls, all-boys and co-education schools varying in region, school size and religious denomination participated in the study.

The findings of this study will have important practical and theoretical implications for the implementation, development and overall improvement of leadership, leadership autonomy and teacher job satisfaction. This chapter is divided into the following areas: background to the study, research questions and associated hypotheses, the significance of the study and the overall structure of the thesis.
1.2 Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study aimed to answer three main questions and test three hypotheses. Below are the descriptions of the three research questions and the associated hypothesis of each.

Research Question 1 / Hypothesis 1

RQ1. What style of leadership is being practised in NSW independent primary schools, as perceived by primary school teachers?

H1. A transformational style of leadership will be practised across NSW independent primary schools, as perceived by primary school teachers.

The first question aimed to investigate what styles of leadership were being practised in NSW independent primary schools as perceived by primary school teachers. This was a key question to the study as it was unknown whether or not a leader’s style of leadership was a factor contributing to a teacher’s job satisfaction.

Research suggests that transformational leaders are leaders who are visionary and authentic, and who use transforming methods of leadership to change and improve organisations (Yukl, 2009). They consider individual differences, take time to improve standards and care about the needs of others. They promote intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation, and they encourage collegiality (Bass, 1990).

In a recent survey, parents contended that the most significant reason for sending their children to independent schools was for the educational excellence, good teachers, supportive, caring, ‘disciplined’ environment and good facilities (ISCA, 2008). Given the
unique governance and autonomous leadership model practised in independent schools, principals and their school boards have full accountability and responsibility for the way in which these schools are run.

This means that principals in these schools have full responsibility over matters such as the planning and implementation of educational goals and the overall standards concerning educational excellence. They are responsible for the employment of all staff, as well as for the monetary and budgeting requirements. They are required to maintain high standards of professional development, and implement current school resources and facilities. They are responsible for the reputation and overall well-being of all those associated with the school.

It could be hypothesised, therefore, that the nation-wide increase in student enrolments across the independent school sector could be owing to the unique governance structure and autonomous leadership model being practised in these schools. It could be implied that this level of leadership autonomy allows principals full control over matters deemed highly significant to parents, for the attainment of a well-rounded education.

As a result it was hypothesised that the leadership being practised by principals in independent primary schools would be predominantly transformational, through which the emphasis of maintaining quality education and ensuring educational excellence was a priority.
Research Question 2 / Hypothesis 2

RQ2. How do primary school teachers working in NSW independent primary schools perceive their job satisfaction?

H2. Primary school teachers working in NSW independent primary schools will be satisfied in their teaching jobs.

The second question aimed to investigate job satisfaction, as perceived by primary school teachers in NSW independent primary schools. Key to the study was to determine whether or not primary school teachers perceived themselves as being satisfied or dissatisfied in their teaching jobs.

Research suggests that job satisfaction can be both positively and negatively related to one’s work. Scholars such as Birkeland and Johnson (2003) believe that high levels of job satisfaction are linked to positive behaviours, higher work productivity and work performance levels, while low levels of job satisfaction are linked to negative behaviours, lower productivity and lower levels of work performance. The level of job satisfaction within an organisation can be judged in terms of overall well-being, mental health, physical health, staff turnover and work performance.

Of particular interest, it was important to determine the underlying contributing factors associated with a teacher’s job satisfaction, and to what degree these factors were owing to work-related issues other than the leadership in the school: for example, previous research has suggested that job satisfaction could be associated with: supervision, collegial relationships, working conditions, responsibility, salary, work itself, advancement and
recognition (Lester, 1987; Lester & Bishop, 1997). This particular question aimed to determine the weighting of these factors when not related to leadership.

In earlier discussion, it was mentioned that in all states and territories across Australia, the workforce employed in non-government schools is increasing at a far greater rate than in government schools (Productivity Commission, 2011). It was also mentioned that the most significant reason for parents to send their children to independent schools was predominantly for the good teachers (ISCA, 2008). If research suggests that high levels of work performance and productivity levels are a result of high job satisfaction, then it could be assumed that the increased employment and positive teacher feedback are a result of high job satisfaction within these educational environments.

It was hypothesised, therefore, that the national-wide increase in ‘teacher’ employment across the independent school sector could be owing to the fact that these schools promote higher job satisfaction in terms of providing staff with the facilities and opportunities to take on greater responsibility and accountability for their own work. It could be assumed that the working conditions are satisfactory and meet the needs of the modern-day teacher. If supportive, caring, ‘disciplined’ learning environments are promoted, teachers may place greater emphasis on the teaching and learning aspects of education, as opposed to the discipline of children.

As a result, it was hypothesised that if a teacher’s job satisfaction were to be examined in terms of the following measures: collegiality, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition, then teachers in independent primary schools would be predominantly satisfied in their teaching positions.
Research Question 3 / Hypothesis 3

**RQ3.** *What is the relationship between school principals’ leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction?*

**H3.** The relationship between school principals’ leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction will be positively related to transformational leadership styles and negatively related to transactional styles of leadership.

The third question aimed to investigate the relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. It was important to determine how leadership styles related to the job satisfaction of teachers and in particular how transformational and transactional leadership behaviours related to teacher job satisfaction factors such as: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, recognition and advancement.

According to Fullan (2008) “effective leadership inspires more than it empowers, it connects more than it controls, it demonstrates more than it decides” (p. 16). The goal of transformational leaders, therefore, is to inspire subordinates to share the leader’s values and connect with the leader’s vision. This connection is manifested through the genuine concern and supportive supervision provided to subordinates and in turn promoting measures such as relationships, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, recognition and advancement – all vital measures of one’s job satisfaction.

Transformational leaders encourage their subordinates by sharing ideas, thoughts and areas of expertise to reach common goals for the benefit of the organization. Furthermore, when transformational leaders are connected with their subordinates, morale is boosted and
motivation strengthened. When transformational styles of leadership are being displayed, employees should be more satisfied, as opposed to dissatisfied, in their jobs.

Additionally, Kouzes and Posner (1987) found that “when you strengthen others, your level of influence with them is increased. When you go out of your way on behalf of others, you build up credit with them – credit that may be drawn upon when extraordinary efforts are required” (Kouzes & Posner, 1987, p. 165).

Owing to the above explanations and those mentioned in research questions one and two, it was assumed that in schools where principals are inspirational and motivational, and where levels of aspiration are being heightened, then job satisfaction will be higher and teachers will be happier, educational excellence will be promoted and supportive, caring, ‘disciplined’ environments will be sustained. It was, therefore, hypothesised that transformational leadership styles will be positively related to teacher job satisfaction and transactional leadership styles will be negatively related to teacher job satisfaction.
1.3 Definitions

The following definitions were used in this study:

**Transformational Leadership:**
Transformational leadership is “the engagement of one or more persons with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (Burns, 1978, p. 20).

*Transformational leaders (Bass, 1985) promote leadership characteristics such as:*

1. Idealised Attributed
2. Idealised Behaviour
3. Inspirational Motivation
4. Intellectual Stimulation
5. Individualized Consideration

**Transactional Leadership:**
Burns (1978) noted that transactional leadership occurs “when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things” (p. 19).

*Transactional leaders (Bass, 1985) promote leadership characteristics such as:*

1. Contingent Reward
2. Management-by-Exception (Active)
3. Management-by-Exception (Passive)
4. Laissez-faire
Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction may be defined as favourable or positive feelings about work or the work environment (Furnham, 1997) and describes how happy people are with their jobs. It can also be defined in terms of unfavourable or negative feelings about work or the work environment, and describes how un-happy or dissatisfied people are with their jobs. A widely accepted definition offered by Locke (1976) states that job satisfaction can be defined as "the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the perception of one’s job as fulfilling or allowing the fulfilment of one’s important job values” (p. 1342).

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

The MLQ is an instrument created by Bass (1985) and further developed by Bass and Avolio (1990). It includes characteristics of Transformational Leadership: Idealised Attributed, Idealised Behaviour, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration, and factors of Transactional Leadership: Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception (Active), Management-by-Exception (Passive) and Laissez-faire. The MLQ has been used and tested in various organisational settings world-wide and has proven to be a reliable and valid instrument in the area of educational settings.

Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)

The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) is a 77-item questionnaire based on the research of Maslow and Herzberg and developed by Lester (1987) to measure the job satisfaction of teachers working predominantly in educational settings. The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ), developed by Lester (1987) is a Likert scale questionnaire (Likert, 1932) and contains items relating to supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, recognition, advancement, security and pay
(Lester & Bishop, 1997). Translated into several languages, the TJSQ has been used worldwide and has proven to be a reliable and valid instrument in the area of educational settings.

**Subordinate**

For the purpose of this study, subordinates are referred to as teachers working closely with school principals.

**Principal**

Most commonly used in the independent school sector to represent the school principal or leader of the school is the term ‘Headmaster’, ‘Head of School’, or ‘Deputy Head of School’. To ensure continuity and to avoid confusion throughout the thesis, the term ‘Principal’ has been used. The term ‘Principal’ was also chosen as it was the most commonly used term in the literature and when referring to leadership in educational settings.
## 1.4 List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Companion of the Order of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACARA</td>
<td>Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>The Association of Independent Schools NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISR</td>
<td>Australian Institute for Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Officer of the Order of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>The Department of Education and Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEWR</td>
<td>Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMT</td>
<td>Great Man Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEU</td>
<td>Independent Education Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Literacy and Basic Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLN</td>
<td>Language Literacy and Numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRS</td>
<td>National Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ</td>
<td>Research Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJSQ</td>
<td>Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Significance of the Study

This study is significant for a number of reasons.

Firstly, this study is unique, being the first of its kind to focus primarily on the principal leadership styles and behaviours in relation to teacher job satisfaction as perceived by primary school teachers across NSW independent primary schools. Currently, the number of independent school students across NSW has increased proportionally and so too has the proportion of the teaching workforce in this sector. At this given time, a review of the leadership practices being carried out in these schools is timely. Additionally, most independent school structures are K-12, which can sometimes result in the primary school division being overlooked. This study is significant as it focuses primarily on the leadership, and perceptions of teachers working in the primary school (K-6) division only. This represents an important step toward identifying and examining principal leadership styles in independent primary schools.

Secondly, the conceptual framework used to guide this study is unique, with no such configuration of variables having been used in the study of independent primary schools across NSW. The conceptual framework driving this study consists of the combination of leadership and job satisfaction theories and instruments including: Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959); Dinham and Scott’s Three Domain Theory (Dinham & Scott, 2000); The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2004); and, The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Lester (1987). This provides scope for the development of fresh insights into the leadership styles and behaviours across NSW independent schools and to some extent, into organisations in general.
Thirdly, relationships between leadership variables and measures of job satisfaction are examined. The results will contribute knowledge to the existing literature on principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction.

The study has practical implications for school administrators, consultants and principals. Principals are often in the best position to change school cultures, and the leadership styles and behaviours that create the culture of a school (Kottkamp, 1984; Collard, 1990; Flynn, 1993). This study may assist principals and school administrators to improve policies and practices, to respond to problems related to the job satisfaction of staff members and to improve their existing leadership styles and their current behaviours, thereby becoming more effective managers of people.

The findings of this study provide further insight into the aspects of workplace culture in independent primary schools and the effects leadership behaviours can have on teachers’ job satisfaction: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition. The insights gained from this study will add to the current literature concerning workplace culture, and it will also contribute to current knowledge of the culture of NSW independent primary schools.

Furthermore, this study is significant because the perceptions of primary school teachers only will be included. This is a response to the dearth of research into job satisfaction of teachers as perceived by teachers.
1.6 Summary

This chapter provided an introduction to the study. It discussed the background, purposes and significance of the study and presented the three central research questions that guided the study. Additionally, the extent of the study was outlined and any assumptions based on previous literature were introduced and explained.

1.7 The Structure of the Thesis

In line with the concerns of the current study, the next chapter will review the literature pertaining to principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction: teacher morale, motivation, collegiate relationships and work productivity. Following this, the method and instruments employed in this research will be outlined and presented in chapter 3. A full analysis of the results will be presented with particular emphasis on the questions and hypotheses of the study in chapter 4. A detailed comparative discussion of the results will be presented in chapter 5. Finally, a conclusion will be presented outlining recommendations, limitations of the study and directions for future research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter comprises four inter-connected sections. In the first section, NSW non-government independent schools are defined and the context and features are explained. The independent school leadership and governance structure are briefly outlined, including possible reasons for the steady rise in student numbers in these organisations. Literature specifically pertaining to leadership autonomy and the significance of leadership in relation to teacher job satisfaction in these settings is examined.

In the second section, the concept of leadership is defined and transformational and transactional styles of leadership are briefly canvassed. More specifically, literature pertaining to leadership in educational settings is examined, and literature across other organisations is also reviewed to obtain a broader view.

In the third section, the concept of job satisfaction is defined and explained. Empirical research and relevant theories concerning job satisfaction in various organisations, especially in school settings are critiqued. Job satisfaction variables from the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1987), such as supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition are introduced.

The fourth section includes a discussion of the relationship between leadership and teacher job satisfaction, which is the core of this study. Analysis of the relationships between leadership and other organisational aspects such as teacher efficacy, teacher well-being, teacher morale and teacher job satisfaction are reviewed. Leadership styles that relate
positively or negatively to teacher job satisfaction are also reviewed in context with the seven measures of job satisfaction including: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition.

2.2 Independent (Non-Government) Schools – Context and Setting

Independent schools in Australia are a diverse group of non-government schools serving a range of different communities, including small and large co-educational, single-sex, day and boarding schools. They cater for students across metropolitan, rural and remote areas. Unlike government schools, many independent schools offer a religious or values-based education fundamental to the beliefs and practices of particular religious cultures or entities, such as: Anglican, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Islamic or Jewish denominations. Some independent schools, such as Montessori or Rudolf Steiner, promote a particular philosophy or interpretation of mainstream education. Additionally, some independent schools are Aboriginal community schools, while others are designed to meet the needs of students living with disability (ISCA, 2011).

In contrast to that of government schools, which are governed by their state department and publically funded, most independent schools are independently governed by their own board of management (the school board). In most instances, the school stands as an independent entity, acquiring and managing its own assets. However, some independent schools with common aims, educational philosophies (such as the Lutheran system) are governed and administered as small systems and are owned by the church or the community organisation to which they are affiliated. Independent schools are not-for-profit organisations. Any income they do receive is directed to meeting the operating costs of the
school, or invested in providing resources for improving the school’s facilities, as determined by the principal and the school board (Productivity Commission, 2011).

Independent school principals and school boards have full responsibility for the school finances and budgets, overall management and governance, implementation of policies, staffing and resources. Each independent school has its own policy for student enrolments, which usually reflect the characteristics, religious denomination or educational philosophy of that particular school. The majority of independent schools are open to all students, however, substantial annual fees are required and in some instances academic merit is a condition of entry. Despite some independent schools offering a range of student scholarships and bursaries to assist with the payment of fees, many students are not eligible for such advantages.

Despite the fact that independent school principals do not have control over such matters as the religious denomination, conditions of student entry or the overall educational philosophy, they are fully responsible for the manner in which these policies are implemented in the school and the wider community. While such arrangements can be highly advantageous, there is the risk that closed bureaucratic systems can develop. This is dependent largely on the quality and values held by the leadership. Educators such as Duignan and Macpherson (1992), Sergiovanni (1992), Starratt (1994), Duignan and Bhindi (1997a) and Bhindi and Duignan (1997) are all advocates of authentic leadership. They believe that leadership is “centrally concerned with ethics and morality and with deciding what is significant, what is right and what is worthwhile” (Duignan, 2004, p. 2). They believe that leadership and administrative life are driven by these values, although when
these values are absent or not being practised, organisations can become ‘toxic environments’ (Bhindi, 2008).

In all states and territories of Australia, the number of non-government school students has increased proportionally more than that of government students in the last five years (ABS, 2011). The steady rise in independent school student enrolments showed that in the year 2000, the number of government schools fell by 223 schools, while that of non-government schools increased by 91 during the same time (ABS, 2011). Most of this growth started occurring prior to 2005 and has remained stable. In 2010, there were 1,017 independent schools in Australia, which enrolled some 492,146 full-time equivalent (FTE) students, which was an increase of 7,653 students in one year. This also represented 14 percent of all Australian school enrolments compared with 20 percent for the Catholic sector and 66 percent for government (ABS, 2011).

The proportion of the teaching workforce employed in non-government schools has steadily risen in line with a similarly changing pattern of student enrolments (Productivity Commission, 2011). While there could be a myriad of reasons for the decline and rise in numbers across the government and non-government school systems, the Independent Schools Council of Australia (ISCA, 2008) carried out research to investigate the main factors affecting school choice amongst parents. The most significant reasons parents chose to send their children to independent schools were for educational excellence, good teachers, a supportive and caring environment, discipline and good facilities.

An overwhelming majority of parents indicated that combined with the high standard of teaching, parents highly recommended sending their children to independent schools due to
the fact that independent schools met the educational outcomes desired by parents with children attending these schools (ISCA, 2008). Ideally, they wanted their children to be happy. They believed that independent schools provided this type of environment.

Cost-related issues were significantly cited throughout the study in response to questions about the disadvantages of independent schools and the reasons for not recommending an independent school to others. Regardless of this cost, however, parents revealed that they continued to send their children to independent schools, in the belief that the ‘educational package’ provided significant longer-term educational outcomes. Parents stated that they wanted their children learning in a safe, protective environment that provided both academic and personal development. They wanted their children to obtain a ‘well-rounded’ education with a strong emphasis on learning life skills (ISCA, 2008). They considered that these outcomes would better prepare their children for future employment opportunities, therefore, sending their children to independent schools was an investment in their future (ISCA, 2008, 2011). Of great importance, it was cited that the employment of ‘good teachers’ was the most influential factor in their decision to send their children to an independent school (ISCA, 2008).

If the ‘high standard of teaching’ and the ‘good teachers’ are the most influential factors for independent school choice amongst parents, it would be in the best interest of school principals to ensure that these teachers are recognised for their efforts, rewarded accordingly and shown what they do is appreciated so they will want to remain within that particular educational setting. Schools in which there are high teacher dissatisfaction rates can ultimately cause issues in many areas, such as teacher morale, teacher turnover, and
student achievement. Fullan (2008) contends, “effective leadership inspires more than it empowers; it connects more than it controls; it demonstrates more than it decides” (p. 16).

An effective principal can assist in creating an environment that promotes positive teacher perceptions and a positive learning environment for all students and teachers alike. It would be fair to say that teachers’ perceptions are related to one of the fastest-growing concerns principals are currently faced with. Based on the work of scholars such as Atwater, Yammarino and Roush et al., (1992; 1995; 1998) it has been suggested that the ways in which managers are perceived and evaluated by others are important determinants of leadership success. However, self-perceptions and subordinate perceptions often differ in their judgement of behaviours and perceptions constituting leadership and managerial effectiveness. This study has adopted this approach, and the perceptions of the leader’s subordinates have been included. Thus, teachers’ perceptions are pertinent to the success of schools, and leaders must understand how their leadership practices can affect the teachers they lead (Coleman, 2011).

Owing to its autonomous leadership and governance model, the independent (non-government) school context was chosen for this study to gain a better understanding of the leadership practices utilised in these schools and how teachers perceive their principal’s leadership style. This research aims to discover whether independent school teachers feel recognised and rewarded for their efforts, whether they feel appreciated, and whether they are provided with opportunities for advancement. Overall, the research seeks to find out whether teachers perceive themselves as being satisfied in their current educational settings – in terms of the leadership style being practised.
The following section defines, explains and reviews leadership. It is important to gain a sound knowledge of how leadership is being represented in the context of the current study, i.e., the independent (non-government) schools sector. Therefore, key components of leadership, leadership styles and leadership factors are presented primarily in relation to educational settings, with additional analysis of leadership across larger organisations for broader scope.

2.3 Leadership

Leadership is a robust concept that occurs among all people, regardless of culture. According to Bass (1981), the study of leadership is an ancient art, which suggests that the success of any institution or endeavour has been due to effective leadership. In the light of current educational reforms impacting on Australian schools, the field of leadership study has received considerable attention.

Educational organisations need to start examining the leadership in their organisations as a way of making positive improvements and to build successful and effective learning environments. This particularly applies to independent (non-government) schools, in which greater leadership autonomy is implemented. It is imperative for these empowered leaders to examine student outcomes, teacher performance and most importantly, teacher job satisfaction.

While in literature there is no shortage of definitions pertaining to leadership, definitions vary in accordance to the context, aim and purpose in which the studies have been conducted. As Stogdill (1974) once quoted, “[There are] almost as many definitions of
leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (p.259). According to the Oxford Dictionaries Online (2012), “leadership may be defined as the action of leading a group of people or an organisation; to lead is to be in the state or position of being a leader.” Northouse (2007) also defines leadership as being a “process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 3). Furthermore, Burns (1978), primarily working in the field of politics, and widely known for his influential work in the field of leadership states:

“I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivation – the wants and the needs, the aspirations and expectations – of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers’ values and motivations” (p. 19).

These definitions imply that leadership is an action or a process of leading, influencing or motivating others to achieve a desired goal. Many scholars including Burns (1978) and Ciulla (2004) agree that leadership not only consists of these factors, but also includes deep and complex relationships. They argue that leadership is not only an action or process of influence, but it seeks to better understand the complex relationship that exists between a leader and those being led. According to Ciulla (2004) “leadership is not a person or a position. It is a complex moral relationship between people, based on trust, obligation, commitment, emotion, and a shared vision of the good” (p.xv). Ciulla’s definition suggests that leadership not only focuses primarily on the implementation and daily constraints of administration, but also on relationship building, team work, commitment and a shared vision to reach common goals.
These definitions suggest that a leader’s main aim is to empower and guide others in a way that encourages them to achieve personal goals. They imply a process of transformation. A leader, who encourages, supports, guides and empowers others, is one who distributes the control of leadership from self to others. A transformation of empowerment occurs, so that others take on greater responsibility and accountability for achieving set goals, thus gaining a greater sense of personal and collective achievement.

Drawing on these selected definitions, leadership can be viewed in a number of ways. The main theme occurring across all definitions is that leadership is an action or a process of leading or influencing others to achieve a desired goal. Leadership entails moral and ethical relationships sustained through trust, commitment, direction, emotion and inspiration, and requires teamwork, commitment, relationship building and a shared vision. Leadership for the purpose of the current study suggests that a leader’s aim is to empower, transform and guide those being led, to support them to achieve greater accomplishments. Leadership is active, not passive.

2.4 Leadership Theories

Background information is essential to the evolution in leadership, which has over the years influenced leadership theories. Much of what is known about leadership has emerged as a result of leadership theories, admiration of leaders with specific attributes, and culture-specific traditions that have influenced good from bad leadership practices.

Such received knowledge, experience and on-going leadership research helps an understanding of how leadership has been conceptualized, how authority and power have
been exercised and why leaders behave as they do. Importantly, this background knowledge also gives vital clues about the values underpinning leadership practices and the impact of leadership behaviour on the followers’ motivation and morale, work ethics and sense of wellbeing.

Researchers of leadership have produced theories involving leadership traits (Locke, Kirkpatrick, Wheeler et al., 1991), situational interaction, function, behaviour, participation, power, vision and values (Richards & Engle, 1986), intelligence and charisma, among others.

While earlier leadership theories focused on the qualities and attributes that distinguished a leader from a follower, and explained individuals’ effectiveness as leaders (Galton, 1869; Galton & Eysenck, 1869), succeeding theories have looked at other variables such as situational factors, proficiency levels and relationships. Some of the most commonly cited theories in literature pertaining to leadership include the great man theories, trait theories, contingency theories, situational theories, behavioural theories, participative theories, management theories and relationship theories. A brief description of these leadership theories, with relevance to the current study, is discussed in the following section.

The great man theory (GMT) of leadership is a concept dating back to the 19th century and is the source from which much of the leadership literature originates (Burns, 1978; Bennis, 1989; Bass, 1990). The great man theory assumes that leadership is inherent and that great leaders are born, not made. Napoleon is a good example of a ‘great male leader’ who believed he was born to lead and that leadership was inherent. Cited in the work of Bass (Bass, 1990), Napoleon is said to have expressed his belief about the importance of
leadership by stating that he would “rather have an army of rabbits led by a lion than an army of lions led by a rabbit” (p. 8).

The term ‘great man’ was applied originally because prior-to and including that period, leadership was almost entirely a male responsibility, particularly in military-based leadership. It describes great male leaders (Northouse, 2007) as being heroic, gallant and destined to rise when needed. In today’s society, a male’s responsibility has changed, gender equity has become more prominent and the underlying tone of masculinity in reference to leadership is less a focus. The actual term ‘great man’, therefore, is rarely used as this term provides no reference to woman, themes of femininity or female traits. It provides no due credit to great woman leaders, nor makes any reference to women being heroic, gallant and destined to rise when needed. However, the underlying notion and concepts of the ‘great man’ theory have carried over and can be found as the foundation from which much of the following literature originates including transformational styles of leadership, a theory that is championed throughout this study (Burns, 1978; Bennis, 1989; Bass, 1990).

Furthermore, in relation to the current study, many of the concepts that underpin the great man theory are also present in a transformational style of leadership and can be applied to leadership in schools today. Many great leaders (both men and women) in history have at most been more transformational, than transactional in their leadership styles (Bass, 1985). It can be said that these leaders stood up for what they believed, and through determination their personalities and ideas were influential. Many leaders of history made huge sacrifices. There was little evidence of any transactions being made. To be “transactional was considered the easy way out; to be transformational was the more difficult path to pursue”
(Bass, 1985). When associated with the leadership in schools today, and considering the extant pressures placed on school principals, then it can be understood that the transactional ‘easy way out option’ of leadership may be most desirable for some. A deeper understanding of these transformational leadership styles and the benefits of their outcomes is vital for the improvement of whole-school outcomes.

Mann (1959), who carried out extensive research on literature advocating the great man theory, indicated that intelligence, masculinity, adjustment, dominance, extroversion and conservatism were all traits of these leaders (Mann, 1959; Northouse, 2004). The great man theory is a prime example of situations in which a combination of behaviours is required for success. While transactional style behaviours such as extroversion, dominance, masculinity and conservatism may be considered undesirable in today’s society, when tempered with transformational styles of leadership and managed effectively, these traits may be the very thing that leads a team and in this case, a school, to victory.

**Trait theories** were also explored at length in the 19th century by many researchers, and were incorporated in the popular works of scholars such as Thomas Carlyle (1841, 1869, 2001) and Francis Galton (1869). Trait theories examine the study of human personality, whereby traits, habitual patterns of behaviour, thought and emotion are measured. Similar to that of the great man theory, Carlyle and Galton believed the traits of a leader were inherited, leaders were born, not developed and that leadership was rooted in characteristics of the leader. Both Carlyle and Galton identified the talents, skills, and physical characteristics of men who rose to power, as well as identifying leadership qualities in the families of powerful men. It is vital to recognize and identify leadership
qualities of the past if today’s leaders are to fully understand and improve current models of leadership in the future.

Early research on leadership often emphasized that leaders inherited certain characteristics or traits (Bass, 1990b) and that these traits could not be learned or taught. Problematic in most educational settings is that school leadership is not inherent. More often than not, leaders in schools are neither employed nor trained in the first instance as school leaders. Most commonly, school teachers are promoted to the position of leader due to teaching merit, length of employment, relationships within the school and requirements of the school – but not due to their leadership skills. In the earlier works of Stogdill (1974), these inherent characteristics were studied to determine if other people who had such traits would also become great leaders. However, by using this theory, Stogdill found it difficult to explain how people who were not leaders or interested in leadership, possessed exactly the same qualities and unique traits that were considered the making of a great leader. The above theories, therefore, required much deeper consideration in terms of leadership theory, what constituted leadership and whether or not leadership could in fact be taught. Pertinent to this study are the following questions: can teachers be taught how to become great leaders and if so, what styles of leadership should be taught?

Also critical to the current study and educational settings in general, is the realisation that the above theories did not consider contributing factors such as a leader’s environmental, situational or contingency factors in the application of leadership. Fiedler (1967), widely known for the Fiedler contingency model, based a leader’s effectiveness on situational contingency. His theory defined two types of leaders as ‘relationship-oriented’ and ‘task-
oriented’, both of which Fiedler believed were effective if and when their leadership orientation fitted the situation (Fieldler, 1967).

According to this theory, there is no ideal leader and no ideal leadership style that best suits any particular educational setting as “there is no one best way of organising” (Morgan, 2007). Leadership success in educational settings would, therefore, depend upon a number of factors and variables, including the leadership style, traits, qualities and most importantly, the relationship between the teachers in the school and the school principal with respect to the situation and the environment. In summary contingency theories maintained that a particular style of leadership was determined most suitable when related to a particular set of variables associated with the organisation’s environment. Burns and Stalker et al. (2009) contend that no single leadership style was best when designing organisational structures.

Similar to that of contingency theory is the situational leadership theory, which originated in the works of Hersey and Blanchard (Fieldler, 1967) and is also based on the notion that there is no best way to lead (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). This theory implies that effective school leaders are those who can adapt their leadership style to the educational setting for which they are responsible (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). Set on the premise that effective school leadership is dependent on each school’s unique situation, school leaders are required to choose the best course of action based upon that situation.

This style of leadership was characterised in terms of task and relationship behaviours and included four main leadership styles: telling, selling, participating or delegating (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). It was determined that not one of the four specified leadership styles was
considered optimal for use individually, either at once or all the time. The best leadership style depended on the maturity level of the teachers associated with the group. Furthermore, the situational leadership theory rests itself on the leadership style of the school principal and the maturity levels of the teachers associated with the school. Teachers with higher maturity levels were associated with confidence and capability while teachers with lower maturity levels were associated with inability and insecurity.

These previous theories suggest that the style of a principal in educational settings should be dependent on a combination of factors, including the behaviour and maturity levels of the teachers, the situation of the school and the school environment. It is implied that no single aspect of leadership should be associated with any particular educational setting at any one time, and that school principals need to be open-minded and adaptable for successful leadership to occur in these establishments. Furthermore, sceptics of the trait theories, such as Mann (1959) and Stogdill (1974), prompted further research and provoked scholars to look beyond leadership traits and start examining how the ‘behaviour’ of leaders predicted effectiveness (Derue, Nahrgang, Willman et al., 2011).

While meta-analytical evidence suggests that leaders’ behaviours are important predictors of leadership effectiveness, it was believed that the behaviour paradigm would provide basis for new theory (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Judge, Piccolo & Ilies, 2004). This led scholars such as Stogdill and Coons (1957) to analyse the behaviour of leaders at a deeper level, thus initiating structure and consideration, and establishing the behaviour paradigm of leadership research (Derue, Nahrgang, Willman et al., 2011).
The **behaviourism leadership theory** contrasted trait theories and introduced the concept that great leaders are ‘made’, not ‘born’. According to this theory, the focus is on the behaviour of the leader, rather than the qualities, traits or internal situations. The understanding and implications of this theory would mean that school teachers in educational settings could ‘learn’ to become principals’ through the teaching and observation, knowledge and understanding of good leadership practice.

Moreover, Lewin’s **participative leadership theory** (Lewin, 1946) states that the minds of many make better decisions than the judgment of a single mind alone. Lewin (1946) believed that the ‘behaviour’ of the school principal is central to achieving successful outcomes within the school, therefore when a principal takes into account the opinions of others, he/she will ultimately be more valued and appreciated. In turn, members of staff will be more dedicated to the decision-making practices as well as becoming more actively involved.

In further studies, participative leadership was examined in relation to the effect it had on children in educational settings. Lewin, Lippit and White (1939), established three main leadership styles: authoritarian/autocratic, participative/democratic and laissez-faire/delegative leadership styles. It was anticipated that the most effective style of leadership would be determined at the conclusion of a study carried out on primary-aged school children led by these leadership styles (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939; Jani, 2012). In their findings, it was discovered that the participative/democratic style of leadership was the most effective style of leadership.
These findings also revealed that authoritarian/autocratic leadership styles of leadership left little room for group decision-making and at times this style of leadership was viewed as controlling, bossy and dictatorial (Jani, 2012). Productive as this group may have seemed, it was discovered that these children had little to no opportunity for contribution, and found the concept of working independently difficult. When related to whole-school settings, it could also be assumed that the same findings would be evident with adults and would produce a style of leadership less than effective.

The laissez-faire/delegative style of leadership lacked enthusiasm and coordination. Of the three groups, this group was the least productive (Kendra, 2012). Little or no guidance was offered, and all decision-making was left to group members (in this case, small children). Scholars such as Kendra (2012) contend that delegative styles of leadership can be effective in situations where group members such as school teachers are highly qualified or hold expertise in a particular area, however this style of leadership often leads to poorly-defined roles and a lack of motivation, regardless of prowess.

Overall, it was revealed that a participative style of leadership was the most effective, offering its group members guidance, encouragement, consideration and input. The authoritarian style of leadership (despite appearing productive) lacked contribution, input and independence. The laissez-faire/delegative style of leadership was the least productive style, offering no guidance and leaving children to make all the decisions (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939; Kendra, 2012).

However, as a result of the scepticism that arose from these theories and styles of leadership, the next decade brought about much discussion around concepts such as
autocratic versus democratic, directive versus participative, task versus relationship, and initiation versus consideration (Bass, 1990). The findings from studies such as Lewin, Lippit and White’s (1939) also led to greater research and understanding of leadership styles, and of particular interest were the authoritarian/autocratic and the participative/democratic leadership styles, both of which, showed advantages and limitations to student achievement outcomes and work productivity in educational settings.

Thus, a surge of interest towards ‘transforming’ organisations and the promotion of change and development in individuals, groups, and organisations occurred. Theories such as the Relationship Theory, otherwise known as the Transformational Theory and the Management Theory also referred to as the Transactional Theory were introduced and became leadership styles of great interest and influence. Fundamental distinctions between these two styles of leadership have their roots in the seminal works of James Burns (1978) and Bernard M. Bass (Bass, 1985).

Burns (1978), on the one hand, provided the first comprehensive theory to better explain and understand the difference between transformational and transactional leadership. He explained transformational leadership in terms of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory (Maslow, 1954) with the understanding that transformational and transactional leadership were at opposing ends of a continuum. Bass (1985), on the other, contended that transformational and transactional leaderships are distinct processes, but that neither is mutually exclusive. He suggests that transformational leadership compliments the effects of transactional leadership. He uses the term transformational as transforming and transactional as transacting or trading one thing for another.
The primary difference between transformational and transactional styles of leadership is that transformational leadership is focused on positive transformations and positive change, and transactional leadership is focused on leader-subordinate exchange (Yukl, 1999), the role of the leader, the organisation and overall performance of the group.

In the following section, transformational and transactional leadership styles are reviewed in terms of educational settings. They are defined, explained and examined in terms of current and past literature.

2.5 Transformational Leadership

The Transformational Theory otherwise known as the Relationship Theory focuses on the relationship between leaders and followers. Transformational leaders are considered to have high ethical and moral standards and are those who motivate, influence and encourage people to work together.

Some examples of extraordinary transformational leaders may include: Nelson Mandela, Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr., Mother Theresa, and Franklin D. Roosevelt (Bass 1985). These ‘greats’ represent only a small percentage of leaders who fall under the classification of transformational leadership. Proponents of distributive/facilitative/authentic leadership such as Kouzes and Posner (1987) and Bhindi (2006) would agree, however that the success of these transformative leaders would have been ineffective without the authenticity, empowerment and collaboration of their peers (Bass 1985).
In the works of Bhindi (2006), Kouzes and Posner (1987) are cited stating that “leaders know that they cannot do it alone. It takes partners to get extraordinary things done in organizations. Leaders build teams with spirit and cohesion, teams that feel like family. They actively involve others in planning and give them discretion to make their own decisions. Leaders make others feel like owners, not hired hands” (p. 131). It is asserted that no matter how effective, competent or efficient a leader may be no leader can operate successfully alone. “They need the support and commitment of others as well” (Bhindi, 2006, p. 2).

It could be fair to say, that many characteristics of a transformational leadership stem from a combination of theories. In particular, Lewin’s participative leadership theory (1946) also recognises that the minds of many make better decisions than the judgment of a single mind alone, and therefore, supports a collaborative authentic style of leadership.

Transformational leadership in an educational setting would incorporate leadership that is visionary and authentic, and aimed to ‘transform’ not only the school, but also the teachers who work in it. Yukl (2009) defines transformational leadership as “the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organizational members and building commitment for the organization’s mission, objectives and strategies” (p. 24). This style of leadership considers the behaviours, traits and qualities of school principals and includes situational and contingency factors. The relationship between principal and teacher is of utmost importance, whereby predominantly democratic/participative leadership styles would be practised. In an educational setting, this style of leadership would build relationships between teachers and principals, as well as building trust and collegiality amongst staff.
Moreover, Bass (1990) surmises that transformational leaders offer a purpose that transcends short-term goals, whereby leaders influence, inspire, stimulate and mentor their followers, and thus have a greater impact on attitudinal change. In accordance, followers are inclined to trust, admire, respect and identify with the needs of the leader. The original works of Bass (1985; 1990b), who extended the work of Burns (1978) and who was influenced by Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory (1943), included three factors of transformational behaviour: idealised influence, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration. A later revision of the theory added attributed and behaviour forms of idealised influence as well as inspirational motivation. Each factor is based on behavioural measures that determine a leader’s level of influence, stimulation, consideration, inspiration and motivation as perceived by those rating them.

The first factor of transformational leadership is Idealized Influence. Idealized influence is a style of leadership that influences subordinates to view their leaders in an idealised way (Bass & Avolio, 2004). These leaders behave admirably, which usually causes followers to idealise and identify with them. In the case of a school setting, these leaders take stands for their teaching colleagues and appeal to them on an emotional level. The relationship is built on genuine trust and there is a solid moral and ethical foundation between the two parties (Covey, 2007).

Principals who are idealized leaders, envisage a desirable future, articulate how it can be reached, provide examples to be followed, show determination and confidence, and set high standards of performance (Bass, 1999b). Gerhardt (2004), believes that these leaders use “outstanding influence in order to move and motivate others to accomplish tasks beyond personal and organizational norms” (Gerhardt, 2004, p.2).
Researchers such as Kouzes and Posner (1987) found that by strengthening others, trust is built and a leader’s influence is more effective. If a school principal is seen to be going out of the way to help subordinates, their credit is increased – “credit that may be drawn upon when extraordinary efforts are required” (Kouzes & Posner, 1987). Kouzes and Posner (1987) also point out that “leaders create a sense of covenant when they help others to grow and develop. When the leader is viewed as helpful and appearing to be making decisions in the best interest of each member of staff, then they are more likely to be committed to the leader and the organisation’s goals.” It is when these characteristics are absent, as will be discussed in transactional styles of leadership, teachers are more likely to consider their commitment as being a “fair day’s work for a fair day’s pay … instead of exceeding minimums and giving their best” (Sergiovanni, 1991, p. 235).

The second factor of transformational leadership is one known as inspirational motivation. **Inspirational motivation** is the ability to inspire and motivate followers. It denotes a leader as a figure, who inspires and articulates a vision that is appealing. Inspirational leaders express, in simple ways, shared goals and mutual understanding of what is right and important; they inspire and they motivate (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

In an educational setting in which transformational change is being conducted, principals have the task of stimulating others to adopt new ideas. Principals who display behaviours of this leadership style encourage enthusiasm and optimism, rousing team work, pointing out positive results and advantages, and emphasizing aims, stimulating teachers and more (Simic, 1998). Principals displaying inspirational and motivational behaviours challenge their teaching subordinates with high standards, communicate a sense of optimism towards future goals, and provide meaning for the task at hand (Bass, 1999b). Importantly, teachers
also require a strong sense of purpose if they are to be motivated to act, and school principals need to acquire communication skills that allow their vision to be articulated in a persuasive way (Bass, 1999b).

Thirdly, a transformational leader is known for displaying **Intellectual Stimulation**. Intellectual stimulation is modelled when leaders pay attention to the developmental needs of followers, and support and coach their development to become more innovative and creative (Bass, 1999b). Bass and Avolio (2004) believe that principals who promote intellectual stimulation encourage teachers to question assumptions, their own beliefs and values, and when appropriate, those of the principal, which may be out-dated or inappropriate for solving current problems. Principals who promote intellectual stimulation help those in their presence to think about old problems in new ways (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

A principal who promotes intellectual stimulation willingly allows for a shift in power or distribution of leadership authority. Such leaders encourage their subordinates to take on greater responsibilities in the workplace as well as engage with key stakeholders to impart educational practice with a higher purpose and meaning (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997; Duignan & Bhindi, 1997a; Begley, 2001). Scholars such as Harris (2004) and Goethals, Sorenson et al. (2004) believe that this style of leadership “implies inter-dependency rather than dependency” and entails genuine and dependable leaders, who focus on a redistribution of power and a shift in authority across and within their organisation.

Interested in teacher empowerment, Blasé (1987) carried out research that drew upon teachers’ perceptions of empowerment across a range of schools in the United States. The
findings suggested that ‘teacher empowerment’ should focus on ‘leadership strategies’ of principals, and ways in which leaders’ impact on teachers’ sense of empowerment. The study also pointed to strategies and leader characteristics that influence teachers’ sense of empowerment. Some of these included: demonstrating greater trust in teachers, developing shared governance structures, encouraging/listening to individual input, and greater teacher autonomy, all of which fall under intellectual stimulation. Overall, Blasé (1987) believed that the significance of transformational leadership in relation to the development of teacher empowerment and building strong, positive relationships between principals and teachers cannot be overstated. Researchers such as Burns (1978), Duignan and Macpherson (1992), Sergiovanni (1992), Starratt (1994), Duignan and Bhindi (1997; 1997b), Begley (2001), Harris (2004), Stefkovich and Begley (2007) and Bhindi (2008) also support principalship in which power and authority is shifted and shared to empower those within the organisation.

Lastly, **Individualized Consideration** is a transformational leadership characteristic whereby leaders recognize and attempt to satisfy their associates’ current needs and aspirations. Paying attention to others is one of the most important aspects of transformational leadership (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman et al., 1990). Principals who display characters of this leadership style try to understand and share in others’ concerns and developmental needs, and treat each individual uniquely (Bass, 1999b). They expand, elevate and empower those needs in an attempt to maximize and develop their full potential (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Those principals delegate or distribute assignments as opportunities for growth (Bass, 1999b), spend time teaching and coaching, develop individuality, and facilitate rather than
dictate. They create supportive climates and value the teachers with whom they work. The focus of this leadership style is on the performance and potential of individual group members (Kendra, 2012). Moreover, Lewin’s participative leadership theory (1946) also supports this leadership characteristic whereby a principal takes on a participative role, and takes into account the opinions of others. It is believed that this leadership characteristic encourages teacher dedication and greater involvement in the decision-making practices of the school.

In the works of Bhindi (2006), it is reiterated that leadership is more successful when it is distributed. His studies reveal that distributive leaders “instil genuinely empowered learning communities, where teachers value and celebrate interdependence and teamwork, relationships are sustained by mutualisation, trust and collegiality” (p. 5). He believes that “distributive leadership is an intentional platform driving the workplace culture, and empowerment creates the necessary potency” (p. 5). Harris (2004), also advocates that this style of leadership entails genuine and dependable leaders, who focus on a redistribution of power and a shift in authority across and within their organisation. It implies interdependency rather than dependency (Harris, 2004). Furthermore, Blasé (1997) believes that activities that serve to recognise or enhance a person’s self-esteem and work satisfaction are examples of leadership consideration.

On the other hand, however, Kendra (2012) argues that methods of distributive or delegative leadership styles fall under the laissez-faire paradigm of transactional leadership. Depending on the manner in which the delegation occurs, this style of leadership can be seen as ‘shifting responsibility’ or ‘passing the buck’. These leaders
avoid decision-making and usually leave important decisions up to group members with little or no guidance.

It would be fair to argue that individualised consideration can be viewed differently, depending on the behaviours, styles and intentions of the leader, and whether or not the reasons for distribution and empowerment are in fact for the enhancement of work-satisfaction as opposed to a leader’s self-profit. Kendra (2012) reminds us, that while this style of leadership can be effective in situations of group members being highly qualified or holding expertise in a particular area, it can often lead to poorly defined roles and a lack of motivation.

While conceptually distinct, Bass (1985) believes that “transformational and transactional leadership are likely to be displayed by the same individuals in different amounts and intensities.” The next section defines transactional leadership as well as transactional factors. It revises previous and current literature in relation to the current study.

2.6 Transactional Leadership

The Transactional Theory, also referred to as the Management Theory identifies leaders as being directive, sometimes dominating, action-oriented and usually interested in looking out for ones’ self. Transactional leadership, is a term used to classify a group of leadership theories that examine the interactions between leaders and followers, all of whom agree with, accept or comply with the leader in exchange for praise, rewards and resources or simply the avoidance of disciplinary action (Bass, Jung, Avolio et al., 2003. p. 208).
Transactional leadership focuses on the lower levels of basic needs satisfaction that is discussed in reference to Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory (Maslow, 1954) in the following section. Transactional leaders exchange benefits with their subordinates and clarify a sense of duty with rewards and punishments to reach goals. Most commonly these leaders use rewards for good work or positive outcomes and punishment for poor work or negative outcomes (Bass, 2008). As previously discussed in the studies carried out by Lewin (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939; Lewin, 1946; Kendra, 2012), transactional leadership consists of authoritarian/autocratic leadership styles and focuses on lower-level needs by stressing specific task performance (Hargis, Wyatt & Piotrowski, 2008).

While transactional leaders are effective in completing specific tasks by managing each portion individually, little room can be left for group decision-making and at times, such leadership style, could be viewed as controlling, bossy and dictatorial (Jani, 2012). Bass (1985) believes that the managerial style that underpins transactional leadership is a foundation for transformational leadership, which applies to Maslow’s Theory of higher-order needs (Bass, 1985). As discussed earlier in relation the Great Man Theory, while theoretically dissimilar, both transformational and transactional leadership behaviours are highly important and valuable for a diverse range of needs. This implies that successful leadership in educational settings and other organizations occurs when these behaviours can be demonstrated in various strengths by the same leader depending on the situation, task or group’s needs.

A major difference between transformational leadership and transactional leadership is that transactional leaders are concerned more with processes rather than the ‘big picture’. Transactional leaders display behaviours associated with two core types of transactions,
which have developed and become more complex. These transactions fall under the labels constructive and corrective transactions (Bass & Avolio, 1991). Constructive transactions are known as contingent reward and corrective transactions are known as management-by-exception.

Constructive transactions are associated with the 'management' functions in an organisation (Bass & Avolio, 1991) and these constructive ‘transactions’ evolved and various key aspects and factors emerged. Bass (1985; 1990b) believes there are four key aspects that underpin the transactional style of leadership, two of which are directly associated with constructive transactions.

These aspects include: contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire. In the next section, these transactional behaviours are defined, discussed and reviewed in relation to current and past literature.

**Contingent Reward** is a constructive form of transactional leadership by which a leader clarifies expectations and offers recognition when goals are achieved (Bass & Avolio, 2004). These leaders focus on reward and in some cases punishments. In the work of Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (2004), these rewards are classified as contingent positive reinforcement or contingent penalization/negative reinforcement.

Contingent positive reinforcement could be as simple as a leader’s praise. Praise could be given when individuals complete a task on-time, ahead of time, or when working at a good pace towards completion. Contingent negative reinforcement could involve meting out
punishments to those who are underperforming, such as suspensions when goals or tasks take longer than expected or are not met at all. Bass (1985) states that “contingent punishments are handed down on a management-by-exception basis, in which the exception is something going wrong.”

Eventually it was discovered that within this style of leadership are two forms of management-by-exception. These two forms of management-by-exception are known as active and passive forms.

**Management-by-Exception (active)** is a style of leadership by which principals primarily only intervene when something goes wrong. Active management-by-exception constitutes leadership whereby principals continually examine teachers’ performance and make modifications and provide corrections throughout the process. These leaders expect subordinates to obey and they specify standards for compliance.

These principals also make clear what constitutes ineffective performance and quite often they will implement punishment for any form of insubordination or non-compliance with standards. This form of transaction is considered corrective, as more often than not, these principals take corrective action for any deviances, mistakes or errors as quickly as they may occur (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

**Management-by-Exception (passive)** on the other hand constitutes a style of leadership whereby the school principal waits for things to go wrong before attempting to fix the problem (Bass 2008). These principals are motivated to take action only when problems become chronic. They usually fail to intervene until issues become serious and more often
than not, situations implode (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Principals of this nature also display avoidant behaviours. They avoid making decisions, avoid responding to situations and problems, avoid specifying agreements, avoid clarifying expectations and avoid issuing goals and standards of performance to individuals.

This style of management or leadership has a negative effect on all those involved, and on the outcomes of set goals – not intended by the leader. In an earlier study carried out by Bass (1990b) this characteristic of leadership was classified as a prescription for mediocrity, and in particular this was found true if a leader relied on passive management-by-exception, intervening with teachers only when procedures and standards were not being met. According to Bass (1990b) “this kind of management may use disciplinary threats to bring a group’s performance up to standards, a technique that is ineffective and, in the long run, likely to be counterproductive” (Bass, 1990b, p. 21).

In this regard it is similar to laissez-faire styles – or no leadership. Both types of behaviour have negative impacts on teachers and associates. Accordingly, both styles can be grouped together as 'passive-avoidant leadership' (Bass & Avolio, 1991).

**Laissez-Faire** is also a leadership style whereby principals avoid getting involved. These school principals are usually absent when important issues arise and quite often delegate responsibility (Bass & Avolio, 2004). This style of leadership may be considered ‘free-rein’ in style as decisions are often left to others or simply not made at all. Very rarely, do these leaders take action for matters in need (Bass, 1999b). Yukl (2002) describes this style of leadership as the absence of effective leadership rather than an example of transactional leadership.
As can be seen, the above styles of leadership all result in numerous negative impacts and can have adverse effects on teachers. The following studies have been carried out in educational settings and delve deeper into the impacts these leadership styles can have on teachers working in these systems.

In the study, ‘The Dark Side of Leadership; Teacher Perspectives of Principal Mistreatment’, Blase and Blase (2002) presented findings from the perspective of 50 U.S. teachers who revealed the harmful effects that transactional styles of leadership and principal mistreatment had on them. Not only were they affected psychologically, emotionally and physically, but classroom instruction and relationships with colleagues were strongly impacted.

The research revealed serious adverse effects on teachers’ physical well-being, such as: “sleep disorders, fatigue/exhaustion, irritable bowel syndrome, heart arrhythmia, first-time substance abuse, suicide ...” and more (Blase & Blase, 2002). The psychological and emotional effects that teachers experienced included such conditions as: depression, powerlessness, cynicism and distrust, self-doubt, guilt, embarrassment, disillusionment, poor concentration and lowered self-esteem.

In support of the work carried out by Blasé and Blasé (2002), and drawing from management literature and personal experience across different educational settings, Bhindi (2008) observed that “in low-trust, toxic cultures (where transactional forms of leadership exist), collegiality is superficial, relationships are snarled, productivity is affected, workplace commitment is compromised and happiness depends on whether you are in the inner or the outer circle of the micro politics (Bhindi, 2008, p. 3).

The serious and somewhat adverse effects, discussed by teachers in Blasé and Blasé’s (2002) research were described as the result of long-term mistreatment from school principals. This clearly demonstrates the connections between the behaviours associated with leadership styles/behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. In Bhindi’s (2008) research, he clearly discusses these types of leadership behaviours to be the ‘personality traits’ or ‘disorders’ that adversely impact on relationships across organisations such as schools and universities. He believes these impoverished styles of leadership fall under three clearly-defined categories or archetypes: Wimps, Thugs and Show Ponies.

‘Wimps’: being affable, ineffectual, untrustworthy jelly back who easily succumb to pressure, brown-nose with workplace power brokers and featherbed their protégés;
‘Thugs’: the hyperactive, domineering control freaks who lack compassion, conscience, ethics or morality and display many characteristics found in sociopaths (they are toxic leaders); ‘Show Ponies’: are self-promoting, cunning, intelligent, manipulative and shrewd trumpet blowing opera singers. These leaders are often compelling attention and regularly
hatching grandiose schemes that require inordinate amounts of time off-site and often result in leaving their institutions on ‘auto pilot’ and in the hands of grumpy deputies (Bhindi, 2008).

With leadership behaviours and personality traits such as those described, it is reasonable to conclude that these organisations cannot sustain genuinely empowered learning communities in which teachers value and celebrate interdependence (Bhindi, 2006). Graetz (2000) emphasizes, that due to ever-increasing demands and complexities, leadership of change is a critical matter, however, existing leadership literature does not really focus on this facet of leadership, and a greater understanding of this phenomenon is required (Higgs & Rowland, 2005).

Blase and Blase (2003) confirmed that in 2003, “no empirical studies had systematically examined this side of school leadership and the extremely harmful consequences such forms of leadership could have on life in schools” (Blase & Blase, 2003). Bhindi (2008) believes that this side of leadership is “often swept under the carpet and ignored altogether, as many people are reluctant to bring these issues out in the open because they fear entrenched interests” (Bhindi, 2008). He believes that due to this reluctant behaviour, the unchallenged, the “covert, un-discussed transactional leadership’ becomes more pervasive, sometimes subtle and hidden and other times virulent and shameless” (Bhindi, 2008).

This study addresses the current gap in the literature by demonstrating the connections between principal leadership styles/behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. The following section draws on the literature concerning job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined and a number of theories are briefly reviewed and discussed. Teachers' perceptions of their job
satisfaction with respect to whether or not job satisfaction is influenced by their principals' attitudes are also reviewed.

2.7 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction may be defined as favourable or positive feelings about work or the work environment (Furnham, 1997) and describes how happy one is with the job. On the flip side, it can also be defined in terms of unfavourable or negative feelings about work or the work environment, and describes how un-happy one is with the job. A widely accepted definition offered by Locke (1976) states that job satisfaction can be defined as “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the ‘perception’ of one’s job as fulfilling or allowing the fulfilment of one’s important job values” (p. 1342).

The happier people are within their job, the more satisfied they are said to be, which results in higher productivity, morale and initiative (Locke, 1969; Locke, 1976; Furnham, 1997). Job satisfaction, according to Cranny, Smith et al (1992. p. 1) is “an affective reaction to one’s job; or an attitude towards one’s job” (Brief, 1998 cited in Weiss, 2002). Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) also confirm that satisfied workers are more productive than those who are unsatisfied (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959).

Scholars in the field of education, including Davis (1992) and Birkeland and Johnson (2003), also contend that high levels of job satisfaction are linked to positive behaviours and consist of higher productivity and performance levels, while low levels of job satisfaction are linked to negative behaviours and consist of lowered commitment and lower productivity (De Nobile & McCormick, 2006).
Research carried out by De Nobile and McCormick (2006) revealed that teachers working in educational settings, who experienced low job satisfaction in their jobs suffered a variety of adverse mental and physical effects, some of which included psychological withdrawal from the job, poor staff interrelations and absenteeism. It was revealed that in schools where job satisfaction was low, staff turnover was high.

With outcomes and adverse effects such as those described, it is reasonable to conclude that raising levels of job satisfaction in educational settings is vital. It can be implied that when teachers are valued, supported and celebrated for their achievements, then job satisfaction is raised, work productivity is heightened and work performance levels are increased.

Hammer and Organ (1978) look at a more complex set of factors pertaining to the job satisfaction of teachers in educational settings. Their work takes a snap shot of the wider community and reviews job satisfaction in terms of the values and beliefs of society.

They believe that job satisfaction is closely related to societal value judgements and the mental and physical health of teachers. Additionally, they suggest that when factors such as mental and physical health are low, staff turnover and absenteeism rates are low. This, in turn, increases societal judgement values and works in favour to the educational setting as a whole, thus working as a public relations asset to the organisation.

It can be argued that when a teacher values a particular facet of a job, satisfaction is more greatly impacted both positively (when expectations are met) and negatively (when expectations are not met), compared to a teacher who doesn’t value that facet at all (Locke,
Furthermore, Weiss (2002) views job satisfaction as an attitude but suggests that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which affect emotion, beliefs and behaviours.

In the case of educational settings, researchers would need to be mindful that teachers form attitudes towards their jobs based on their overall values, and factors such as feelings, behaviours, and beliefs would need to be taken into account. With this in mind, De Nobile and McCormick (2008b), found that a variety of factors and dimensions can influence a person’s level of job satisfaction, and that “levels of job satisfaction felt by different teachers in similar work environments can vary from one individual to another” (De Nobile & McCormick, 2008b, p. 135).

For the purpose of this study, job satisfaction is defined as “the degree to which a teacher feels positive about their work, the teachers with whom they work and the organisation or environment in which they work”. This definition signifies that when feelings of teachers are positive, they are satisfied and when the feelings of teachers are negative, they are dissatisfied.

### 2.8 Job Satisfaction Theories

Much of what is known about job satisfaction has developed as a result of numerous studies and job satisfaction theories. Numerous theories have looked at a variety of contributing factors that may relate to one’s satisfaction in the job. Such received knowledge, experience and on-going research help an understanding of how job satisfaction has been conceptualised.
The notion of motivation is associated with job satisfaction, and theories of motivation form the basis of models and measures of job satisfaction (Mullins, 1996). Furthermore, it is argued that job satisfaction is closely associated with motivation because satisfaction may motivate effort and motivated effort may lead to satisfaction (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985b; Mullins, 1996).

The relationship between job satisfaction and motivation can be viewed as a symbiotic process, and numerous theories are divided into two contrasting theoretical approaches, including content theories and process theories (Dunford, 1992; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1993; Vecchio, 1998).

**Content theories** are those concerned with motivation and identifying people’s needs, their strengths and the perceived goals to satisfy those needs. Major content theories include: Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory, McGregor’s X and Y theory, Alderfer’s (ERG) theory, Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory, and Scott and Dinham’s Three Domain Theory, all of which underpin the current study.

**Process theories** on the other hand, emphasize the actual process of motivation and the relationship between variables, including the way in which behaviour is directed. Well known process theories include expectancy theory, equity theory, goal theory and attribution theory. In the following section a brief description of the abovementioned job satisfaction content and process theories are discussed with relevance to the current study and educational settings. These theories are reviewed in terms of analysing the relationships found between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.
Originally intended as a theory of human motivation and used predominantly in leadership, **Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory** is a theory that relates job satisfaction to the fulfilment of personal needs. The theory is based on a simple hierarchy of needs model, whereby basic (physiological) needs are met before the higher (sociological, esteem and self-actualisation) needs are met (Locke, 1976).

In the context of an educational setting, the basic (physiological) needs of a teacher such as health, food and sleep are situated at the bottom of the pyramid and the higher (sociological, esteem and self-actualisation) needs such as achieving individual potential are placed at the top.

As can be seen in Figure 1, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory is based on the image of a pyramid.

![Figure 1: Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory](image-url)
In accordance with this theory, once a teacher’s lower needs are satisfied, then that teacher will seek to meet the satisfaction of higher needs. If a teacher fails to satisfy needs at any given level, this may result in the individual striving to satisfy that particular need and thus not fulfilling the higher level needs (Maslow, 1943; McCormick & Ilgen, 1985a; Owens, 2001; De Nobile, 2003). When these needs are not met, lower job satisfaction occurs.

As previously mentioned in the leadership section, it is suggested that a principal displaying a transactional style of leadership would place greater emphasis on the basic needs situated at the bottom half of the pyramid and quite possibly never acquire the levels of satisfaction concerning sociological, esteem and self-actualisation. A transformational leader on the other hand is more concerned with meeting the higher needs of teachers and thus driving teachers to obtain higher levels of performance and productivity, and in turn raising levels of job satisfaction (Bass, 1985).

The more experienced and competent principals are within an educational setting, the more the teachers’ needs are met and satisfied (Mullins, 1996). Scholars, such as Locke (1976) and Wofford (1971), argue that Maslow’s theory and the hierarchical order of needs was not based on empirical evidence and, therefore, required further research. Despite this fact, Maslow’s theory still supports the basis of a number of job satisfaction theories, such as Alderfer’s (ERG) theory and Herzberg’s two-factor theory, which are discussed in further depth in the next section.
Alderfer’s (ERG) theory attempts to improve on Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory by allowing greater flexibility of movement between the five levels of needs. Alderfer limited Maslow’s five levels down to ‘three’ with the idea that each individual’s needs are varied. Unlike Maslow’s theory, the order of levels Alderfer presents can be pursued at any stage simultaneously, and work in both directions. The three categories are based on existence, relatedness and growth.

Demonstrated in Figure 2, a pyramid-style image has been created to demonstrate the similarities, progression and relationship between Alderfer’s and Maslow’s theories.
Existence, shown at the base of the pyramid consists of factors such as those found in Maslow’s two lowest basic needs levels. In an educational setting, these needs would refer to a teacher’s physiological, safety and security needs and would include food, shelter and water, and the means by which they are secured, such as employment security, stability and income.

Relatedness, the next level up, consists of a teacher’s social relationships and external esteem including involvement with family, friends and co-workers. This category is consistent with a combination of Maslow’s self-esteem, love and belonging levels.

Alderfer’s final level, Growth, comprises internal esteem and self-actualisation, the most abstract of a teacher’s needs, including the desire to succeed, to be creative or to be productive (Alderfer, 1969). This category is relative to Maslow’s higher needs level of self-actualisation.

The main difference between Alderfer’s ERG Theory and Maslow’s Needs Theory is the order in which needs are met. Alderfer’s theory works on the premise that as individuals progress from existence to relatedness to growth, satisfaction is achieved. However, when one regresses from growth towards existence, levels of frustration rise, hence job satisfaction is affected. The direction of the needs obtained by a teacher, therefore, is measured in terms of job satisfaction, whether that be higher or lower depending on how important the need.

As previously mentioned, Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory (1959) is another content theory, which has received considerable attention during the past decade. This theory is
also highly pertinent to the current study as the factors suggested by Herzberg are strongly associated with those in an educational setting.

Also known as motivator hygiene theory, this theory suggests that a teacher’s job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are driven respectively by ‘two’ different factors known as **hygiene factors** and **motivation factors** (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959; Herzberg, 1968; Hackman & Oldham, 1976).

In Figure 3, the pyramid image has been repeated to show the progression of influences and similarities between the abovementioned theories. As can be seen, Herzberg’s Two-
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Factor Theory characterizes a breakdown of Alderfer’s (ERG) Theory and is represented by ‘two’ main factors as opposed to ‘three’ or ‘five’ as represented in Maslow’s theory.

In relation to a teacher’s job satisfaction in an educational setting, Herzberg’s hygiene (extrinsic) factors, would be placed at the base of the pyramid and include a combination of basic/existence and relatedness needs. These needs are pertinent to a teacher’s working environment such as pay, supervision, policies, supervisor relationships/colleagues and working conditions (Herzberg, 1968). These factors are considered extrinsic to the job and are related to lower levels of satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. Herzberg’s motivation (intrinsic) factors on the other hand, would be placed at the top of the pyramid and be representative of Maslow’s higher needs and form the basis of Alderfer’s relatedness and growth needs.

As shown in Figure 4, these motivation factors relate to the aspects of a teacher’s job that make them want to perform: for example achievement in work, recognition, promotion and responsibility (Herzberg, 1968). As these factors are said to arise from the work itself, they...
are considered **intrinsic** and are associated with higher levels of satisfaction or job satisfaction.

Herzberg stresses that a teacher’s job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are determined by a variety of factors and are not necessarily on two opposing ends of a scale. Whilst job satisfaction may be related to such aspects as advancement, achievement and recognition, other aspects such as insufficient pay and unstable working conditions can cause great frustration – and lead to dissatisfaction. Therefore, the reversal of factors contributes to the reversal of one’s satisfaction.

Despite its extensive use, the two-factor theory has been criticised for being too limited in its categorisation of (motivators) satisfiers and (hygiene factors) dissatisfiers (Gruneberg, 1979; McKenna, 1987) whereby some of the hygiene (extrinsic) factors have been identified as sources of job satisfaction rather than dissatisfaction, and vice versa.

An example of this is from the work of Menon and Christou (2002) who identified headmaster relationships with a sample of primary school teachers as a significant source of job satisfaction (De Nobile & McCormick, 2006, p.2) as opposed to job dissatisfaction. Provided that the work of Herzberg is not used strictly as a two-factor paradigm, this theory is still highly useful and relevant for the study of job satisfaction in educational settings and in particular, the current study.

Scholars such as Dinham and Scott (1996a; 1998b; 2000), whose studies predominantly lie in the field of education, also found limitations with the previous two-dimensional models whereby satisfaction and dissatisfaction were presented as two mutually exclusive
domains. In their study of 2000 teachers across England, New Zealand and Australia, they provided evidence for a third domain which was grounded in the wider environment surrounding the organisation and in this case, the educational setting (the school). Their findings disclosed that those working in educational settings are surrounded by an outer domain, a domain ‘which teachers and school executives find uniformly dissatisfying’ and a domain not often found in other organisations (Dinham & Scott, 2000). They argue that the major dissatisfiers are located, not within the school environment, but within the broader environment and the social context of each school setting (Dinham & Scott, 2000).

**Dinham and Scott’s three-domain theory** (1996b, 1998b; 2000), therefore, is specifically associated with educational environments, and incorporates a third factor of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction called ‘school based factors’. These factors account for aspects of work (eliciting satisfaction or dissatisfaction to some degree in teachers), and include school-based matters extrinsic to the task of teaching and working with others.

The pyramid image illustrated in Figure 5 represents the similarities between the abovementioned theories, and displays an outer circle to represent the ‘third domain – school factors as discussed in the works of Dinham and Scott (1996b, 1998b; 2000). As can be seen, Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory, Alderfer’s (ERG) Theory and Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory all have their roots in the other two domains: intrinsic satisfiers and external dissatisfiers.
**School Based Factors** consist of factors such as the "nature and pace of educational change, perceptions of society, government policies, increased expectations and the employing body" (Dinham & Scott, 2000).
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Dinham and Scott’s study also revealed that the most strongly felt dissatisfiers included factors such as society’s poor attitude towards teachers, the negative image portrayed of teachers in the media, the apparent easy working conditions, issues associated with change and change management, added responsibilities, the lack of support and promotion opportunities and more (1998b; 2000).

These ‘third domain’ dissatisfiers relate specifically to the unique governance structure associated with educational settings. They are associated with school based social systems, community involvement and society’s expectations on teachers and schools. They are not factors associated with larger business or corporate organisations. Thus, when two-factor theories are applied to educational settings, teacher satisfaction and teacher dissatisfaction can be misinterpreted. Therefore, consideration of the third ‘school based factors’ domain as presented in Dinham and Scott’s (2000) research is vital when conducting research on job satisfaction in educational settings.

Previously, content theories have been criticised due to the process aspect of motivation being ignored. According to Dunford, (1992, p.82) these models fail to examine the process of motivation and presume that connections between needs and behaviour are straightforward.

Process theories, on the other hand, emphasize the actual process of motivation; the relationship between variables including the way in which behaviour is directed. Accordingly, there are many well-known process theories that aim to consider these relationships. Some of these include expectancy theory, equity theory, goal theory and attribution theory.
The inclusion and understanding of the above process theories are important to the current study. Process theories emphasize the ‘process’ of how relationships occur between variables; therefore, by relating leadership behaviours to job satisfaction variables it is possible to grasp a deeper understanding of this overall process.

**Expectancy theory** is a process theory that involves the attitudes and behaviours of those in work-place settings. Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory would suggest that in an educational setting both situational and personality variables are important to job satisfaction. Vroom believes that motivation is the force or inclination that drives a person to act in a particular manner or to carry out a particular action – one of which is determined by the expectancy that the act will be followed by a particular outcome (Robbins et al. 1994, p. 257). The strength of the force or the inclination is dependent on the attractiveness of that particular outcome to the teacher: for example, an increase in pay or promotion.

While various studies have used expectancy theory to determine job satisfaction and found it useful (Wofford, 1971; Hoy & Miskel, 1996) others, and particularly in the field of education, have not (Locke, 1969; McCormick & Ilgen, 1985b). It has been argued that Vroom’s theory is difficult to apply as rarely do people discuss their contemplated behaviours in terms of the outcomes they wish to achieve. Therefore, while the Vroom (1964) model acknowledges the complexity of work motivation from a theoretical point of view, this model has been criticised for its lack of practical assistance in matters associated with solving motivational problems (Luthans, 1981).

**Equity theory** also has a ground basis of ‘motivation’ and focuses on determining whether the ratio of contributions and benefits of each person within the relationship are distributed
equitably across employees. For example in an educational setting, are roles distributed evenly, or is one person dealt more responsibility than another? When two people with similar experience take on additional responsibility are ‘both’ paid the same additional salary? What happens when one teacher is paid for their efforts and another is not? According to Adams (1965), distress and anger are induced by employees who perceive themselves as either under-rewarded or underpaid, whilst those who are over-rewarded or overpaid may experience guilt (Spector, 2000, 2008).

It is implied that if the ratio of input and reward is not met, teacher satisfaction, performance, collegiality and feelings towards the organisation may decrease considerably. Interestingly, therefore, over-reward and under-reward can both lead to dissatisfaction of sorts. Researchers who carried out empirical research (Gruneberg, 1979) based on equity theory revealed that there were contributing factors other than ‘equity’ that influence job satisfaction (Locke, 1976; Gruneberg, 1979) and the measurement of ‘equity’ was too difficult to ascertain (Locke, 1976).

Edwin Locke’s (Locke, 1968) Goal Theory, on the other hand, suggests that an employee’s focus is goal orientated as opposed to equity oriented. This theory proposes that a teacher’s motivation and performance are increased when specific goals are challenging, accepted and rewarded upon obtaining them. Setting specific goals such as (I want to become the head of school before I am 40) may generate higher levels of performance than setting general goals such as (I want to be in a position of leadership).

The higher the goals and the harder they are to achieve, the more the teacher will want to obtain them. Locke (1969; 1976) believes that these types of goals are positively connected
to performance and thus positively connected to one’s job satisfaction. Additionally, Locke also proposes a theory based on ‘values’ whereby a similar relationship between variances occurs. This theory proposes that job satisfaction is increased when values are experienced and met. As opposed to Maslow’s and Herzberg’s theories, Locke (1969; 1976) suggests that ‘values’ rather than ‘needs’ are what drive satisfaction. He states that job dissatisfaction can be described as “the un-pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one’s values” (Locke, 1969, p.317). According to Locke, needs are something every person must have, whether they want them or not. Values on the other hand, are entities that are valued and wanted (Locke, 1968; 1969; 1976).

Similar to that of Maslow’s needs theory, Locke (1968; 1969; 1976) works on the premise that there are basic and higher values. The strength of one’s job satisfaction is measured depending on the value they place on a certain task or outcome. In relation to a salary increase for example, the teacher who ‘most’ values the increase, is likely to experience greater satisfaction having obtained it, and vice versa.

**Attribution theory** addresses the processes by which individuals explain the causes of behaviour and events. Fiske and Taylor (1991) believe that “Attribution theories concern how people explain their own and other people’s behaviour” (p. 14). Attribution theory examines what information is gathered and how it is combined to form a causal judgment. For example: if someone is sad, is it because they are depressed or is it because something terrible happened to make them feel this way.
In his works, scholar Bernard Weiner (1992) proposes that the amount of effort in which a person engages in the workplace is dependent on that person's perceptions or attributions. He suggests that when attributions lead to positive outcomes and increased expectancy of future success, such attributions should result in an increased desire to achieve and accomplish future tasks of a similar nature. When attributions lead to negative outcomes and decreased expectancy of future success, then one’s desire is decreased (Weiner, 1992).

Weiner’s attribution theory is based on three categories including: stable theory (stable and unstable) whereby stability influences individuals' expectancy about their future, locus of control (internal and external) whereby control is related to the individuals' persistence on mission, and control (controllable or uncontrollable) whereby causality influences emotional responses to the outcome of task (Munton, Silvester, Stratton et al., 1999). In summary, Weiner’s attribution theory is largely concerning achievement. He believes that ability, effort, task difficulty, and luck are the most important factors affecting attributions (Weiner, 1992). Relative to the current study, achievement and recognition in one’s job are examined in depth. In particular, correlations are drawn upon to determine the types of leadership styles that relate to job satisfaction in terms of recognition and achievement.

In summary, the literature identified two main theoretical perspectives consisting of both content theories and process theories. The numerous theories discussed, made aware the possibilities that influence how teachers respond to feelings of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. Strongly noted in the literature was the relationship between increased satisfaction and enhanced job productivity. It was discussed that an employees’ level of motivation and enthusiasm is strongly related to the degree of satisfaction and significance that teachers find in their work. It was also raised that employees who exhibit a decline in
commitment and dedication to their work also exhibit a decline in job satisfaction and an increase in negative feelings about work and their work environment (Furnham, 1997). Scholars such as McCormick and Solman (1992a, 1992b), Singh and Billingsley (1996b, 1996a), Luthans (2002) and De Nobile and McCormick (2006) identified that the most costly of negative outcomes, which are all associated with job satisfaction, are teacher absenteeism and turnover, lowered commitment and productivity, as well as a diminished health of staff members and occupational stress (Bruce & Cacioppe, 1989; Starnaman & Miller, 1992; Australian Teaching Council, 1995; Singh & Billingsley, 1996a; Muchinsky, 2000; Spector, 2000; Rosenblatt & Shirom, 2005; De Nobile & McCormick, 2006).

Additionally, job satisfaction theories were criticised owing to the fact that satisfaction cannot be directly measured or observed, and as a result empirical data and evidence in support of theories was lacking. In the work of Locke (1976), it is argued that the concept of one’s satisfaction (emotional reaction or response) can only be understood and “grasped by a process of introspection; an act of conceptual identification directed to one's mental contents and processes.” (Winfrey, 2009). Furthermore, Danielson and McGreal (2000) acknowledge that teachers’ behaviours can be assessed, but their states of mind, values and beliefs cannot be known until their behaviours are revealed. The effects or consequences of dissatisfaction may lead to an employee forfeiting the position and looking for employment elsewhere. In most cases, dissatisfaction is not known, until the final behaviour or the final action is carried out.

While previous research has provided a multitude of job satisfaction definitions, and factors predicting job satisfaction in a variety of organisational settings (Locke, 1976; Muchinsky, 2000), the wealth of this research is yet to provide agreement on a theoretical
basis of job satisfaction (Lester, 1987; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). What has been agreed on, however, is that job satisfaction is a fundamental concern in many organisations worldwide.

It is evident, therefore, that the phenomenon of job satisfaction cannot be explained by using one single theory alone. While some literature is in support of the abovementioned theories, just as many are opposed. Some theories have been used and tested extensively; others are yet to be fully utilised: for example, Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory, Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory and Vroom’s Expectancy Theories have formed the basis of many job satisfaction studies and are still widely used today.

Other theories, on the other hand, such as Alderfer’s (1969) ERG Theory, Locke’s (1976) Goal and Values theories and Weiner’s (1992) attribution theory are yet to be fully implemented and tested more extensively. A deeper understanding of job satisfaction, therefore, is perhaps achievable by integrating a number of theoretical frameworks.

In light of the current study, combinations of the above theories have been considered for application. In particular, Lester’s (1987) nine-factor teacher job satisfaction model was reviewed. This model was designed specifically to determine teachers’ satisfaction and dissatisfaction in educational settings. Lester uses concepts derived from Maslow’s (1970) and Herzberg’s (1966) theories to form the basis of this model. She uses nine factors to determine teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction as opposed to basic and high level needs or motivation and hygiene factors as discussed in previous theories.
Accordingly, the nine factors as suggested in the work of Lester incorporate both content
and process theories, where no single factor is deemed more important than another and all
are equally represented. The areas of focus include teacher-principal relationships,
participation in decision-making, recognition, school culture, communication,
responsibility, feedback from others, the level of pay and benefits, the perceived fairness of
the promotion system, the quality of the working conditions, relationships with colleagues
and students, and the job itself (the variety of tasks involved, the interest and challenge the
job generates, and the clarity of the job description/requirements) (Herzberg, 1968; Lester,
1987; McCormick & Solman, 1992a, 1992b; Chaplain, 1995; Dinham & Scott, 1996b,
1998; Scott & Dinham, 2003). For the purpose of this study, these factors have been
closely reviewed and condensed under nine main sub-themes including, supervision,
colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security and
recognition.

2.9 Relationships between Leadership and Job Satisfaction Variables

In this section, a critical perspective on leadership is discussed to address a possible
connection between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Unlike the plethora of
research associated with teachers and their job satisfaction, limited research focused on the
direct relationship between principal behaviours and teacher job satisfaction in educational
settings. Studies that were directly linked, however, included the work of, scholars such as
Houser (1927) Kornhauser and Sharp (1932), Bergen (1939) Lawshe and Nagle (1953) and
Viteles (1953) who all highlight the importance of leadership behaviour when determining
the attitudes of job satisfaction.
As previously stated, Dinham and Scott (2000), also focus strongly on teacher job satisfaction and principal relationships. They believe that the most strongly-felt job dissatisfiers found amongst teachers relating to teacher dissatisfaction included factors such as society’s poor attitude towards teachers, the negative image portrayed of teachers in the media, the apparent easy working conditions, issues associated with change and change management, added responsibilities, the lack of support and promotion opportunities and more (1998b; 2000). They believe that principals are held accountable for addressing the above stereotypes and the challenges presented to teachers. They need to demonstrate consideration of societal pressures in order to establish satisfying work environments.

As presented in the work of Dinham and Scott (1998b; 2000), the ‘school based domain’ is of great importance for leaders to understand if teacher morale is to be increased. This outer domain encompasses many of the factors that contribute to a teacher’s dissatisfaction. If a leader can ensure that teachers feel empowered, motivated and valued, these outer factors may have less impact on teachers’ morale, and eventually may start to lose value. Upon review of the literature, clear patterns emerged from the numerous studies examined. Some of the recurring themes included teacher morale and motivation, teacher efficacy, working conditions, collegiality, responsibility and advancement. These perspectives on job satisfaction are discussed in relation to possible connections with leadership in the following section.

**Leadership and Teacher Morale/Motivation**

It is vital for leaders to understand the positive and negative effects their leadership styles may have on teachers’ satisfaction, particularly when it has been determined that job
satisfaction can be the seminal factor of a school’s success. Accordingly, when a leader understands the relationships between morale, satisfaction and school climate, improvements to the overall educational establishment can be put in place.

Numerous studies can be cited to support the contention that leaders make a difference in their subordinates’ satisfaction and performance. Allen (1981) contested that the school principal’s leadership was the most important factor in determining a school’s climate and the students’ success. Fullan (2008) also contested that “if anyone can influence teachers on a day-to-day basis, it is the principal, both directly and indirectly” (p. 25). These leaders can have a profound effect on the way they influence and motivate teachers, and a better understanding of this relationship is imperative for leaders in these organisations.

As discussed in the job satisfaction section, Herzberg’s (1966) Motivation Hygiene Theory suggests that motivation and hygiene are two central factors that determine job satisfaction. Previously mentioned, Herzberg (1964) is known for his studies on employee motivation, particularly in relation to organisations, because it significantly affects employee productivity. Discussed in this section was that motivators (satisfiers) fulfil an individual’s need for psychological growth and hygiene factors (dissatisfiers) are preventative and environmental. Achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement are examples of motivators. In order to accomplish organizational objectives, leaders must understand and motivate people. This understanding is essential if support from followers, peers, and others, is to be achieved.

As discussed in the leadership section, leaders in educational settings have a responsibility to use ”outstanding influence in order to move and motivate others to accomplish tasks.
beyond personal and organizational norms” which will lead to deeper levels of satisfaction (Gerhardt, 2004, p. 2). Cited in the works of Kelley et al. (2005), Blake and Mouton (1985) state that “leaders who fully understand leadership theory and improve their ability to lead are able to reduce employee frustration and negative attitudes in the work environment” (p.18). Like leaders, teachers need to feel motivated, valued, and appreciated to succeed at work. Thus, leaders displaying inspirational and motivational behaviours, challenge followers with high standards, communicate a sense of optimism towards future goals, and provide meaning for the task at hand (Bass, 1999b).

Furthermore, principals as formal leaders need to start recognising the common themes, traits and the individual attitudes contributing to the job satisfaction of teachers. Kelley et al. (2005) also believed that job satisfaction could be improved if leaders better understood the link between theory and practice. Winfrey (2009) contends that principals are the formal leaders in schools who heavily influence school organizational effectiveness and culture. By better understanding the research that has been carried out previously, it is implied that school principals may put into practice better strategies that will prevent possible negative situations from occurring and enhance the overall morale and motivation of teachers.

Not only is it important for leaders to understand the link between theory and practice, so too must teachers. While teachers need to feel motivated and valued, they should also be respected as professionals who are competent in their field of work. Moreover, it can be implied that a teacher’s job satisfaction is increased and work performance is raised when they are treated as true professionals.
Continual professional development opportunities for teachers ensure that the links between theory and classroom practice are constantly being improved. According to Allen and Cosby (2000) “We need teachers who are trained to learn from their students. For this to occur, they must be alive intellectually, and constantly updating their skills” (p. 41). Moreover, once leaders acknowledge the relationship between their influence and job satisfaction, they can start the process of implementing new strategies that will facilitate the needs of their staff and improve the overall morale and motivation amongst teachers in their educational setting.

**Leadership and Teacher Efficacy**

Empirical studies found in the area of educational leadership support the contention that leaders make a difference in employees’ satisfaction and overall teacher performance. In better understanding the issue of being appreciated as teacher professionals, Nir and Kranot (2006) conceptualized self-efficacy as a way to try and better understand the role that leadership has on teacher’s perceptions. As suggested by Bandura (1986) “self-efficacy is defined as people’s judgments of their capabilities to organise and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (p. 205).

It was determined that several aspects of a transformational leadership style and personal teacher efficacy were connected, therefore, revealing that transformational leaders promote personal teacher efficacy. Hipp and Bredeson (1995) published a study that looked at the relationship between a school principal’s leadership style and teachers’ self-efficacy. The basic assumption of this publication was that a school principal’s leadership style and personal teacher efficacy are directly linked (Hipp & Bredeson, 1995).
The relationship between personal teacher efficacy and a principal’s leadership style is seen to be rather complex and mediated by teachers’ satisfaction on the job. In their study, Nir and Kranot (2006) established that the leadership style of a school principal is a major source of influence on the internal content and work circumstances an individual experiences in an organisational setting (Nir & Kranot, 2006). Their empirical research confirmed the argument raised by Hipp and Bredeson (1995) who stated that these two factors are directly linked when transformational leadership is involved.

Although different leadership styles differ in the way they influence and shape the inner organizational settings, the findings from Nir and Kranot’s (2006) study suggest that leadership style is not an exclusive element of personal teacher efficacy. Transformational leadership that is supportive and positive stems back to the thought of a teacher’s self-efficacy. If a leader is positive, it is highly likely that the performance level of those working with the leader will also be positive. The abovementioned literature implies that, as perceived by teachers, a leader’s behaviour and attitude are of great importance.

**Leadership and Collegiality**

Evidence in the literature has shown that leaders who are ‘effective leaders’ become what is referred to as the leader of leaders. These leaders are those who encourage teachers other than themselves to engage in leadership practices and autonomy (Harris & Muijis, 2003). They display characteristics such as coaching, mentoring, learning and teaching as well as modelling effective forms of teaching (Bass & Avolio, 1991; Harris & Muijis, 2003). A study carried out in 12 schools across England found that there was “ample evidence that people were trusted to work as autonomous individuals, within clear collegial value frameworks which were common to all. There was a strong emphasis on teamwork and
participation in decision making (though heads reserved the right to be autocratic). Goals were clear and agreed, communications were good and everyone had high expectations of themselves and others” (Day, Harris, Hadfield et al., 2000 p. 162). Moreover, when collegial approaches to leadership focus on learning and teaching there can be great benefits for pupils (Lambert, Walker, Zimmerman et al., 1995; Elmore, 2000; Harris & Muijis, 2003). While it can be argued that greater teacher autonomy and collegiality should be encouraged, in light of the occasional need for intervention, the ‘leader of leaders’ must be prepared to address unprofessional conduct and poor performance among teaching staff. For greater autonomy and collegiality to be successful, boundaries, goals and expectations must be set and adhered to if standards are to be maintained and the interest of learners protected.

A positive relationship with colleagues is a necessity if a sense of mutual professional relationships is to be built in educational organisations. Mutual professional relationships in the workplace heighten job satisfaction, and the formation of small learning communities could occur during social interactions and common planning times (Kim & Loadman, 1994). These common planning times are essential for relationships to develop and for teachers to share knowledge and work as teams. In a study involving 2000 teachers’ perceptions of job satisfaction, Syptak, Marsland and Ulmer (1999) discovered that employment sustains social contact, and increases job satisfaction when positive relationships arise. Thus, the above research implies that for mutual professional relationships and teamwork to be successful, leaders need to allow their employees ample time for professional relationship building opportunities and socialisation to develop.
It is clear, however, ‘that one size does not fit all’, and successful mutual professional relationships and teamwork may not be as achievable in some schools compared to others. Increasing demands placed on school principals will mean that collegial approaches will depend on a variety of factors, including the size of the school, the number of employees, employee teaching commitment and expectations, and most importantly, the composition and character of those working in the organisation. What may be a success in one school may not be successful in the next. Thus, a large element of the collegial approach requires leaders and employees in the school setting to work together to find an approach befitting their unique environment.

**Leadership and Working Conditions**

Macmillan and Northfield (2009) linked morale, whether it be positive or negative, to an individual’s attitude towards the working environment or working conditions. Working conditions in the context of this study relate to the working environment in which people are employed. If leaders can create comfortable working environments and conditions for their teachers, then teachers may wish to stay working in those working environments for longer periods of time. As can be seen throughout the literature pertaining to working conditions, Kim and Loadman (1994) point out that these conditions can be the very factors that strongly affect an individual’s job satisfaction.

While leadership style alone cannot be responsible for the many elements that surmount to one’s satisfaction in the job, leadership is responsible for providing the best working conditions available to employees. Moreover, the “levels of job satisfaction felt by different teachers in similar work environments can vary from one individual to another” (De Nobile & McCormick, 2008b, p. 135).
Studies have produced consistent findings regarding how teacher job satisfaction is related to decisions encouraging teachers to remain in the teaching profession. Lieberman (1988) noted that for leaders to retain quality teachers, then "Teachers must have opportunities to take on more responsibilities, more decision-making power, and more accountability for results. Teachers must also be paid higher salaries, in due recognition of complexity and significance of their work" (p. 649).

These are just a few of the many factors that may contribute to influencing a teacher to stay or leave the school or the profession altogether. High levels of job satisfaction are a necessity to encourage occupational commitment and reduce turnover rates. Despite a vast number of studies having been conducted on teacher job satisfaction and turnover, exodus from the teaching profession persists (ABS, 2011; Productivity Commission, 2011; ISCA, 2011). Leaders need to ensure that working environments and conditions are at an optimal level if they want to retain teachers for longer periods of time.

**Leadership and Responsibilities**

Employees are more satisfied when they have adequate freedom and authority to do their jobs, when they have challenging opportunities at work, and when their managers are good leaders (Bavendam, 2000). As suggested in Maslow’s (1970) needs theory, responsibility served as a higher need, and employees who had the drive and motivation to take on extra responsibility in the workplace generally had higher levels of satisfaction. Herzberg (1966) associated professional autonomy and the freedom to make choices in the workplace with responsibility as a strong determinant of job satisfaction. He also believed that responsibility was a motivator and encouraged levels of satisfaction, as opposed to dissatisfaction. In 1967, Sergiovanni (1967), replicated the work of Herzberg’s (1966) two-
factor theory and affirmed responsibility as one of three factors contributing to teacher job satisfaction.

Previously mentioned in the leadership section, transformational leaders who promote intellectual stimulation allow for a shift in power. They encourage their followers to take on greater responsibilities in the workplace as well as engage with key stakeholders to impart educational practice with a higher purpose and meaning (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997; Duignan & Bhindi, 1997a; Begley, 2001). Scholars such as Harris (2004) and Goethals, Sorenson et al. (2004) believe that this style of leadership ‘implies inter-dependency rather than dependency’ and entails genuine and dependable leaders who focus on a redistribution of power and a shift in authority across and within their organisation.

In the work of Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) it was discovered that despite employees being dedicated to their work and enjoying their responsibilities, quite often they asked the question as to whether or not they would be more satisfied working in a more demanding setting. Additionally, it was discovered that school commitment was significantly correlated with higher levels of leadership support and lower levels of role conflict (Billingsley & Cross, 1992). When examined on its own, role conflict was found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. This suggests that the higher the role conflict, the lower the job satisfaction.

In the works of Schmidt (1976), it was noted that those in supervisory roles experience high levels of dissatisfaction. Therefore, supervision was classified as a high dissatisfaction factor, yet job satisfaction is influenced by that very same leadership support. Stefkovich and Begley (2007) and Bhindi (2008) support leadership whereby power and authority are
shifted to empower those within the organisation. It is believed that intellectual stimulation is raised amongst those who are given greater responsibility and trust in what they do.

**Leadership and Advancement**

According to job satisfaction theorists Maslow (1970), Herzberg (1964), and Dinham and Scott (2000), advancement is a motivator or intrinsic satisfier leading to higher level needs. Scholars Kim and Loadman (1994), describe advancement opportunities as those which provide individuals with job promotions. For employees to advance within an organisation or awarded a job promotion, usually hard work, loyalty and good performance are required (Syptak, Marsland & Ulmer, 1999). Previously, scholars including Herzberg (1966) and Sergiovanni (1967) have connected the opportunity for employee advancement in the workplace to job satisfaction.

It was noted across studies that advancement factors were strong determinants of job satisfaction and when employees were rewarded with recognition and advancement as a result of their achievements, higher levels of satisfaction became apparent (Schmidt, 1976). Additionally, recognition by superiors was identified by Johnson (1967) as a factor related to job satisfaction. In his works it was found that one’s status was a factor showing a relationship to job dissatisfaction.

Furthermore, while salary was seen as a factor relating to advancement throughout the literature, it was affirmed that salary was not identified as a motivator, nor was it a factor that elicited job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In the works of Kim and Loadman (1994) it was affirmed that unfairness of salary distribution was a factor that led to feelings of unhappiness or job dissatisfaction.
As discussed in the section regarding Locke’s (1976) equity theory, employees are more satisfied when they sense fair rewards are consistent with opportunities and when employees are rewarded fairly for the work they do. In relation to the current study, salary as an individual factor is not presented. It was determined that no direct relationship between a leader’s behaviour or leadership and the salary available to members of staff was significant. This is a result of pre-determined salary rates in the education sector. Advancement on the other hand is purely determined by the head of school, therefore this factor has been included as an individual factor for review.

With these factors in mind, the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction becomes a highly complex set of variables. Political, economic and societal changes have prompted fundamental shifts in educational policies and the manner in which schools are led. As a result of these changes, principals are expected to comply with the highest moral and ethical standards in their dealings with staff and practices, whilst being responsible for the teachers and students under their care.

In response to the overt pressures it is understood that some principals may face a multitude of difficulties in their attempts to respond effectively to these challenges. Duignan (2012) also raises concerns regarding the current emphasis on corporate management values, strategies and practices in many educational organisations and the considerable criticism of schools and schooling in the media.

Consequently, teaching and other members of staff may feel the weight of these pressures, which in turn impact on the overall morale, motivation, collegiality and work productivity in the school. Therefore, the significance of leadership in relation to the development of
strong, positive relationships between principals and teachers cannot be overstated and the abovementioned theories and researchers have suggested that respectful, trusting, constructive relationships between principals and teachers are essential for school improvement (Boyer, 1995; Schlechty, 1997; Senge, 2000; Cotton, 2001; Hoachlander, 2001).

2.10 Summary

Literature reviewed in this chapter defined, explored and explained the characteristics of independent schools. The function and unique culture and challenges of leadership were discussed and teachers were reviewed with reference to relevant critique research.

Pertinent leadership theories and findings from empirical and scholarly research on leaders and leadership were also canvassed and reviewed. The literature identified a number of theories that were directly relevant to this study. The characteristics of each of these theories was explored and connected to the transactional and transformational leadership styles.

The literature review supports the notion that in an open environment, in which principals are perceived as democratic transformational leaders who maintain honest and open communication, teachers would be more satisfied with their job, as opposed to closed environments in which principals display transactional, harsh and authoritarian leadership styles and behaviours (Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy, 1987). Advocates such as Leithwood, Thomlinson, Genge and Jantzi (1996; 2000), Bogler (2001) and Nielsen, Randall, Yarker
and Brenner (2008) support transformational styles of leadership in assisting principals to address the emergent demands of the abovementioned policy and structural reforms.

It is suggested throughout the literature that greater knowledge and understanding of transformational styles of leadership could contribute to a range of positive organisational outcomes and assist leaders in becoming more effective leaders and managers which in turn leads to improvement in school policies and practices.

Job satisfaction literature was also reviewed. Job satisfaction was defined and examined in relation to several job satisfaction theories. This included Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory, Alderfer’s (1969) ERG theory, Herzberg’s (1968) two-factor theory and Scott and Dinham’s (2000) three domain theory, Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory, Locke’s (1969; 1976) equity and goal theories and Weiner’s (1992) attribution theory. The literature examined work environments, which included a variety of factors affecting teachers’ satisfaction. Intrinsic and extrinsic factors as well as outer school domains were explored. The literature also identified teacher self-efficacy as a factor contributing to teacher job satisfaction. The review concluded that teachers felt satisfied when their leaders were positive and supportive, when they were involved in decision-making processes, when their ideas were valued and when they felt a sense of worth in the establishment in which they worked.

The relationships between leadership styles and job satisfaction were also reviewed in the literature. The research suggested that leadership could be seen within the broader context of the range of issues that affect an individual’s experience of work (Herzberg, 1968; Lester, 1987; McCormick & Solman, 1992a, 1992b; Chaplain, 1995; Dinham & Scott,
De Nobile and McCormick (2008b), also found that a variety of factors and dimensions can influence a person's level of job satisfaction. An example of just a few of these factors would include moral and motivation, participation in decision-making, recognition, school culture, communication, responsibility, salary and benefits, promotion, working conditions, collegiality and the job itself (Herzberg, 1968; Lester, 1987; McCormick & Solman, 1992a, 1992b; Chaplain, 1995; Dinham & Scott, 1996b, 1998; Scott & Dinham, 2003).

It was determined that the style of leadership being practised in schools impacted on the relationship between employees and the leader. In environments where positive styles of leadership are practised, staff retention is higher, and vice versa. It was continually suggested “that keeping teachers satisfied with their work should be a priority for school systems and a goal for school leadership teams” (De Nobile & McCormick, 2006, p. 3).

While the previous studies were conducted in a variety of settings, including schools, it was evident across the literature that a very small percentage of these studies were carried out in primary schools. Furthermore, research of leadership and teacher job satisfaction relationships in NSW independent primary schools was largely lacking and no study was found that included teachers’ perceptions of their leader’s style in this particular setting. The need to investigate these relationships in NSW independent primary schools is apparent, and this study addresses the dearth of research here.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This study examined the relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by primary school teachers in NSW independent schools. Leadership styles were compared with measures of teacher job satisfaction, including supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition. This chapter discusses the methodology used in this study. It describes the research design, sample, instruments, validity and reliability of these instruments, procedures of data collection and procedures of data analysis.

3.2 The Method

The study used a quantitative approach that examined the transformational and transactional styles of leadership in relation to a set of job satisfaction variables, including supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition.

The use of a quantitative methodology in educational research can be very useful when trying to determine whether or not a claim is true or false. Either as part of a larger project that employs many different methods or as a basis for a complete piece of work, the stronger the research evidence is, the more certain it can be that the knowledge claim is accurate (Creswell, 2002; Field, 2009).
When researching topics that may be considered sensitive or personal, quantitative methodologies can offer participants a private and confidential method of response, particularly through the form of an online survey. An online survey allows participants to conduct the survey in the privacy of their own home and at a time that is flexible and convenient to them (Creswell, 2002; Field, 2009). Initial feedback from a sample of primary school teachers indicated that an ‘open’ forum or a one-on-one discussion may generate fear and leave participants feeling threatened or reluctant to divulge personal thoughts or opinions pertaining to the leadership behaviours currently being practised in their schools. Given the sensitive nature of this topic, it was therefore deemed important to provide an online, anonymous option to participants.

Combined with the quantitative methodology, a qualitative component was also included. While the weighting of the qualitative section was minimal, and consisted of only one question, it was hoped that by combining and increasing the number of research strategies, the dimensions and overall scope of the project would be broadened (Gay & Airasian, 2000; Creswell, 2002).

Through the use of multiple methods, it was hoped that a deeper and richer understanding of the relationship between leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction would be obtained, thus obtaining deeper insight into core issues.

A total of 211 NSW independent primary school teachers, from all-girls, all-boys and co-educational schools varying in region, school size and religious denomination, participated in the study. Independent (non-government) schools in NSW were chosen for this study.
due to their leadership autonomy, unique governance structure, increasing popularity and accessibility for research.

Data were collected using a survey combining two instruments and comprising four sections: a demographic survey; the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004); an adapted Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) developed by Lester (1987); and a general comments section. Descriptive and inferential procedures such as t-tests, Chi-Squares, correlations and multiple regressions were used for data analysis and to test the hypotheses.

The principal aim of the study was to investigate relationships between aspects of leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. Correlational research was used to test whether or not relationships existed between given variables, as well as to test the extent of these measures (Gay & Airasian, 2000; Field, 2009). Therefore, a correlational research design was the prominent measure used in the study.
3.3 The Research Design

As previously mentioned, the study aimed to answer three main questions and test three hypotheses:

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

**RQ1.** What style of leadership is being practised in NSW independent primary schools as perceived by primary school teachers?

**H1.** A transformational style of leadership will be practised across NSW independent primary schools as perceived by primary school teachers.

**RQ2.** How do primary school teachers working in NSW independent primary schools perceive their job satisfaction?

**H2.** Primary school teachers working in NSW independent primary schools will be satisfied in their teaching jobs.

**RQ3.** What is the relationship between school principals’ leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction?

**H3.** The relationship between school principals’ leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction will be positively related to transformational leadership styles and negatively related to transactional styles of leadership.
3.4 The Sample – Independent Schools/Primary Teachers

Independent (non-government) schools across NSW were chosen as the context for this study owing to their autonomy, unique governance structure, increasing popularity among parents and students and accessibility for this research. Due to an increased interest in the topic and having worked in a variety of teaching and leadership roles across independent schools both nationally and internationally, the researcher also considered it important to gain a deeper understanding of leadership practices as perceived by teachers in independent schools, and how these practices impacted on job satisfaction in terms of supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition.

As previously mentioned, independent schools are independently governed, managed, and accountable at the level of the individual school. An independent school’s governing body is autonomous and fully accountable for the overall management of the school, including but not limited to, the employment of staff, finances and curriculum. The success of an independent school relies on factors such as the experience, style and skill of the school principal, the teaching staff and the school board. It is clear from the literature that an effective principal can promote positive teacher perceptions and positive learning environments. Independent primary school teachers were chosen for this study to determine the relationship between the leadership styles and the satisfaction of the teachers working in these establishments as perceived by the respondents.

Furthermore, and as defined by Mertens (2005), the process of sampling is one of great importance as it “influences the quality of data and the inferences you can make from it” (p. 307). Thus, it is considered important that the sample be representative of the
population from which it is drawn if generalisations are to be made from the study to the target population (Welkowitz, Ewen & Cohen, 1988; Babbie, 1995; Kitchens, 1997; Krathwohl, 1998; Gay & Airasian, 2000). It was, therefore, considered important that a study looking at the variables of relationships between leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction should arguably be guided from the point of view of the teacher.

### 3.5 Instruments

In order to obtain data for this study, a survey was devised and formatted for online delivery via the Survey Monkey service. The survey comprised four sections. The first section requested demographic and general information. The second consisted of items concerning leadership in schools using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1990a). The third section consisted of adapted items from the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1987; Lester & Bishop, 1997). The fourth section allowed for comments through an open-ended comment bank.

By distributing an electronic link to the survey via email, participants were guaranteed anonymity. Additionally, all information obtained was collected and stored electronically, and at no time would participants be identifiable, as no identifiable information was collected. Providing participants the option to complete the survey online afforded them the opportunity to complete the survey at their own leisure, in the privacy of their own home, office or choice of locality. The survey instrument can be found in Appendix G.
3.5.1 Demographics

The first section of the survey was broken into several sections asking participants to provide demographic and general information regarding:

- Teacher gender
- Age (21-65+)
- Teaching experience in years (1-45+)
- Current teaching position (Full-Time/Part-Time)
- Current grade level taught (K-6, Specialist/Other)
- School region (NSW or Sydney Metropolitan)
- School type (girls, boys, co-educational)
- Gender of the school principal
- Amount of time spent working with the principal being rated.

3.5.2 Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

The second section of the survey required teachers to complete The Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass, 1985). The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1995) is a measure of transformational leadership that is used widely in both leadership development and research. Also known as the MLQ 5X short form, the questionnaire includes 45 items measuring a broad range of leadership types ranging from passive leaders and leaders who give contingent rewards, through to leaders who transform their followers into becoming leaders themselves.
The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire assesses a full range of leadership behaviours, including:

**Transformational Leadership:** idealised attributes, idealised behaviours, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration; and

**Transactional Leadership:** contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), passive/avoidant, management-by-exception (passive), and laissez-faire (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Avolio, Bass and Jung (1995) have reported evidence for the high-reliability, inter-correlations, convergent and discriminative validity of the MLQ-5X dimensions (Bass, Jung, Avolio et al., 2003). Additionally, the classic form of the MLQ includes both self- and rater-form. The self-form measures self-perception of leadership behaviours whilst the rater-form is used to measure leadership as perceived by superiors, peers and subordinates and identifies the characteristics of a transformational leader, helping individuals discover how they measure up in the eyes of those with whom they work (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

This study has utilised the rater-form only, and respondents were instructed to refer to their current school principal or a principal with whom they had worked during the previous five years. Using Likert-type scales, participants were asked to judge how frequently each statement fitted the principal they were describing: 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, 4 = frequently, if not always.
The MLQ has been used and tested in numerous studies across small and large organisations, including: a sample of 256 U.S. supervisors and managers (Bass, 1985), business studies, industrial, service, manufacturing, high-technology, military, government, church, correctional, hospital, volunteer organizations, and higher educational settings (Longshore, 1989; Bass & Avolio, 1990b; Singer & Singer, 1990; Yammarino & Bass, 1990; Tucker, 1991).

The MLQ has been used in numerous K-12 educational settings (Gorham, 1992; Arends, 1993). King (1989) conducted factor analysis testing and confirmed the appropriateness of the MLQ factor structure for educational purposes to support the work of Bass (1985). Additionally, Koh (1991) tested the validity of Bass’ leadership theory across secondary educational settings in Singapore. Hoover et al. (1991) wanted to test the validity of the MLQ across southeast United States to determine private secondary school headmasters' leadership qualities, and compare these results with those of business supervisors. Arends (1993) applied canonical analysis to data collected by the MLQ with teachers in British Columbia.

Evans (1996) used the MLQ in elementary schools across a south-western Michigan district to study the relationship between elementary principals’ use of transformational leadership strategies and the five social-organizational factors: shared goals, teacher collaboration, teacher learning, teacher certainty, and teacher commitment, as perceived by the school’s teachers (Bogler, 2001).

Scholars such as Ingram (1997) also used the MLQ in Michigan to explore the leadership behaviour of principals in ‘inclusive’ educational settings that educated moderately- and
severely-disabled students in the regular classroom on a full-time basis. The study aimed to “determine whether the leadership behaviours of principals, as perceived by teachers, tended to be more transformational or more transactional, and whether there was a difference in the leadership behaviours of principals and the extent to which principals motivated teachers to exert effort beyond the ordinary” (Ingram, 1997, p. 411).

Bogler (2001), administered the MLQ to 930 teachers across Israeli schools to examine the effects of principals’ leadership styles (transformational or transactional), principals’ decision-making strategy (autocratic versus participative), and teachers’ occupation perceptions on teacher satisfaction from the job. In all studies, results showed the MLQ to have high validity for the overall transformational and transactional leadership constructs in the field of education (Ingram, 1997).

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was, therefore, considered appropriate for use in the current study and was selected as a fundamental instrument to determine whether the leadership styles of principals, as perceived by teachers, tended to be more transformational or more transactional across NSW independent primary schools and whether or not these styles of leadership related to teacher job satisfaction.

3.5.3 Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)

The third section of the questionnaire required teachers to fill out The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) (Lester & Bishop, 1997). The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) is a 77-item questionnaire based on the research of Maslow and Herzberg and developed by Lester (1987) to measure the job satisfaction of teachers working predominantly in educational settings. Whilst there are many methods for
measuring job satisfaction, Likert scale questionnaires (Likert, 1932) are the most frequently used method to determine satisfaction within job dimensions (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Field, 2009).

The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ), developed by Lester (1987) contains items relating to supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, recognition, advancement, security and pay (Lester & Bishop, 1997). Translated into several languages, the TJSQ has been used worldwide and has proven to be a reliable and valid instrument in the area of educational settings. During previous validity testing, the 77-item questionnaire was found to have a series of items with factor loadings below 0.30, proving insignificant and omitted for use in this study.

Additionally, a further 10 items concerning pay and security were omitted as their purpose was not relevant to this study due to having no direct relationship to principals. This process of elimination left 56 items for use, containing 14 items on supervision, 10 items on colleagues, seven items on working conditions, eight items on responsibility, nine items on work itself, five items on advancement and three items on recognition. Furthermore, the wording of some items was adjusted to better suit the target audience: for example, the word 'principal’, replaced ‘supervisor’ as the term supervisor is not commonly used or found in educational settings to represent the head of school or school principal, to which this survey refers.

As represented above, the TJSQ instrument has measures of job facets applicable to most organisations (such as working conditions, advancement, colleagues and pay), although the items in general relate specifically to teaching, educational organisations and the typical
school environment (Holdaway, 1978; Lester, 1987; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; De Nobile, 2007).

Moreover, the TJSQ has been referred to or used in many doctoral dissertations and numerous studies relating to teaching and educational organisations over the last decade (Lester, 1987; McCormick & Solman, 1992a, 1992b; Lester & Bishop, 1997; Field, 2009). It was originally designed and tested by Lester (1987) to measure teacher job satisfaction across randomly selected elementary school, junior high school and senior high school teachers in New York City, and in Nassau, Suffolk and Westchester Counties.

Factor analysis was undertaken for the development and refinement of the TJSQ instrument, which returned a total score of (0.93) (Lester, 1987). Scholars such as McCormick and Solman, (1992b) adapted the instrument for use in their study of 111 teachers in the service of the New South Wales Department of Education, Australia to determine whether teachers allocate primary responsibility for their occupational stress to sources external to the individual (McCormick & Solman, 1992a).

More recently, DeNobile and McCormick (2008) used the TJSQ to investigate the relationship between aspects of organisational communication and facets of job satisfaction. The 356 participants were staff members from 52 primary schools of six Catholic education systems in New South Wales, Australia. The results identified that there were several organisational communication factors that were predictors of job satisfaction, and implications were discovered for policy and practice with regard to communication in these schools (DeNobile & McCormick, 2008b). Owing to this theoretical basis and the TJSQ’s classification of job facets associated with job satisfaction and educational settings,
this questionnaire has been considered highly suitable for a study on primary school teachers and has been selected as a pivotal instrument to accompany the MLQ for use in this study.

3.5.4 Additional Items

An additional two items were added to follow on from the MLQ and TJSQ. In accordance with the previous questions and using Likert-type scales, participants were asked to indicate how satisfied they were within their job on a scale of: 1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = neutral, 4 = satisfied, 5 = very satisfied (Field, 2009). Finally, a text limited general comment section was included allowing participants the opportunity to add personal opinion and comment on issues they felt important or that may have relevance to the study.

3.6 Data Collection and Recruitment

The study comprised K-6 full-time and part-time primary school teachers across NSW independent schools. Due to the Privacy Act, direct teaching staff email addresses could not be obtained. A distribution licence was therefore purchased and all 296 independent primary schools on this list were contacted by facsimile via the licensing agent. The questionnaires were distributed so that each region and school type would be represented proportionately in the distribution. It was trusted that principals and/or school administration would forward the facsimile to K-6 members of staff, informing them of the study. A letter inviting teachers to participate in the study accompanied each questionnaire.
It was specified to teachers that their consent to participate would be indicated by the completion of the survey and that participation was purely voluntary. A sample letter can be found in Appendix C. Confidentiality for schools and individuals was assured. This methodology proved restrictive and ineffective, receiving a total of nine responses over a 12-week period.

During this 12-week period, The Independent Education Union (IEU) was contacted and it was requested that a link be placed on the IEU website directing members to the survey. After several weeks of inquiry, permission was granted and a link was placed on the main page. Even though response rates increased via the online link, response requirements were not being met and further methods needed to be utilised.

Each independent school’s email address across the state of NSW was then manually located via online sources. A bulk email was sent to all principals/school administration of the 296 independent primary schools requesting that emails be forwarded to all teaching staff within those schools. This methodology proved more successful, although response rates were still minimal, and up to 20 school principals rejected the invitation for teachers to participate.

Amongst those who declined participation were principals of 10 very prominent and well-established independent day and boarding schools across Sydney’s metropolitan and city areas. The main reasons for decline were related to work overload, poor timing, currently involved in other research or simply not interested. All principals who declined participation were sent an email of appreciation, thanking them for their time and courteous replies.
Additionally, approximately 60 error emails were returned to the researcher due to incorrect email address details and old email addresses not being updated. Data collection requirements were still not being met. This prompted the researcher to contact approximately 200 schools privately by telephone and, where possible, principals were approached directly.

Names and direct emails of principals were obtained and a personal database created. The database contained a record of the region, name of school, name of principal, name of deputy, administration, telephone and fax numbers, dates, telephone call information, how many times the school had been contacted previously and whether or not the school had rejected participation. This information was used to facilitate return rates and avoid errors such as schools being invited to participate more than once. Personalised emails were then sent directly to school principals seeking permission for distribution to members of staff. The response rate increased marginally, bringing it to 52 recorded responses in total.

Demonstrated in Figure 6, are the survey distribution results indicating how participants were notified of the survey.

![Figure 6: Survey Distribution Methods](image-url)
As can be seen, the most effective method of distribution was via the school email, with 27% of participants (n=65) finding out about the survey via this method. Close to 20% of participants (n=52) found out about the survey via the school principal and the IEU website (n=46). Less successful forms of distribution included the original facsimile sent to schools with a low 6% response rate and through colleagues (n=38, 16%). A further 10% of participants (n=24) found out about the survey via other means not specified. In total, 240 responses were made over the 9-month period however 29 of these surveys were incomplete or not filled out correctly, therefore leaving a total of 211 surveys for analysis.

3.7 Ethics

Ethical principles require that participants in research must give informed consent to being part of the research, that identification of informants must be protected, researchers must not coerce participants into participating or divulging information and all data must be kept for five years to protect researchers against charges of forging data (Bouma, 2000). The current study met all of the above conditions and was approved by the University of Wollongong Human Research Ethics Committee. A sample ethics approval form can be found in Appendix H.

As a result of the perceived sensitive nature of this particular research, adherence to strict ethical guidelines was required throughout. It was agreed that the participants through completion of the survey granted informed consent, and the involvement in the study was voluntary. Participants were advised that they could withdraw at any time by discontinuing completion of the survey.
As mentioned earlier, the survey was administered through an online tool known as ‘Survey Monkey’. This allowed participants’ anonymity and all information obtained was collected and stored electronically. With password protection a requirement, only the researcher had access to the data from a private, password-protected computer. At no time would participants be identifiable, as identifiable information was not collected. By providing participants the option to complete the survey online, this also allowed them the opportunity to complete the survey in privacy.

A text limited general comment section was included, allowing participants the opportunity to add personal opinion and comments on issues they considered important or that may have contributed to the study. Participants were informed not to provide any names of people or schools, as this information was irrelevant and would be withdrawn from the study. No such information was provided by participants.

3.8 Response Rate

By combining the distribution methodologies as stated above, 240 surveys in total were returned. Of these 240 surveys, 29 were rejected because they were either incomplete or not completed as required. This left 211 questionnaires suitable for use in the study, a final overall response rate of 5% of the NSW independent primary school teaching population. For future research of a similar nature, it would be recommended that alternative methodological strategies be carried out to increase the response rate percentage. For example; it could be suggested that a qualitative methodology be adopted to include a case study, research group and / or interviews. As well as this, it could be advantageous to focus on a guaranteed select number of schools as opposed to all NSW independent schools.
3.9 Data Analyses

Data from the questionnaires were transferred from Survey Monkey into SPSS, a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences computer program. Once transferred, reverse scoring was carried out on the suggested items as recommended by Lester and Bishop (1997) and according to the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire guidelines. Descriptive statistics and frequencies were then generated so that a review and general assessment of the data could be made.

The process of review and general assessment was important, to know from the onset how essential particular items were and how the participants responded. By reviewing this information, the researcher could then determine the value of particular items and whether or not these should be included for further analysis. Assessments such as these gave a comprehensive understanding, in advance, of what the data entailed, so that the researcher could start making sense of what, in essence, appeared to be many numbers (Welkowitz, Ewen & Cohen, 1988). It was also important to identify what styles of leadership were perceived prevalent, the general perception of job satisfaction, the means for various questions and any obvious patterns or themes that might have made the findings clearer before initial analysis.

3.10 Summary

In this chapter a quantitative methodology was explained, presented and discussed. An overview of the research design was presented in terms of research questions and relative hypotheses. Independent schools and primary teachers were reviewed in terms of sampling, and the MLQ and TJSQ instruments were discussed. Validity and reliability of
these instruments were examined in relation to previous empirical studies and literature and procedures of data collection and data analysis were discussed.
Chapter 4: Results

4.1 Introduction

Set out in four sections, this chapter reviews the demographic profile of participants, leadership style relationships, job satisfaction relationships and leadership and job satisfaction relationships combined. Analyses of these data addressing each research question and related hypotheses are examined.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

RQ1. What style of leadership is being practised in NSW independent primary schools as perceived by primary school teachers?

H1. A transformational style of leadership will be practised across NSW independent primary schools as perceived by primary school teachers.

RQ2. How do primary school teachers working in NSW independent primary schools perceive their job satisfaction?

H2. Primary school teachers working in NSW independent primary schools will be satisfied in their teaching jobs.

RQ3. What is the relationship between school principals’ leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction?

H3. The relationship between school principals’ leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction will be positively related to transformational leadership styles and negatively related to transactional styles of leadership.
4.2 Demographic Profile of Participants

This section presents a demographic profile of the teachers, principals and schools represented in the study. General information such as teachers’ gender, age, years of teaching experience, total years working with principal, teachers’ current grade levels, principal gender breakdowns, school regions and school types were analysed from the information received. These results are important when understanding how representative the data are in relation to the population. There are approximately 364 independent (non-government) primary schools across New South Wales (NSW), with approximately 4500 primary school teachers working in the independent primary school sector (Hunt, 2011). Requests for participation were sent to all independent (non-government) primary schools in NSW. A total of 211 teachers completed the survey.

4.2.1 Teacher Profile

Of the 211 participants who responded to the survey, 77% (n=162) were female and 23% (n=49) were male. This is consistent with the gender profile of the NSW independent schools’ teaching profession in which 79% primary school teachers are female and 21% are male (ABS, 2011).

Participants were asked to indicate their age ranging from 21 to 65+ years of age. The responses indicated that participants’ ages ranged from 23 to 65 years of age, with an average age of 43 years. Indicative of these results, were the findings from the Staff in Australian Schools (SiAS) (2011), which showed the average age for primary school teachers across Australia was 42 years of age. For analysis purposes, Table 1 reports the
distribution of teachers’ ages in ten-year bands and shows similarities and patterns with regard to age group populations.

Table 1: Teachers’ Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-61+</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings demonstrated that there was a relatively even distribution of participants’ ages across three of the 10-year age bands. The highest population of participants fell in the 31-40-year age band, with 34% (n=71) and 20% (n=43) of participants aged 21-30. Interestingly, as shown in Table 2, a breakdown of the individual age groups revealed that 19% of the participants in the 21-30-year age band were aged 28-30. Furthermore, 28-year-old participants had the highest single age proportion (5.7%) of participants (n = 12) in the study. These results support the findings from the SiAS (2011), that the proportion of primary school teachers aged less than 30 years of age has increased from 18% in 2007 to 23% in 2010.

Table 2: Age Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Breakdown</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis of the age bands as outlined in Table 2, confirmed that close to 50% of the participants (n = 97) were aged 41 years or above, which supports the ageing teaching population trend as outlined in the SiAS (2011). The above statistics confirm that the ages
of participants in this study are in alignment with the current teaching age population as discussed in ABS (2010) and SiAS (2011).

Full-time employment was the most common type of employment for 83% of participants (n = 175) in the study. Less than one-fifth (17%) of the participants (n = 36) were employed part-time, with the majority of women fulfilling these positions. In alignment with these statistics, full-time employment is most common for 77% of independent schools primary teachers in Australia, with female teachers, as opposed to males, being more likely to be employed in part-time roles (SiAS, 2011).

The majority of participants held K-6 primary classroom teaching positions, with 78% of participants (n=164) filling these roles. The remaining 22% of participants (n = 47) claimed to be in specialist teaching roles such as music, language, PDH/PE and other roles such as learning support. This is similar to the teaching roles identified in the SiSA (2011) report, which comprised 73% of teachers in K-6 primary classroom teaching positions and 27% of teachers in roles such as specialist support, learning support or coordination and management roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Years 16
As demonstrated in Table 3, participants were asked to indicate the length of time they had spent in their teaching careers, on a scale of 1 to 45+ years.

For the purpose of analysis, participants were grouped in 10-year bands to determine if there were any similarities or patterns with regard to participants’ experience in the job. In alignment with the statistics reported by the SiSA (2011), the results showed that 16 years teaching experience was the average (n = 211, M = 16.50, SD = 10.39). Only one participant reported having 45+ years of teaching experience and 3 participants reported having more than 41 years of experience.

The percentage of participants who fell in the 1-10-year teaching band had a much higher response percentage than those in all other bands. Table 3 indicates a steady response percentage decrease as the length of teaching experience increases: for example, 37% of teachers had 1-10 years’ teaching experience; 29% had 11-20 years’ experience; 22% had 21-30 years’ experience, 10% had 31-40; and only 1% had greater than 40 years’ teaching experience.

In summary, these results indicate that the percentage of participants with less experience exceeded those with more years of experience. These statistics are a similar representation of those reported in the SiSA (2011).
Table 4 reports the distribution of participant’s time spent working with the principal in five-year bands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Years 5

Participants indicated the amount of time they had spent working with the principal as being in the range of 1-21+ years. As represented in Table 4, no participants had worked with a principal for more than 20 years.

The response percentage of participants dropped considerably as time bands increased: for example, 76% of participants indicated having worked with the principal for five years or less; 94% of participants had worked with the principal for 10 years or less; and only 6% of participants had worked with the principal for more than 11 years. This could be a reflection that teacher and principal turnover had occurred after a 5-year period.

4.2.2 Principal Profile

The principal profile reported by the participants in the study was of almost equal distribution. Participants indicated that 49% of the principals rated were male (n=104) and 51% were female (n=107). Demonstrated in Figure 7, these findings strongly represent the percentages revealed in the SiAS (2011) report, which showed a breakdown of 45% male primary school principals and 55% females across Australia.
4.2.3 School Profile

Participants were from a wide geographical area, covering most regions of New South Wales. For increased levels of anonymity, participants’ schools could not be identified, therefore as shown in Table 5, all regions were grouped into either Sydney metropolitan or rural NSW regions. Rural NSW regions included areas such as South Coast, Hunter, Central Coast, Central NSW, Northern NSW, Western NSW, Riverina and Mid-North Coast. Sydney metropolitan regions included Inner North Sydney, Central/City, North, South, East and West Sydney Regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Metropolitan</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural NSW regions</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results showed that 58% of participants (n = 123) were from Sydney metropolitan areas and the remaining 42% of participants (n = 88) were from rural NSW regions. Reports on the exact percentage breakdown of primary school teachers across the above selected
regions could not be provided, therefore teacher ratios were compared with the proportion of schools in the same locations. According to the Association of Independent Schools NSW (AIS, 2012), 60% of the 364 independent primary schools within NSW (Hunt, 2011) (n = 218) are based in Sydney metropolitan regions and the remaining 40% (n = 146) are located in rural NSW regions. The breakdown of teacher percentage proportions is indicative of the breakdown of the schools in these regions.

Table 6 examines the types of schools at which participants were employed. Just fewer than three-quarters (73.5%) of the participants (n=155) reported coming from co-educational schools, nearly 20% were from all-girls’ schools and approximately 10% were from all-boys’ schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Educational</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Girls</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Boys</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to many school-teachers (particularly specialist teachers) in the independent primary school sector teaching a K-12 curriculum, as opposed to a K-6 curriculum, an exact percentage of teaching population in the primary school sector is not available. Therefore, as reported by the AIS (AIS, 2012), it was noted that 88% of independent primary schools across NSW are co-educational, 5% are all-girls’ schools and 7% are all-boys’. As can be seen, the teacher percentage proportions found in the current study are not a direct representation of the equivalent primary-school percentages. The high proportion of
participants from girls’ schools (n = 37, 17.5%) in comparison to that of boys’ schools (n = 19, 9%) could be a reflection that the researcher had worked 15 years previously in various girls’ schools in the Sydney metropolitan area, and local teachers or past colleagues from these schools may have been supportive of the study.

4.3 Leadership Style Results

For research question one, “What style of leadership is being practised in NSW independent primary schools as perceived by primary school teachers?” a series of descriptive analyses was performed to determine the prevalent style of leadership and any emerging patterns from the data set. Pearson Chi-Squares were calculated to determine whether patterns emerged between perceived leadership styles and category variables such as school region, school type, or participants’ teaching positions.

A series of independent means t-tests was also undertaken to determine if there was a correlation between perceptions of leadership style and continuous variables such as participants’ ages, years of teaching experience and years working with the principal.

Table 7 demonstrates the mean, median and standard deviation for the two leadership styles represented. The transformational and transactional leadership characteristics were determined by combining a series of leadership and behavioural items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2004).
These characteristics included:

*Transformational Leadership*

- Idealised Attributes
- Idealised Behaviours
- Inspirational Motivation,
- Intellectual Stimulation
- Individualised Consideration

*Transactional Leadership*

- Contingent Reward
- Management-by-Exception (active)
- Management-by-Exception (passive)
- Laissez-faire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 suggests that whilst the difference in the transformational and transactional leadership scores was minimal and not statistically significant, the results advocate that participants rated their leaders as being slightly more transformational than transactional in their leadership styles. These findings indicate that leaders demonstrated higher overall scores across the transformational leadership characteristics compared to those that fall under the transactional leadership style.
Notably, however, the standard deviation for transformation leadership (SD 1.03) is more than double that of transactional leadership (SD .49). These results would suggest there is greater deviation and variance of mean scores in terms of a transformational style of leadership. Therefore, a breakdown of the mean, median and standard deviations for all nine leadership characteristics of the transformational and transactional leadership styles was carried out and results are provided in Table 8. This information was analysed using a Likert-scale of 1-5 (not-at-all to frequently).

Table 8: Leadership Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Characteristics</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership (TF)</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership (TA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (TF)</td>
<td>Mean 3.74</td>
<td>Management-by-Exception (active) (TA) Mean 3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealised Behaviour (TF)</td>
<td>Median 4.00</td>
<td>Contingent Reward (TA) Mean 3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealised Attributes (TF)</td>
<td>Std. Deviation 1.06</td>
<td>Management-by-Exception (passive) (TA) Mean 2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (TF)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laissez-faire (TA) Mean 2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration (TF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Falling under the transformational leadership style, inspirational motivation (M=3.74, SD 1.06) and idealised behaviour (M=3.69, SD 1.01) were reported as being the highest contributing leadership characteristics of this leadership style. Idealised attributes (M=3.25, SD 1.24) and intellectual stimulation (M=2.92, SD 1.13) scored below the average mean for this leadership style, signifying that these characteristics had less impact as perceived
by participants. Individualised consideration (M=2.88, SD 1.21) was perceived as having the lowest contributing score.

Analysis of the transactional leadership characteristics showed much lower scores on average. It was determined that management-by-exception (active) (M=3.08, SD .93) was the highest contributing characteristic of transactional leadership. Next was contingent reward (M=3.02, SD 1.14) and management-by-exception (passive) (M=2.60, SD 1.05). Laissez-faire (M=2.39, SD 1.10) had the lowest represented scores of the transactional leadership style. Laissez-faire leadership characteristics were perceived by participants as being less effective methods of leadership in comparison with other forms of leadership.

Whilst these results would indicate that participants perceived their leaders as being more transformational than transactional in their leadership style, neither style of leadership was more prominent than the other. This was the result of overlapping scores across the two leadership styles: for example, some transactional leadership characteristics, such as management-by-exception (active) (M=3.07, SD 0.93) and contingent reward (M=3.02, SD 1.13) scored greater means than transformational leadership characteristics, such as intellectual stimulation (M=2.9, SD 1.13) and individualised consideration (M=2.88, SD 1.20). These results suggest a greater deviation and variance of scores across the transformational style of leadership and thus explain why the standard deviation for transformational leadership (SD 1.03) is more than double that of transactional leadership (SD .49). Transactional leadership scores showed little variance.

Furthermore, the above results indicated that one’s leadership style could not be categorised explicitly, as both styles of leadership play fundamental roles in the overall
composition of an effective leader. For the purpose of this study, leaders are labelled as being either ‘more’ or ‘less’ transformational or transactional in their leadership styles.

4.3.1 Principal Gender

It was unknown whether or not a relationship existed between principals’ leadership styles and their gender. Of the 211 participants who rated their principals, 107 principals were female and 104 were male.

Demonstrated in Table 9, an independent t-test determined almost identical perceived leadership scores for both genders. Both male (M =3.35, SE 0.10) and female (M=3.25, SE 0.10) principals received mid-average scores in transformational styles of leadership, and vice versa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: T-test of Leadership Styles and Principal Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Levene’s test in Table 9 shows that whilst female principals’ scores were slightly lower, this difference was not significant \( t (209) = .713, p >.05 \), representing a very low-sized effect \( r = 0.04 \). In this study, gender is not related to leadership style.
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4.3.2 School Region, School Type and Teaching Position

Represented in Table 10, a series of three Pearson Chi-Squares was carried out to determine whether or not relationships existed between the two experimental conditions (transformational and transactional leaderships) and variables such as the school region, school type and the year level of a teacher.

The results from the first Chi-Square analysis on regions indicated that both Sydney metropolitan and rural NSW participants perceived their leaders as being more transformational in their approach to leadership.

Pearson Chi-Square results indicated that no significant association was found between perceived leadership style and a region $\chi^2 (1) = .593, p > .05$ as well as representing the fact that based on the odds ratio, the odds of a leader being more transformational were only 0.64 times higher if they were from a Sydney metropolitan area.

The second Chi-Square analysing school types indicated that participants working in all-boys’ (n = 13, 6.2%) and co-educational (n = 93, 44.1%) schools rated their principals as being more transformational than transactional in their leadership styles. Those working in all-girls’ schools, on the other hand, (n = 19, 9%) rated their leaders as being slightly more transactional in their styles of leadership. Whilst transformational styles of leadership featured more prominently in boys’ and co-educational schools, these overall differences were again not significant $\chi^2 (1) = 2.391, p > .05$. This indicates that the type of school in which one worked was not an indication of a principal’s leadership style.
Table 10: Pearson Chi-Square of Leadership Styles by Region and School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Metropolitan</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural NSW</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Girls</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Boys</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Educational</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third Chi-Square test analysed the relationship between participants’ teaching positions and their perceptions of job satisfaction. These results suggested that K-6 classroom teachers and K-6 specialist/other teachers all rated their leaders as being slightly more transformational than transactional in their approach to leadership. These results were only marginally different, and suggested that job roles and teaching grades were not significant $x^2 (1) = .580, p > .05$ when determining one’s leadership style. In summary, these results concluded that variables such as the school region, school type and the participant’s teaching position had no significant association with a principal’s style of leadership, as perceived by primary school teachers.
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4.3.3 Teachers’ Age, Experience and Years Working with Principal

As demonstrated in Table 11, independent t-tests were carried out to determine whether relationships existed between the two experimental conditions (transformational and transactional leadership styles) and continual variables such as age, years experience and years working with the principal.

The first t-test in Table 11 showed that participants who rated their leaders as transformational were slightly younger (M=21.02, SD 10.97, SE 0.99) than participants who rated their leaders as being more transactional (M =21.77, SD 10.95, SE 1.17). This difference was not significant \( t(209) = -0.492, p >.05 \) representing a low-sized effect \( r = 0.03 \) and indicating that a teacher’s age is not a contributing factor when determining a principal’s leadership style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( \text{Mean} )</th>
<th>( \text{Std. Deviation} )</th>
<th>( \text{Std. Error Mean} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher’s Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Working With Principal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second t-test determined that, on average, participants with greater years’ teaching experience (21-45+) perceived their principals as being more transactional in their leadership approaches (M =16.76, SD 10.67, SE 1.14), as compared with those participants with less teaching experience (M=16.33, SD 10.23, SE .91), who perceived their principals as being more transformational. This difference was not significant $t$ (209) = -.294, $p > .05$ and represented a low-sized effect $r = 0.02$). There was no relationship between a teacher’s experience and the perceptions of a principal’s leadership style.

The third t-test indicated that participants who had been working with the principal for longer periods of time (1-45+ years) rated their principals as being more transactional (M =4.54, SD 3.76, SE .40) than participants who had spent fewer years with their principal (M=4.23, SD 3.64, SE .32). This difference $t$ (209) = -.593, $p > .05$ represented a low-sized effect $r = (0.04)$, and signified that there was no relationship between the length of time participants spent working with a principal and their perceptions of leadership.

In summary, these results concluded that variables such as a teacher’s age, teaching experience and the length of time spent working with a principal had no significant association with a principal’s style of leadership as perceived by primary school teachers.

### 4.4 Job Satisfaction Results

For research question two, “How do primary school teachers working in NSW independent primary schools perceive their job satisfaction?” descriptive statistics and frequencies were analysed to determine how participants rated their perceived levels of job satisfaction.
Pearson Chi-Squares were calculated to determine whether patterns emerged between perceived job satisfaction and categorical variables such as gender, school region, school type or a participant’s teaching position. Additionally, t-tests for independent means were calculated to determine if there was a correlation between perceptions of job satisfaction and continuous variables such as participant’s age, years of teaching experience and years working with principals. Importantly, the following results are representative of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire only and have no relationship with the scores previously measured in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

Table 12 demonstrates the mean, median and standard deviation scores for job satisfaction as perceived by participants. Using 3.00 as a cut-off point on a Likert-scale of 1-5 (strongly disagree to strongly agree), participants were asked to indicate how satisfied they were in their jobs. The job satisfaction scores were determined by combining a series of satisfaction measures from the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester & Bishop, 1997). These measures included:

- Supervision
- Colleagues
- Working Conditions
- Responsibility
- Work Itself
- Advancement
- Recognition
Table 12: Job Satisfaction (56 Item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shown in Table 12 is a mean score of 3.46, which suggests that participants scored above the 3.00 cut-off score and were, on average, satisfied in their teaching jobs (M = 3.46, SD 0.62). This score (M = 3.46, SD 0.62) was then used in SPSS to further analyse the various measures of job satisfaction as perceived by participants.

Table 13 represents the job satisfaction frequency scores of the 211 participants in the study.

Table 13: Job Satisfaction Frequency Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency scores support the above findings and reveal that just less than three-quarters (71.6%) of participants had scores equal to or greater than 3.00, implying that the majority of participants (n = 151) were satisfied in their jobs. The remaining 60 participants (n = 60, 28.4%) had scores lower than 3.00 and were dissatisfied in their jobs.
To better understand the contributing factors of participants’ job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, Table 14 provides a breakdown of all seven job-satisfaction measures in chronological order, from the highest mean score to the lowest.

Table 14: Job Satisfaction Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Conditions</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancements</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was determined that responsibility (M = 4.36, SD 0.41) was the highest contributing factor of job satisfaction. Next, colleagues (M =3.57, SD 0.79) and the work itself (M = 3.59, SD 0.50) were also strong contributors to one’s satisfaction, whilst working conditions (M=3.34, SD 0.54) scored moderately.

It was suggested that supervision (M=3.18, SD 1.13), recognition (M=2.93, SD 0.58) and advancements (M=2.85, SD 1.07) had lower contributing scores of job satisfaction. In summary, these results indicate that responsibility, colleagues and the work itself have a high influence on participants’ job satisfaction. Measures such as advancement, recognition and supervision, on the other hand, influenced lower levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction.
4.4.1 Teacher Gender/Principal Gender

To determine if there was a relationship between teacher job satisfaction and gender, Pearson Chi-Squares were carried out to determine whether or not a relationship existed between job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction and category variables such as a participant’s or principal’s gender (Field, 2009).

Results indicated that out of the 49 male participants who responded to the survey, 75% reported being satisfied (n=37) in their jobs. Similarly, out of the 162 female participants, 70% were also satisfied (n=114) in their jobs. Based on the odds ratio \( \chi^2 (1) = .488, p > .05 \), the odds of a teacher being more satisfied were only 1.03 times higher if the teacher’s gender was male. Therefore, there was no significant association between a teacher’s gender and perceived job satisfaction.

Table 15: Pearson Chi-Square of Job Satisfaction and Teacher Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.488(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.017(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Results indicate a significant association.
Furthermore, of the 104 participants who reported having male principals, 71% of these participants (n=74) were satisfied in their jobs. Of the 107 participants who reported having female principals, 72% were satisfied (n=77) in their jobs. Interestingly, of the 60 participants who were dissatisfied in their jobs, exactly 50% had male principals and the other 50% had female principals. These results $x^2 (1) = .017$, $p > .05$ confirmed that the gender of a principal has no relative effect on the perceived satisfaction of one’s job. In summary, the above results indicate that gender is not a contributing factor to one’s satisfaction.

4.4.2 School Region, School Type and Teaching Position

Table 16 shows three Pearson Chi-Squares, carried out to determine whether or not relationships existed between job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction and category variables such as a participant’s school region, school type and participants’ teaching position.

The first test, region, indicated that 58% of participants were from Sydney metropolitan regions (n=123) and a further 42% were from rural NSW regions (88). Of the 151 satisfied participants, almost equal distributions were from Sydney metropolitan regions (75%) and rural NSW regions (70%). These findings indicated that no relationship existed between job satisfaction and school location $x^2 (1) = 1.515$, $p > .05$ and are, therefore, not considered significant.

The second test, school type, was carried out to establish whether or not the type of school in which one worked was related to job satisfaction. Whilst the difference across the school types was not significant $x^2 (2) = 0.995$, $p > .05$ it was indicated that on average
participants working in all-boys’ (74%) and co-educational (73%) schools had a higher percentage of satisfied participants than those working in all-girls’ (64%) schools.

Table 16: Pearson Chi-Square of Job Satisfaction by Region and School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Metropolitan</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural NSW</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Girls’</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Boys’</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Educational</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Other</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third test, teaching position, revealed that, full time K-6 classroom teachers (70%) and specialist/other teachers (84%) were satisfied in their jobs. Despite a higher percentage of participants in specialist/other roles (84%) showing satisfaction, the overall differences in these figures were not significant, indicating that job roles and teaching grades are not an indicator of one’s job satisfaction. In summary, these results concluded that variables such as participant’s school region, school type and participant’s teaching position, had no
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significant association with a principal’s style of leadership, as perceived by primary school teachers.

4.4.3 Teachers’ Age, Experience and Years Working with Principal

Represented in Table 17, a series of three t-tests was carried out to determine if there was a comparative relationship between job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction and continual conditions such as teachers’ age, years experience and years working with the principal (Field, 2009).

Table 17: T-test of Teacher’s Age, Experience and Years Working with Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Aged (21 - 65+ Years)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years Teaching Experience (21 – 54+ Years)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Working With Principal (Spanning 1 - 20+ Years)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first t-test, teachers’ age, showed that of the participants aged 21-65+, the average mean score of those who were satisfied in their jobs was (M = 21.46, SD 11.26, SE = 0.92) and the average mean score of participants who were dissatisfied was (M = 21.00, SD 10.18, SE = 1.31).
This suggests that on average, participants who experienced greater satisfaction in their jobs were slightly older than those dissatisfied in their jobs. This difference was minimal and not significant \( t \) \((209) = .273, p > .05\), therefore, indicating that a teacher’s age is not a contributing factor when determining job satisfaction.

The second t-test, total years teaching experience represented in Table 17, showed that the average mean score of satisfied participants with 21-45+ years teaching experience was slightly higher \((M = 16.52, \text{SD 10.67, SE 0.87})\) than those displaying dissatisfaction \((M = 16.48, \text{SD 9.74, SE 1.26})\) in their jobs. This suggests that on average, participants with greater experience were more satisfied, however, again this difference was not significant \( t \) \((209) = 0.021, p > 0.05\), and indicated that a teacher’s age is not relative to one’s job satisfaction.

Finally, the third t-test, years working with principal, found that on average, participants who had been working with the principal for less amounts of time reported being more satisfied \((M = 4.63, \text{SD 3.48, SE 0.45})\) than participants who had been working with the principal for longer periods of time \((M = 4.25, \text{SD 3.77, SE 0.31})\). These results would suggest that the longer teachers worked with a principal, the less satisfied they were in their jobs. Whilst these findings are interesting, the results were not statistically significant \( t \) \((209) = 0.750, p > 0.05\) indicating that there was no relationship between teacher job satisfaction and the length of time a teacher and principal worked together.

In summary, variables such as participants’ age, years’ experience and years’ working with the principal had no significant association with job satisfaction, as perceived by primary school teachers.
4.4.4 Job Satisfaction (56-Item and 1-Item) Comparison

In addition to the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (56-item), participants were also asked to answer a single question relating to job satisfaction: “In general, how satisfied are/were you with your job whilst working with the leader you make reference to?” All scores for each participant were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1-5 (very dissatisfied to very satisfied).

Demonstrated in Table 18 are the mean, median and standard deviation scores for the (1-item) teacher job satisfaction question. Importantly, these scores were representative of the Teacher Job Satisfaction question only, and had no relationship with the scores previously measured in the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire or the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Job Satisfaction (1-item)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Job Satisfaction (56-Item)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score at 3.24, suggests that participants on average were satisfied in their teaching jobs (M = 3.24, SD 1.49). However, this score was slightly lower than the mean score of the (56-item) Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire score (M = 3.46, SD 0.62).

Further testing was carried out to determine if there were any similarities and differences between the (1-item) score and the (56-item) score. Firstly, a breakdown of participants who perceived themselves as being satisfied or dissatisfied in their jobs was carried out. As can be seen in Table 19, according to the (1-item) score it was indicated that 50.7% of the
211 participants (n = 107, 50.7%) perceived themselves as being satisfied in their jobs. This was 20.9% less than those who scored satisfaction in the (56-item) questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Job Satisfaction (1-Item)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining 89 participants (n = 89, 42.2%) had showed perceptions of dissatisfaction in their jobs, revealing a 29% increase in dissatisfaction levels between the two styles of testing. A total of 15 participants (n = 15, 7.1%) had neutral feelings towards their job satisfaction. Due to the (56-item) questionnaire scores being combined and averaged to determine one mean score, the option of ‘neutral’ was not valid. Understandably, the elimination of these 15 participants from the main scores would have caused some variance in the results.

A Pearson correlation was carried out to determine whether the above-mentioned differences between the Teacher Job Satisfaction (1-item) score and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (56-item) were significant to the findings of the study.

These results, represented in Table 20, showed a significant positive relationship in the Teacher Job Satisfaction (1-item) mean scores and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (56-item) mean scores ($r = 0.475$, $p < 0.001$). While this is a relatively
modest correlation coefficient score, it does offer greater confidence that the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (56-item) is reliable and that the results indicated by participants are accurate.

**Table 20: Pearson Correlation of Job Sat (1) and TJSQ (56-item).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Job Sat (1-item)</th>
<th>TJSQ (56-item)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Job Sat (1-item)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.475**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Job Sat Q (56-item)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). N = 211.**

4.5 Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction Combined

For research question three, “What is the relationship between school principals’ leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction?” findings from both the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire were combined and analysed. Chi-Square testing was used to examine the overall relationship between perceived leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. Correlations and multiple regressions using a standard enter procedure were then used to analyse a breakdown of the seven job-satisfaction measures against the nine leadership factors.

Demonstrated in Table 21, Pearson Chi-Square testing was run using the scores from the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire items.
Table 21: Pearson Chi-Square testing of TJSQ (56-item) and MLQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TJSQ (56-Item)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.761a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have an expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.74.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

The results show a highly significant association between teacher job satisfaction and leadership style $x^2 (1) = 76.76, p < 0.001$. This represents the fact that based on the odds ratio; the odds of a teacher being satisfied were 26.12 times higher if they were led by a transformational leader than if they were led by a transactional leader. This result supports hypothesis 3, which predicted a positive association between transformational leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction.

Having determined that transformational styles of leadership were significantly related to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction $x^2 (1) = 76.76, p < 0.001$ and transactional leadership styles significantly related to lower levels of teacher job satisfaction, a breakdown of each of the leadership characteristics and job satisfaction variables was conducted to identify where strengths and weaknesses occurred between the two sets of variables.
Presented in Table 22, Pearson correlation coefficients were determined for all of the individual leadership characteristics and job satisfaction variables. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire results have been included in these calculations.

Drawing from the work of Jacob Cohen (1988), the above correlations have been interpreted using his scale of magnitudes. The interpretation of this scale is that anything greater than 0.5 is large/high, 0.5-0.3 is moderate/medium, 0.3-0.1 is small/low, and anything smaller than 0.1 is classified insubstantial, trivial or otherwise not worth reporting (Cohen, 1988).
Table 22: Pearson Correlations for MLQ and TJSQ Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership Styles</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealised Attributed</td>
<td>Idealised Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.67**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.74**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.66**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01 level  * p < 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**Supervision**

As can be seen in Table 22, significant relationships can be found between *supervision* and all leadership characteristics. High correlations such as these could be a result of the underlying characteristics of *supervision* dealing primarily with school leadership, leadership support and the leader’s general relationships with staff. It can be expected that supportive, inspirational, encouraging and authentic leadership behaviours would be positively related to greater satisfaction with *supervision*, and vice-versa. The following paragraphs analyse the data in greater detail.

In particular, high correlations were found between *supervision* and individualised consideration (r = 0.85), idealised attributes (r = 0.84) and intellectual stimulation (r = 0.84). These correlations are logical because leadership characteristics such as these are consistent with the positive aspects of supervisory behaviour and the supervision of others. It is reasonable to consider, therefore, that these variables would have a high positive relationship with job satisfaction, and vice-versa.

*Supervision* also correlated very highly with contingent reward (r = 0.82); however, contingent reward behaviours are predominantly consistent with transactional styles of leadership. These findings, therefore, would indicate that leadership styles traverse; they are interrelated, and different styles of leadership behaviours overlap. In relation to hypothesis 3, which presumed a negative association between job satisfaction and transactional styles of leadership, these results suggest that where policies, compliance and managerial expectations are required, leaders need to adopt a combination of styles to get the job completed successfully. In light of the occasional need for intervention, all leaders must be prepared to address unprofessional conduct and poor performance among teaching
staff if standards are to be maintained and the interest of learners protected. Therefore, to meet such requirements a transformational leader may need to display transactional characteristics. These results show that when transactional styles of leadership are used in the correct context, increased levels of job satisfaction can occur under this style of leadership.

*Supervision* had a very high negative correlation with laissez-faire leadership (r = -0.74). Laissez-faire leadership falls under a transactional style of leadership and is consistent with avoidance of urgent matters, issues, decision making and being absent when needed. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider that higher levels of laissez-faire leadership would be related to lower levels of satisfaction with *supervision*. These behaviours offer support to hypothesis 3, which presumed a negative association between job satisfaction and transactional styles of leadership.

**Colleagues**

A high correlation was found between *colleagues* and idealised attributes (r = 0.53) and individualised consideration (r = 0.53). These relationships are logical because both variables may be interpreted in terms of collegial support. It makes sense that, in an environment where collegiality is fostered and leaders go beyond self-interest for the good of others, this type of leadership would be relative to higher levels of job satisfaction in terms of collegiality. *Colleagues* correlated moderately with contingent reward (r = 0.45) despite contingent reward falling under the transactional style of leadership.
This suggests that when principals provide colleagues with assistance in exchange for their efforts, when they make expectations clear and express satisfaction when expectations are met, levels of satisfaction are increased. A moderate negative correlation was found between *colleagues* and laissez-faire (*r* = -0.48). This indicates that when a leader is consistently absent, response to urgent matters is delayed and staff are not involved in decision-making processes, collegiality breaks down. The negative associations between collegiate relationship and transactional styles of leadership offer support to hypothesis 3, which presumed levels of job satisfaction, would be decreased when led by transactional styles of leadership.

**Working Conditions**

*Working conditions* had a high correlation with leadership characteristics such as idealised attributed (*r* = 0.58), idealised behaviour (*r* = 57) and contingent reward (*r* = 56). In support of hypothesis 3, the *working conditions* factor of job satisfaction is increased when these transformational styles of leadership are being implemented. In particular, when the working conditions involve a collective sense of mission amongst staff, principals aspire to meet the needs of their employees and define their policies clearly, then transformations are taking place and *working conditions* are improved. Laissez-faire (*r* = -0.48), management-by-exception (passive) (*r* = -0.43) and management-by-exception (active) (*r* = -0.19) characteristics of transactional leadership on the other hand reported having negative correlations with the *working conditions* factor of job satisfaction.
Responsibility

The only leadership characteristic to be correlated even moderately with responsibility was inspirational motivation ($r = 0.31$). Inspirational motivation relates to leaders expressing a sense of empowerment and confidence in their staff, articulating a compelling vision of the future and expressing what needs to be accomplished. Responsibility refers to the extent to which staff members felt responsible for planning and shaping their own work. It makes sense, therefore, that a low correlation across the leadership characteristics was found in relation to this variable, given its autonomy. When staff felt as though responsibility for their own work was lacking, levels of satisfaction and motivation were decreased.

Work Itself

The Work itself factor of job satisfaction had significantly high correlations with intellectual stimulation ($r = 0.58$), intellectual consideration ($r = 0.58$) and idealised behaviour ($r = 0.56$). It is understood that when a leader promotes a collective sense of mission, staff participation is encouraged and they spend time to develop a person’s strengths, it could be expected that the person’s levels of job satisfaction would be raised. These results provided support for hypothesis 3, as it is plausible that higher satisfaction with the work itself is related to higher levels of support from one’s leader. Significant negative correlations with work itself were consistent with laissez-faire ($r = -0.47$), management-by-exception (passive) ($r = -0.38$) and management-by-exception (active) ($r = -0.30$). Reflective of the above results, when these elements are present, a negative response to one’s job satisfaction is fostered.
Advancement

Advancement was significantly related to intellectual consideration ($r = 0.64$), intellectual stimulation ($r = 0.59$), and idealised attributed ($r = 0.55$). These results show that when a leader is supportive of promotion and provides colleagues with opportunities to advance, levels of job satisfaction are raised, and vice-versa. Apart from contingent reward ($r = 0.57$), all other transactional characteristics of leadership showed significant negative relationships with job satisfaction in terms of one’s advancement. These results suggest that principals who display laissez-faire ($r = -0.50$), management-by-exception (passive) ($r = -0.38$) and management-by-exception (active) leadership characteristics are not supportive of workplace advancement, and as a result medium-to-high negative associations with job satisfaction concerning this factor become evident.

Recognition

High-to-moderate correlations were found between recognition and transformational leadership characteristics. Of particular interest, individualised consideration ($r = 0.55$), idealised attributed ($r = 0.54$), intellectual stimulation ($r = 0.51$) and contingent reward ($r = 0.52$) all had high significant positive relationships with recognition. These scores tell us that participants perceive recognition as an important factor of job satisfaction, and that leaders who display individualised consideration and idealised attributed characteristics are the best facilitators of this factor. Participants indicated that leaders who displayed leadership characteristics such as laissez-faire ($r = -0.46$), management-by-exception (passive) ($r = -0.35$) and management-by-exception (active) ($r = -0.22$) were ineffective in providing recognition where due, which resulted in significantly moderate negative correlations in terms of job satisfaction.
Demonstrated in Table 23, regression analysis was carried out to determine how variables, such as those associated with job satisfaction, might be predicted by leadership styles. Data were checked for normality using a normal probability plot for standardised residuals. Normality was found to be satisfactory and job satisfaction was treated as the dependent variable. The independent variables were the individual leadership characteristics: idealised attributed, idealised behaviour, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire.

**Table 23: Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Leadership Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R</th>
<th>Std. Error of</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Change df1</th>
<th>Change df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>48.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 211

Table 23 shows that the independent leadership variables accounted for 67% of the variance in job satisfaction. The overall model was significant, p = 0.000. These results confirm the correlation findings, which showed that idealised behaviour (β = 0.12, p = 0.005), individualised consideration (β = 0.17, p = 0.000), management-by-exception (active) (β = -0.06, p = 0.038) and laissez-faire (β = -0.121, p = 0.005) were all highly significant variables accountable for the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of teachers. As can be seen from these results, idealised behaviour and individualised consideration have positive associations with job satisfaction, whereas management-by-exception (active) and laissez-faire variables have negative associations, thereby being the two main contributors accountable for job dissatisfaction. Consistent with the correlation analysis, these results
are reflective of transformational leadership styles; being strongly related to increased levels of job satisfaction and transactional leadership styles (in particular, passive avoidant characteristics) pertaining to lower levels of satisfaction.

Other variables of leadership, such as idealised attributed ($\beta = 0.02, p = 0.626$), inspirational motivation ($\beta = 0.00, p = 0.983$), intellectual stimulation ($\beta = 0.01, p = 0.849$), contingent reward ($\beta = 0.04, p = 0.413$) and management-by-exception (passive) ($\beta = 0.04, p = 0.231$) were not significant predictors of job satisfaction. The model diagnosis indicated there was no multi-co-linearity in the model.

4.6 Discussion of Qualitative Data

Question 58 of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) provided participants with the opportunity to make qualitative comments. A total of 63 of the 211 participants ($n = 63, 30\%$) responded to this item, providing a total of 116 statements. These statements were recorded, categorised and analysed according to the qualitative data methodology described previously. Initial analysis was carried out to categorise statements with respect to the following measures of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ): supervision, colleagues, recognition, responsibility, advancement, work itself and working conditions.

The findings from the comments section were not reflective of the quantitative results. A total of 97\% of the comments were of a negative nature, which might suggest that the participants who responded to this question were those participants dissatisfied in their jobs, as compared with those who were satisfied. However, numerous tests were run to determine if this was case, and all tests proved this not to be true. Some participants, who
scored substantially high scores of job satisfaction, indicated considerable negativity in their comments. As a result, it was determined that the comments section may have provided participants the opportunity to voice their concerns about issues that were not raised within the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) or the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ).

Additionally, the Likert-scale question and answer form makes it difficult for participants to express their feelings on particular matters of concern. For the purpose of this study, the qualitative data adds depth to the body of information previously provided and shows areas of interest for future research possibilities. Additionally, it could be suggested that for future research possibilities, a qualitative research be carried out with a breakdown of themes for open-ended comments. The themes below were demonstrated by participants as being areas of concern; therefore, it would make sense to use these themes as guidelines to direct future research. Given the opportunity to respond specifically to these issues, perhaps participants will provide more robust responses adding greater depth and insight to the study.

**Supervision**

Of the 63 participants who responded to the comments section, 57 participants (90%) made statements pertaining to the overall supervision in schools. The category, supervision, was therefore, broken down into seven emerging themes, which added greater clarity and understanding. The themes consisted of staff management, school management, support and collaboration, decision-making, delegation and communication.
Staff Management

There were 20 participants (32%) who made statements pertaining to supervision who also made comments regarding staff management issues. The main issues raised involved principals’ day-to-day management of teachers and staff: for example, seven comments were negatively related to the conduct of principals. Participants discussed staff inequality, bullying between principal and teacher, forms of harassment and ridiculing, as areas of concern. What participants wrote;

“Staff are ridiculed in front of each other in staff meetings and in front of students and staff, it is made to look like she's joking but the intent is to demean the staff member it is aimed at.”

“Generally speaking, I felt I was treated more like one of the students than a valued teaching associate. The principal constantly spoke down to me and rarely spoke at all, in fact, unless there was a parent/teacher issue to be explained.”

“This is not a personal grudge; it is very much just the way things are. Leadership members put staff against each other and put staff down.”

A further five participants indicated that principals developed personal relationships with some members of staff and not others. “The principal at this school treats staff differently. She goes out to lunch and spends weekends away with various members of executive team whom later discuss this quite openly.”
A recurring theme in this section was that some participants felt as though principals treated staff differently. It was also mentioned by one participant that in some cases favouritism occurred, which quite often led to promotion and/or advancement opportunities. “My principal has definite favourite staff members who often get all the 'good' jobs with recognition and other staff get no jobs or mundane tasks with limited recognition.”

Two comments involving the management of staff included principals being demeaning towards staff and displaying dictatorial behaviour. “The principal at this school is like a 'queen bee'. She has her followers and her favourites. She often criticises members of staff in front of others”

“The principal is a dictator, talks to people in an unkind, unprofessional way on occasions.”

It was indicated by three participants that principals were practising forms of bullying, and that members of the school board were also a part of the bullying demonstrated in schools. “The principal and some of the executive staff are intimidating bullies! I have spent years hoping things would improve ...”

“Staff are berated, threatened, bullied and harassed by the leadership. Staff lose their sense of professionalism. They are treated like the students they teach and often adopt a similarly poor attitude. Often the principal is also berated by the board that oversee the running of the school, and this form of bullying then trickles down the line.”
Furthermore, three participants (15%) raised concern about school boards. It was clear from the statements that there was a lack of school board involvement, particularly when reports of inappropriate behaviour or mismanagement were displayed by principals. “The principal’s leadership is very poor however; he has the ability to convince the board and executive that all is great.” It was evident across the three statements, that school boards were either unaware of such issues, or school boards chose to ignore the problems.

For example one participant specified that; “… Some of the older members of staff tolerated him (having worked in the school for 20+ years) although many new and younger members of staff felt it necessary to resign.... one would have thought ... the School Board would have read the signs and acted a little sooner, before ruining so many careers.”

A total of three participants made comments regarding principals’ unethical behaviour involving national testing such as NAPLAN and school performance measures.

“... staff can be pressured into working very long hours with nothing to compensate them for this. More often, lower fee schools are trying to introduce 'extras' as incentives for parents to send their children to the school. One example is Saturday tutoring. In many of these schools staff are pressured into tutoring students for NAPLAN tests during the weekend. Sometimes payment is offered, sometimes it is not”.

Of these three participants, it was also revealed that some teachers were pressured into changing student grades and being asked to inform parents that their children were performing at a higher level than actual. “… I found myself (under the principal's duress) altering annual report grades from a 'D' in Mathematics to an 'A' or an 'E' to a 'B' and so
on to match those scored by the children in their NAPLAN results. This was not a true
indication of the student's learning ability ... This decision has left a lot of teachers feeling
undermined and under-valued."

Interestingly, only one of the 20 participants left a comment of a positive nature regarding
staff management and the relationship between staff and principal. "The Principal at my
school is an amazing person on so many levels. Some of the staff the next step down are
not necessarily in the same calibre, which then impacts the rest of the staff. When a school
is very large it is difficult to have the entire executive "the same"... unfortunately it can
take just one bad fly to spoil the ointment."

School Management

Comments were made regarding the principal’s involvement in the overall management
and the day-to-day administration of the school. All 14 participants’ (22%) responses were
of a negative nature. Some participants discussed the apparent lack of experience and lack
of ability of their school principals “The primary principal at this school discourages
teachers and seems highly inexperienced in her role as principal. She often relies on the
deputy and other long-term teachers for all information and delegates responsibility.”

“The principal of our junior school is unfamiliar with the policies, K-6 curriculum and
young children in general. She has never taught in a junior school and relies on staff for
most information.”

“... She is high school trained and is working in a junior school for the first time.”
Other participants questioned their principal’s commitment to quality education and indicated they were overworked, undervalued and that schools were being run like businesses. “... The leadership at my current school seems to view education simply as a business where more "bottoms on seats" are needed (without additional staff) to pay overheads. This does not coincide with my view of education.”

“The schools are run like a corporation with very poor management and the dollar always reigns supreme. Workload issues are also always a problem in such schools, with staff feeling overworked and undervalued all of the time. Such schools cannot be regulated the way government and systemic schools can be so staff can be pressured into working very long hours with nothing to compensate them for this.”

Amongst the 14 responses, comments were made in regard to principals being ‘off-site’ or ‘absent’ when most needed. “The leader of our school is the principal of three campuses. This is an example of where being spread too thinly is not working. I know there is recent research stating that this situation is an ideal one, but from experience, it is not. Our campus is looking at closure as a result.”

“It is worth noting that the principal of K-12 spends little or no time in the junior school, for which I am the K-2 coordinator. As such she shows little interest or influence on the teaching and learning in our department. This is highly disappointing at times but also enables us much autonomy. Our job satisfaction is high, despite or because of the principal’s lack of engagement and interest in K-2.”
As mentioned above, however, the principal’s absence (for some) was seen as an opportunity for greater teacher autonomy and was the possible cause of higher levels of job satisfaction in the school.

Further comments pertaining to the management of school were made in regard to high staff and principal turnover. “In the 5 years I've been working at this school the leadership has changed 3 times. Each time there has been a huge shift in staff participation, satisfaction, recognition, expectations and general direction of the school. I've seen a definite connection between leadership styles and staff satisfaction and happiness!”

Another participant commented that after 13 staff resignations and three deputy head resignations across three years due to the poor leadership, nothing was done.

“... After thirteen resignations and three changes of deputies in three years, one would have thought the K-12 Head or the School Board would have read the signs and acted a little sooner, before ruining so many careers ...”

Another participant felt that principal assessments and evaluations should be introduced and forwarded to the school board on behalf of the teaching staff. This would allow for greater communication between teachers and executives working in the school. “All principals need at least monthly assessment – preferably by their own staff – but results must be passed on to superiors. This assessment should be both formal and informal.”
Support and Collaboration

A total of six participants stated that support from principals was limited, there was little-to-no specialist support provided and that at times parents received more support than the teachers themselves. “She quite often supports the parents over her own staff and young staff members feel unsupported.”

“Support is limited, sometimes non-existent. Teachers are left to deal with a myriad of difficult student problems with no training and no specialized support. Parents remove their children from the school and teachers are quizzed, berated, threatened and blamed for this.”

“I feel disappointed that I am not always able to achieve the best by my students, as the leadership at my school has unrealistic expectations about what can be achieved. Inadequate technical support also means that IT equipment is often not functioning and therefore unavailable.”

Decision-Making

Overall, six participants (10%) made statements regarding the decision-making practices in their schools. All six participants considered that staff involvement was very limited. “The staff are not allowed to express opinions or make requests for assistance or resources. There is no collaborate decision making.”

“After many years the staff at this school are no longer encouraged to be part of the decision making process. The executive team are ineffective because they are not
encouraged to make decisions without the permission of the principal. At staff meetings staff are told what will happen and the consideration of their experience in teaching is ignored.”

“It is also important for principals to listen to suggestions for improvement with an open mind, willing to consider that there may be other ways to approach things.”

Delegation

Delegation of duties and work overload were emerging issues raised by five participants (8%) in relation to their principals. Six statements proclaimed that deputy principals and longer serving members of staff were often inheriting principals’ workloads and responsibilities. “Our principal is very much into delegating and getting things done at the expense of others.”

“Long serving staff members and the deputy are constantly being called upon to carry out additional workloads on her behalf...”

“Quite often, we are expected to carry out workload requests, which she then has no problem taking credit for when a good job has been done.”

Communication

The statements relating to communication indicated that six participants (10%) found the communication between principals and staff was poor and more often than not, some members of staff felt victimised, humiliated and belittled. “This principal can be vicious in her approach (to both parents and teachers) when trying to deal with important issues. She
doesn't consider long term consequences or private matters involving staff and students which are often discussed openly.”

“Work related issues involving individual staff are often sent out via email to all staff so that issues are open, exposed and clarified amongst all. This is humiliating to those involved and distasteful to those clever enough to read between the lines.”

“This is a wonderful school in terms of children and parents, we have some great new teachers and it is so sad to see them considering giving up teaching after working in our school for only a year or two. Parents are always given a 'token' welcome, but the attitude of leadership is to keep parents out and build a divide between parents and staff.”

Colleagues

Leadership and colleagues were referred to by four participants (6%) in both a positive and a negative manner. Whilst some participants found their colleagues to be the driving force behind continuing on in their careers, others found them to be the very reason for bringing levels of staff morale down. “Colleagues are a great joy and encouragement – the reason I stay.”

“If you work above and beyond, do a good job and your students appear to like you, your colleagues despise you. Your morale diminishes and so too does your ability to function at your full potential. How does a principal protect their good teachers? Or is it easier to ignore this problem?”
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“There are some colleagues who are indifferent, disagreeable and unwilling to be part of a unified team, and bring the school down, but not the principal.”

**Recognition**

Situations involving a variety of positive and negative forms of leadership and recognition were described by 11 Participants (17%). The notion of favouritism was evident throughout the statements, revealing that certain members of staff were appointed to attractive jobs that promoted recognition whilst others received arduous tasks with limited recognition.

“My principal has definite favourite staff members who often get all the 'good' jobs with recognition and other staff get no jobs or mundane tasks with limited recognition. There is no teacher leadership in my school. Only executive staff are given professional roles, teachers are not given opportunity.”

“The Principal and Assistant Principal work hard to build divides between staff, certain staff are rewarded and promoted, and others no matter how hard they work are never affirmed.”

“Whilst I've organised at least five whole school events this year, I have only been formally recognised for one. I don't do the jobs to be recognised, but it is nice to be told you are doing a good job by the one person who hires you.”
“... The principal constantly spoke down to me and rarely spoke at all, in fact, unless there was a parent/teacher issue to be explained.” “... We are treated quite poorly (especially by some parents) who only report the things they are not happy about and very rarely those they are.”

“It is important for teachers to have their strengths and abilities recognised and acknowledged by management/principal. A good leader knows their staff and is able therefore to perceive the strengths and interests of their staff. They can then encourage them to pursue these within the context of the school, eg. special projects, PD, leadership etc.”

“A principal’s genuine smile goes along way when directed at you personally.”

Responsibility

Four participants (6%) who discussed issues or matters regarding Responsibility reported that whilst full responsibility was expected of teachers in the day-to-day planning of their work and their teaching, sometimes guidelines and policies prohibited freedom and creativity to carry out their duties effectively. Some participants felt it was their responsibility to conform and fall in line with those school policies and expectations, while others felt that they were not treated as professionals and were quite often spoken down to.

“Staff are aware they can only make comments/suggestions that are in line with school/principal's policy or they will not be well regarded.”

“Parents very rarely make appointments to meet and barge in unexpectedly when issues arise. This makes teaching at the beginning of the day (and throughout) extremely difficult
with the children. We do not barge in on 'doctors', 'lawyers' or any other profession for that matter, and then demand reasons for our ill health or the issue at hand. A little respect would go a long way. This issue is ignored by our principal who is too busy trying to win 'friends' and 'influence' parents at the expense of staff morale.”

“A teacher's job is no longer straightforward. We are pushed in all directions and work well beyond the hours expected. We are treated quite poorly (especially by some parents) who only report the things they are not happy about and very rarely those they are.”

**Advancement**

A total of seven participants (11%) made comments in relation to advancement. Whilst some participants indicated they were not looking for advancement, others expressed keen interest in such opportunities. “There is no teacher leadership in my school. Only executive staff are given professional roles, teachers are not given opportunity.”

“Staff are aware they cannot make complaints or their jobs/promotion prospects might be in jeopardy.”

**Work Itself**

Comments pertaining to the category, work itself, were made by four participants. These participants implied that a teacher’s role was multifaceted; it was no longer straightforward and more often than not teachers were expected to work above and beyond the recommended hours.

“A teacher's job is no longer straightforward. We are pushed in all directions and work well beyond the hours expected.”
“A number of staff are feeling incredibly overworked and pushed for time as a lot of work has been delegated to them, our class loads have increased and new programs have been written/implemented (by us) with such finite detail that they are almost prescriptive at times. Similarly work is said to be due and then we complete it and told that actually we are not doing this now …”

“...teachers are receiving weekly emails with additional responsibilities such as complete this survey (this is my 3rd this week), attend this seminar, listen to this lecture, comment on this reading, write on this blog, interview this person. At times it's hard not to get crabby when we are paid for a 35hr week, our workload used to be about a 50hr week and now I am working about a 65hr week plus during school holidays”. Another participant stated: “... I am very good at multi-tasking and making optimum use of my time, but the workload is getting ridiculous and taking away from teaching preparation time.”

Working Conditions

The working conditions such as facilities and physical surroundings received little attention in the comments made by participants. This would indicate that the working conditions were satisfactory and most participants were satisfied with their overall conditions. “I am happy where I work. The environment is community based and learning is apparent among the staff and students. There is always room for improvement in any workplace but despite that, I recognise my workplace as a place where people work together for the greater good of the students, and staff are satisfactorily looked after on a personal level and very well looked after in a professional capacity”
Other Statements

Very few participants across the study made statements of a positive nature and in support of the leadership in schools. In total, there were only 3 positive comments, including: the previous comment in Working Conditions and the following two:

“I completed this in reference to the Head of K-6, as that is the area I'm working in. There are instances where he is restricted in the amount of support he can offer his staff because of restrictions imposed on him by the Executive principal and school board. My K-6 leader is an excellent, Godly leader who is very well respected.”

“The principal I work with is the best leader that I have worked under. The best things about him are that he is very upfront, caring and his word can be trusted.”

4.7 Summary

In this chapter the results of the study were presented and discussed. Examination of the descriptive statistics established that the sample was representative of the teaching population across NSW independent primary schools in terms of age, years of experience, teaching position and location.

The study findings constitute a significant contribution to the literature. That is, the finding that participants perceived their leaders as being more transformational than transactional in their style of leadership. The finding that there was no clear demarcation between transformational and transactional leadership as practiced by principals in NSW independent primary schools is an interesting and important finding as was the conclusion
that both transformational and transactional leadership may be appropriate in difference contexts.

Similarly, the finding that more than two thirds (the majority) of primary school teachers in NSW independent school were satisfied in their jobs is encouraging but it is significant that nearly one third of study participants were dissatisfied, which, constitutes a possible serious limitation in the capacity as schools to serve students and their communities.

Also significant was the finding that job satisfaction was considered 26.12 times higher when led by a principal using a transformational style of leadership as opposed to a transactional style of leadership. This signifies the importance of educating future leaders with the foundations of a transformational style of leadership, should job satisfaction be heightened in educational settings.

Another area of significant finding was the gender of school principals in relation to the percentage of principals working in that capacity. The leadership in schools was significantly male dominant, while the teaching profession was significantly female dominant. Interestingly however, the findings did show that of the participants, who were dissatisfied in their jobs, exactly 50% had male principals and the other 50% had female principals and vice versa. These results confirmed that the gender of a principal has no relative effect on the perceived satisfaction of one’s job and indicate that gender is not a contributing factor to one’s job satisfaction.

Qualitative comments provided important insights on leadership and job satisfaction matters held by participants, who chose to air their opinions on specific issues which
directly or indirectly were connected towards their principals’ school management. The findings from the comments section were not reflective of the quantitative results. A total of 97% of the comments were of a negative nature. It was assumed that the participants who responded to this question were those participants dissatisfied in their jobs. Interestingly, however, numerous tests proved this assumption was not true. Some participants, who scored substantially high scores of job satisfaction, recorded a great deal of dissatisfaction in their comments. It was determined that the Likert-scale question and answer form in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) or the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) made it difficult for participants to express their feelings on particular matters of concern that were perhaps not raised in the two surveys.

The results of the Chi-Squares, t-tests, correlation coefficients and multiple regressions were analysed and their findings are discussed in relation to the hypotheses and research questions in the final chapter.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter concludes the thesis. It comprises an overview of the study, findings from the data analyses described in chapter 4 and conclusions for each of the research questions and hypotheses. Limitations that arose throughout the study are also discussed. The chapter concludes by presenting recommendations for future research and implications for theory and practice.

5.2 Overview of the Study

The main aim of this study was to determine the relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by primary school teachers in NSW independent (non-government) primary schools. An extensive review of the literature suggested that transformational and transactional leadership styles may be related to job satisfaction, therefore, the focus of this study was to examine whether or not relationships existed between principals’ leadership styles and primary school teachers, as perceived by teachers themselves.

The study used a quantitative approach that examined transformational and transactional styles of leadership in relation to a set of job satisfaction variables including supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition. It included a small qualitative component allowing participants to make responses pertaining to leadership and job satisfaction matters.
A total of 211 NSW independent primary school teachers, from all-girls’, all-boys’ and co-educational schools, varying in region, school size and religious denomination, participated in the study. Independent (non-government) schools in NSW were chosen for this study due to their leadership autonomy, unique governance structure, increasing popularity and accessibility for research.

Data were collected using a survey combining two instruments and comprising four sections: a demographic survey, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004), an adapted Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) developed by Lester (1987) and a general comments section. Descriptive and inferential procedures such as t-tests, Chi-Squares, correlations and multiple regressions were used for data analysis and to test the hypotheses.

5.3 Main Conclusions

This section provides a summary of the findings as presented in chapter 4 and discusses conclusions that can be drawn from these findings. The findings and conclusions are organised with reference to each research question and its related hypotheses. All three research hypotheses were supported.
5.3.1 Research Question and Hypotheses 1

**Research Question 1:** “What style of leadership is being practised in NSW independent primary schools as perceived by primary school teachers?”

The quantitative results revealed that participants (N = 211) rated their leaders as being more transformational (M = 3.30, SD 1.03) in their leadership style than transactional (M = 2.78, SD 0.49).

A breakdown of leadership characteristics determined the weighting of behaviours in terms of transformational and transactional characteristics. Participants perceived their leaders as being more transformational in their leadership style in terms of inspirational motivation (M = 3.74, SD 1.06), idealised behaviour (M = 3.69, SD 1.01) and idealised attributes (M = 3.25, SD 1.24). These findings support the literature, whereby transformational leaders are said to be visionary and authentic, and use transforming methods of leadership to change and improve organisations (Yukl, 2009). As found in the current study, they do promote inspirational motivation, idealised behaviours and idealised attributes (Bass, 1990).

Participants perceived their leaders as being less transactional particularly in terms of characteristics such as management-by-exception (passive) (M = 2.60, SD 1.05), and laissez-faire (M = 2.39, SD 1.10). These findings indicate that the implementation of negative forms of leadership are less utilised.

Interestingly, it was also revealed that the leadership characteristics pertaining to intellectual stimulation (M = 2.92, SD 1.13) and individualised consideration (M = 2.88, SD 1.21) were considerably low. While these characteristics are pivotal to the
transformational style of leadership, teachers suggested that transactional styles of leadership, including management-by-exception (active) \((M = 3.08, \ SD \ 0.93)\) and contingent reward \((M = 3.02, \ SD \ 1.14)\) were more prominent.

It was clear from these results, therefore, that leadership styles traverse, and that no leader is entirely either transformational or transactional. These results support the works of Bass (1985), who contended that transformational and transactional leadership are distinct processes, but neither is mutually exclusive. He suggests that transformational leadership complements the effects of transactional leadership. As discussed earlier in relation to the Great Man Theory, while theoretically dissimilar, both transformational and transactional leadership behaviours are highly important and valuable for a diverse range of needs. This implies that successful leadership in educational settings and other organizations occurs when these behaviours can be demonstrated in various strengths by the same leader depending on the situation, task, or the group’s needs.

The literature pertaining to Burns’ (1978), theory, on the other hand can be ruled out. This theory explains that transformational and transactional leadership were at opposing ends of a continuum. In this study, this was not found to be the case.

The qualitative findings reported different results. A high percentage of negative comments were made, which implied that transactional leadership was taking place. Amongst many other concerns, it was revealed that leadership behaviours such as management-by-exception (passive) and (active) were being displayed. Some participants reported that leaders were absent when needed and had a lack of respect for members of staff.
Research Hypothesis 1 predicted, “A transformational style of leadership will be practised across NSW independent primary schools as perceived by primary school teachers”.

The findings for the descriptive results signified the majority of participants (N = 211) rated their leaders as being more transformational (M = 3.29, SD 1.02) than transactional (M = 2.78, SD 0.49) in their leadership style. Thus, this hypothesis was supported.

This hypothesis supports the original implication that the leadership being practised by principals in independent primary schools would be predominantly transformational, where the emphasis of maintaining quality education and ensuring educational excellence was a priority. This could also provide insight into reasons for the nation-wide increase in student enrolments across the independent school sector. Finally, it could be implied leadership autonomy allows principals greater control over matters that establish successful learning communities.

5.3.2 Research Question and Hypotheses 2

Research Question 2: “How do primary school teachers working in NSW independent primary schools perceive their job satisfaction?”

The mean, median and standard deviation scores for the overall perceived teacher job satisfaction (M = 3.46, SD 0.62) suggest the majority of participants, 151 (71.6%), had scores of greater than 3.0, implying that more than two-thirds of participants in the study were satisfied in their jobs. The remaining 60 (28.4%) were dissatisfied.
A breakdown of the job satisfaction factors (not relating to leadership style) suggested that responsibility (M = 4.36, SD 0.41), colleagues (M = 3.57, SD 0.79), the work itself (M = 3.59, SD 0.50) and work conditions (M = 3.34, SD 0.54) were the main contributors to higher job satisfaction, as these factors all scored above the average mean score. Supervision (M = 3.18, SD 1.13), recognition (M = 2.93, SD 0.58) and advancements (M = 2.85, SD 1.07) on the other hand, had lower contributing scores of job satisfaction and thus contributed to job dissatisfaction.

These results indicate that participants found responsibility, colleagues and the work itself influenced higher levels of job satisfaction. On the other hand, variables such as advancement, recognition and supervision were contributors to job dissatisfaction.

Similarly, the comments discussed in the qualitative section were of a negative nature, and also confirmed that supervision, advancement and recognition were amongst the main areas of concern. Concerns included issues regarding school management, delegation of responsibilities, lack of support, collaboration and decision-making opportunities.

Participants considered that opportunities for advancement were limited, delegation was high, recognition for a job well done was minimal and supervision at times was considered authoritarian/dictatorial. Participants expressed feeling ‘belittled’, ‘mistreated’ and ‘undervalued’, all of which are high contributing factors to low job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Andrisani, 1978; Davis, 1992; Birkeland & Johnson, 2003; De Nobile & McCormick, 2006). Other factors of job satisfaction pertaining to working conditions, the work itself and responsibility were featured less in the qualitative section and were, comparatively, representative of the quantitative findings.
Furthermore, the comments in the qualitative section were supported by the literature pertaining to job dissatisfaction. The psychological and emotional effects that teachers experienced included: depression, powerlessness, cynicism and distrust, self-doubt, guilt, embarrassment, disillusionment and lowered self-esteem, all of which were mentioned as contributors to low job satisfaction (Andrisani, 1978; Davis, 1992; Birkeland & Johnson, 2003; De Nobile & McCormick, 2006).

**Research Hypothesis 2** predicted, “Primary school teachers working in NSW independent primary schools will be satisfied in their teaching jobs.” The overall findings for this hypothesis were supported. The majority of participants, 151 (71.6%) had scores of greater than 3.0, implying that more than two-thirds of participants in the study were satisfied in their jobs. The remaining 60 (28.4%) were dissatisfied.

This hypothesis supports the notion that independent schools promote higher job satisfaction in terms of providing staff with the facilities and opportunities to take on greater responsibility and accountability for their own work. Working conditions are satisfactory and meet the needs of the modern-day teacher.

It was clear from both quantitative and qualitative sections that factors of job satisfaction pertaining to supervision, advancement and recognition were of great concern. If job satisfaction is to be improved, factors such as these will require extensive research in relation to job satisfaction of primary school teachers.
5.3.3 Research Question and Hypotheses 3

Research Question 3: “What is the relationship between school principals’ leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction?”

There was a significant association between the style of leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction $x^2 (1) = 76.76, p < 0.001$. This represents the fact that based on the odds ratio, the odds of a teacher being satisfied was 26.12 times higher if they were led by a transformational leader than if they were led by a transactional leader. This result supports hypothesis 3, which predicted a positive association between transformational leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction.

Further testing was carried out to determine if there were any similarities and differences between the 1-item score and the 56-item score. Firstly, a breakdown of participants who perceived themselves as being satisfied or dissatisfied in their jobs was carried out. It was indicated that close to half (50.7%) the participants ($n = 107$) perceived themselves as being satisfied in their jobs. This was 20.9% less than those who scored satisfaction in the (56-item) questionnaire. The remaining 89 participants (42.2%) showed perceptions of dissatisfaction in their jobs, revealing a 29% increase in dissatisfaction levels between the two styles of testing. A total of 15 participants (7.1%) had neutral feelings towards their job satisfaction. Due to the 56-item questionnaire scores being combined and averaged to determine one mean score, the option of ‘neutral’ was not valid. Understandably, the elimination of these 15 participants from the main scores would have caused some variance in the results. Finally, these results represented a significant positive relationship in the Teacher Job Satisfaction (1-item) mean scores and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (56-item) mean scores ($r =$
0.475, p < 0.001). These results offer greater confidence that the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (56-item) is reliable and the results indicated by participants are accurate.

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for all of the individual Multifactor Leadership (MLQ) and Teacher Job Satisfaction (TJSQ) 56-item variables. Results indicated that all job satisfaction variables had positive correlations with transformational styles of leadership, and negative correlations with transactional styles of leadership. Contingent reward, however, was the only characteristic from the transactional leadership styles that scored all positive correlations with the job satisfaction variables.

The literature discusses ‘contingent reward’ as a constructive form of transactional leadership whereby a leader clarifies expectations and offers recognition when goals are achieved (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Contingent positive reinforcement could be as simple as a leader’s praise. Praise could be given when individuals complete a task on time, ahead of time, or when working at a good pace towards completion. Contingent negative reinforcement could involve handing out punishments for underperformance, such as suspensions when goals or tasks take longer than expected or are not met at all. Regardless of the reward or punishment, this style of leadership was widely accepted, and was positively associated with all factors of a teacher’s job satisfaction.

A breakdown of leadership styles and job satisfaction variables indicated that supervision (TJSQ) had very strong correlations across all the leadership variables, ranging from positive correlations with individualised consideration (r = 0.85) to negative correlations with laissez-faire (r = -0.74) variables. On average, advancement (r = 0.56), work itself (r = 0.55) and working conditions (r = 0.55) scored high positive correlations with
transformational styles of leadership, whilst responsibility ($r = 0.25$) had lower positive correlations with transformational styles of leadership.

Advancement ($r = -0.40$), work itself ($r = -0.38$) and colleagues ($r = 0.38$) scored high negative correlations with transactional styles of leadership, and responsibility ($r = -0.21$) again scored lower negative correlations with transformational styles of leadership. This result could be owing to the fact that responsibility in one’s job in many cases may not have a direct association with a principal’s style of leadership.

Furthermore, multiple regression analysis supported the above findings and revealed that the independent leadership variables accounted for 67% of the variance in job satisfaction. Normality was found to be satisfactory and job satisfaction (TJSQ) was treated as the dependent variable. The independent variables were the individual Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) characteristics: idealised attributed, idealised behaviour, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire.

The overall model was significant: $p = 0.000$. These findings confirm the correlation results: individualised consideration ($\beta = 0.17, p = 0.000$), idealised behaviour ($\beta = 0.12, p = 0.005$) management-by-exception (active) ($\beta = -0.06, p = 0.038$) and laissez-faire ($\beta = -0.121, p = 0.005$) were all significant variables accountable for job satisfaction.

As can be seen from these results, individualised consideration and idealised behaviour have the highest positive associations with job satisfaction. Consistent with the correlation
analysis, these results are reflective of transformational leadership styles being strongly related to increased levels of job satisfaction. Interestingly, however, analysis of the leadership questionnaire alone reported individualised consideration \((M = 2.88, SD 1.21)\) as having a considerably low mean score, lower than those characteristics show in transactional styles of leadership. This indicates that despite the individualised consideration leadership characteristic being the most important in terms of raising levels of job satisfaction, it was amongst the leadership characteristics less evident, as perceived by participants.

Management-by-exception (active) and laissez-faire variables have the highest negative associations with job satisfaction. Consistent with the correlation analysis, these results are reflective of transactional leadership styles pertaining to lower levels of satisfaction, or job dissatisfaction.

**Research Hypothesis 3** predicted, “The relationship between school principals’ leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction will be positively related to transformational leadership styles and negatively related to transactional styles of leadership.”

Chi-Square results indicated that satisfaction in one’s job: \(X^2 (1) = 76.76, p < 0.001\) was 26.12 times higher when led by a principal using a transformational style of leadership.

Pearson correlation coefficients indicated that the main transformational leadership characteristic contributing to job satisfaction with a significantly positive relationship was individualised consideration, \((r = 0.77)\), thus strongly supporting hypothesis 3. Laissez-
faire \( r = -0.66 \), a transactional style of leadership, on the other hand, was strongly negatively related, thus again supporting hypothesis 3.

The literature states that transformational leaders encourage their subordinates by sharing ideas, thoughts and areas of expertise to reach common goals for the benefit of the organization. Furthermore, when transformational leaders are connected with their subordinates, morale is boosted and motivation strengthened. Research implies that where transformational styles of leadership are being displayed, employees should be more satisfied, as opposed to dissatisfied, in their jobs.

Furthermore, these results also support the notion that where principals are inspirational and motivational, and where levels of aspiration are being heightened, job satisfaction will be higher and teachers will be happier, educational excellence will be promoted and supportive caring ‘disciplined’ environments will be sustained. It was, therefore, confirmed that transformational leadership styles are positively related to teacher job satisfaction, and transactional leadership styles are negatively related to teacher job satisfaction.
5.4 Limitations of the Study

This study has several limitations that should be taken into consideration. The limitations of a study are factors that may negatively influence the results, and their ability to be generalized (Gay & Airasian, 2000). Therefore, the results of this study need to be interpreted cautiously in light of the on-going response limitations that arose throughout the course of the study.

Mertens (2005) defines sampling as “the method used to select a given number of people (or things) from a population” and she quotes that “the strategy for selecting your sample influences the quality of your data and the inferences that you can make from it” (Mertens, 2005, p. 307). Maruyama and Deno (1992), recognised that it can be a long process to finally reach agreement with the appropriate persons who participate in the research, and this study was no exception. Firstly, and due to the abovementioned ethical guidelines, participants could be contacted only via a network of emails sent to the school administration email or directly to the principal.

From this point, it was up to the principals to decide whether or not staff participation was granted. Numerous principals responded that they were inundated with requests to contribute to various research projects, that they were inundated with work in general and for these reasons, were unwilling to forward an email link on to their teaching members of staff. Some principals responded that they were simply not interested in the study, while others did not respond at all. Gaining access to ‘teacher’ participants, therefore, proved complicated, as teachers from a wide variety of schools were unaware of the study’s existence. As a result, it took more than ten months to accumulate a statistically acceptable response rate.
Furthermore, it was hypothesised that principals who did choose to forward the survey link on to members of staff may have fallen under a particular style of leadership. The review of literature pertaining to transformational leadership concluded that teachers felt satisfied when their leaders were positive and supportive, when they were involved in decision-making processes, when their ideas were valued and when they felt a sense of worth in the establishment in which they worked.

Allowing members to make their own choices and being a part of the decision-making process is predominantly a transformational leadership trait. This could have explained why a transformational leadership style was represented more strongly than a transactional leadership style, and why participants displayed satisfaction, rather than dissatisfaction, in their jobs.

Additionally, the actions of satisfied teachers forwarding the survey to other satisfied teachers could have resulted in higher results of satisfaction, and vice-versa. It was also considered that teachers, who felt obliged to fill the survey out at school, might have felt threatened to answer the survey honestly in fear of results leaking and potentially ruining their careers. Factors such as these will need to be taken into consideration when interpreting the final results.

An external link was approved to be placed on the IEU website, directing IEU teaching members to the survey. This approach allowed teachers who were not originally privy to the survey an external method (not associated with the school or the principal) an opportunity to participate in the study. However, the IEU is a non-government education union in support of assisting teachers to achieve a fairer and safer workplace. It represents more than 28,000 members across NSW/ACT and is in support of teachers’ industrial and
professional interests. The survey link on the IEU website may have attracted teachers experiencing difficulties in their workplace who viewed the survey as an opportunity to express their angst towards certain matters, therefore, contributing to the results in a negative manner.

The sample size was relatively small in comparison to the entire independent primary school teaching population (N= approx. 5000) across NSW/ACT. While 211 responses is an acceptable number for statistical procedures (Gay & Airasian, 2000), in comparison to the teaching numbers across the state, this population was small.

Lastly, the study was limited to a small sub-group of NSW independent primary school teachers. The results of this study cannot be generalized beyond NSW/ACT, or the independent school sector from which the sample was taken. Moreover, the survey was presented in a Likert-scale format, which may not have provided teachers with the opportunity to answer questions honestly and in a way that would have communicated their opinions more accurately. Due to these potential complications and limitations, the results of this study could have been altered.
5.5 Implications for Theory

The findings from this study have a number of theoretical implications. These implications are discussed in relation to building on theory in the areas of leadership preparation and professional development in educational settings.

This study has been the first of its kind to utilise the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) in an Australian educational setting. This constitutes a new approach to the study of leadership in relation to job satisfaction across organisations and in particular NSW/ACT independent primary school settings. By testing the applicability of this model across other types of organisations, the relevance and robustness of this model could be better ascertained.

Through the concept of transformational and transactional leadership styles, further evidence is provided about characteristics of these leadership styles. In terms of leadership, the theoretical framework used in this study determines characteristics of leadership that have not yet been fully explored in educational settings: for example, leadership characteristics such as individualised consideration, idealised behaviour and inspirational motivation featured prominently as contributing factors of transformational leadership throughout this study. These results add support to the work of Bass and Avolio (1990b; 1990b) in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, as well as adding to current literature.

A need to further investigate the strong negative associations between job satisfaction and leadership styles, such as laissez-faire and management-by-exception (passive) will be important. Whilst the results reported here constitute a significant contribution to the body of existing knowledge, the strong negative correlation analyses indicate that a deeper
understanding of these leadership styles is required if successful implementation of leadership programs is to be undertaken.

This research provides support for the approach to job satisfaction put forward by Lester (1987) because the structure that emerged in this study was similar to that of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1987). Additionally, this study contributes to the research of scholars such as Herzberg (1964), Herzberg (1966), Maslow (1970), Lester (1987) Dinham and Scott (1996a; 1996b, 1998b; 2000), Bogler (2001) and Coleman (2011) who have previously established factors and dimensions of satisfaction in relation to one’s profession.

In particular, the findings of this study add to the extant literature pertaining to research that has established links between various styles of leadership and job satisfaction in the workplace: for example, McCormick and Solman (1992a), Bogler (2001), Barnett (2004; 2006), De Nobile and McCormick (2006; 2008b), McCormick (2007, 2008) and Coleman (2011).
5.6 Implications for Practice

Existing empirical literature stresses the importance of school leaders for good educational outcomes. Leithwood et al. (2004) suggested that approximately one quarter of the total school effects on student outcomes can be attributed (directly and indirectly) to school leadership. A meta-analysis by Hattie (2009) established that the most significant impacts of leadership come from its influence on teachers’ professional development and performance appraisal. This study offers a variety of implications for leadership practices in independent primary schools.

The strong positive relationships between supervision and transformational leadership characteristics, such as individualised consideration, idealised attributes and intellectual stimulation would suggest that leadership needs to be consistent with the supportive aspect of supervisory types of behaviour.

The job satisfaction factor responsibility and the work itself also featured prominently in the results of the study, therefore, suggesting that leaders should be aiming to express a greater sense of empowerment and confidence in their staff by articulating a compelling vision of the future and better expressing what needs to be accomplished. Ciulla (2004) articulates that a transformation of empowerment occurs so that others take on greater responsibility and accountability for achieving set goals and thus gaining a greater sense of personal and collective achievement.

It is suggested that this study be used to inform principals and school administrators in their endeavours to develop, deliver and improve on existing leadership policies and
practices, and leadership frameworks currently being used by leadership consultants and trainers in schools.

The findings of this study will be of practical use to consultants who often liaise with principals and executives in their efforts to devise research, informed leadership development and training programs. The implication for consultants and principals is to determine whether or not effective centres of learning are being run and whether staff are satisfied. Knowing that professional relationships with staff are vital, the incorporation of ‘team orientated’ development programs, therefore, will be essential.

Together with the principal, consultants will need to design programs that help leaders create a collective sense of mission, greater collegiality and team building opportunities with staff. Leaders should be encouraged to focus on showing genuine care, providing staff members with recognition and praise, encouraging staff participation and spending more time to develop and promote the strengths amongst members of staff. Maintaining regular contact with all members of staff by visiting classrooms and encouraging teaching are just a number of ways leaders and consultants can work towards building these relationships.

The findings presented in this study add to the empirical works of positive psychologists and leadership advocates such as Seligman (2002) and Cameron, Dutton et al. (2003). For school counsellors who liaise and support school staff in matters concerning ‘working with others’, ‘self-esteem’ and ‘wellbeing’, the findings of this study, could provide a robust platform of important focus areas.

Of most importance, this study’s findings will provide directions for counsellors and educational administrators to improve existing leadership policies, encouraging leaders to
better apply prevention strategies to resolve problems and conflicts before they get out of hand. These strategies will assist leaders in their endeavours to become more effective when working with staff, students, parents and the community in general.

Independent schools across Australia undergo regular performance audit and review processes. Given the significant correlations revealed in this study, it could be proposed that during the registration and accreditation process that an audit of leadership and teacher job satisfaction becomes a compulsory component of this procedure. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) could be worthwhile instruments when auditing the success of the school in terms of organisational management and job satisfaction.

Finally, this study may be used to inform those involved in organisations other than education in their endeavours to design and develop better leadership policies based on current empirical research.
5.7 Implications for Future Research

The results from this study propose a number of potential directions for future research. Firstly, it is recommended that a quantitative study similar to the current study be undertaken across a wider range of independent school settings (including preparatory, primary, middle and secondary levels) and involve a larger sample size. This would help determine whether or not the results from this study can be replicated.

In terms of wider application, larger educational settings such as the NSW Department of Education and Communication and the Catholic Education Sectors could be included in future studies. If successful, and subject to appropriate adaptations, research across higher educational tertiary settings such as universities and/or TAFE colleges could be implemented.

Additionally, the qualitative component of this study, albeit small, added another dimension. The general comments revealed a number of emergent themes pertaining to leadership and job satisfaction that had not been considered previously in the initial data analysis. These emerging themes and issues added value and greater depth and meaning to the overall understanding of leadership in relation to job satisfaction, and in particular the supervisory aspects of job satisfaction.

This suggests a need for greater research on these dimensions. Future research could implement an additional qualitative component to include focus groups, case studies and/or in-depth interviews with teachers and perhaps principals. This would add further value and provide a deeper understanding of quantitative findings, which could in turn add to the current leadership/job satisfaction dimensions.
In terms of leadership, the theoretical framework used in this study provides a platform for greater exploration concerning characteristics of leadership that have not yet been fully explored: for example, leadership characteristics such as individualised consideration, idealised behaviour and inspirational motivation featured prominently throughout this study as factors contributing to transformational leadership. Further research and a greater understanding of these characteristics could hold potential benefits for those working in leadership positions who are seeking to boost morale, collegiality, work performance and the overall success of the school.

Accordingly, this research provides a platform for greater investigation into job satisfaction variables that have been less extensively researched. In particular, the results determined from this study indicated that more than two-thirds of the participants were satisfied in their jobs, yet variables such as supervision, recognition and advancement were the main contributing factors to one’s dissatisfaction. When leadership and job satisfaction were linked, it was revealed that individualised consideration was the characteristic of leadership that raised levels of job satisfaction far more than any other character or behaviour. A deeper awareness of these job satisfaction and leadership variables is necessary if one is to gain a full understanding as to how leadership directly and indirectly impacts on one’s satisfaction.

Extensive research on the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction has revealed that there is limited research on this area, particularly in Australia. The results and findings from this study are vital for schools and will add to the dearth of literature related to this topic. It may also provide scope to examine and compare aspects of a school’s culture, as well as to re-shape existing leadership frameworks.
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To: School Head / Admin / K-6 Teachers  
From: Katie Waters (UOW)  
CC: ALL K-6 Primary Teachers  
Date: 11.05.11  
Email: katiew@uow.edu.au  
Pages: 1 Page Only  
Re: Research Study on Leadership Styles and Teacher Job Satisfaction

** Please distribute a copy to all K-6 primary teachers **

OR EMAIL

katiew@uow.edu.au and a link will be sent to your school for distribution

LEADERSHIP STYLES + TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

Dear Colleagues,

A study is presently being carried out by Katie Waters (Doctoral Candidate @ University of Wollongong) to seek the current relationship between principal leadership styles and job satisfaction as perceived by primary school teachers across NSW Independent primary schools.

If you are interested in being a part of this study, please go to the web address below and complete the survey. The cover page on the survey will provide you with all the information and any contact details you may require.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/6357JSK

Please note that this survey is completely anonymous and all information will be generated and analysed electronically. At no stage will teachers be asked to identify themselves, other members of staff, the principal or the school. Anonymity is guaranteed.

Thank you for your interest in this study.
Katie Waters

To not receive any future faxes or communication, please contact Katie Waters.

Faculty of Education: University of Wollongong NSW 2522 Australia

Email: katiew@uow.edu.au  
Web Address: www.uow.edu.au
Dear [insert principal’s name],

Currently a Doctorate candidate in Leadership and Management at the University of Wollongong, I am interested in enhancing the overall understanding of leadership in primary schools for future educational development.

Please help support me in my research by forwarding the following link to your K-6 members of staff.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/6357JSK

The above link will lead to the cover page, which will provide you and your staff with all information and any contact details you may require. Please note that this survey is completely anonymous, 1-5 (agree – disagree) answers only are required and all information will be generated and analysed electronically. At no stage will teachers be asked to identify themselves, other members of staff, the principal or the school. Anonymity is guaranteed.

Thank you in advance for your interest and contribution to this study.

Kind Regards,

Katie Waters.

Doctorate Candidate
Faculty of Education
University of Wollongong
katiew@uow.edu.au
Appendix C: Letter to Participants

Dear Teacher Colleague,

I invite you as a full- / part-time primary school teacher in a NSW Independent primary school to complete the following survey. As part of a Doctoral Thesis, I am conducting a study that seeks to find the relationship between principal leadership styles and job satisfaction as perceived by primary school teachers across NSW Independent primary schools. If you choose to be included, you are asked to complete the following survey that will take approximately 20-30 minutes in total. Your consent to participate will be indicated by the completion of the survey.

Likert-type scales 1-5 (strongly agree – strongly disagree) will be used, and at no time will teachers be asked to identify themselves, the principal, any member of staff or the school. The survey consists of the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (Avolio and Bass, 1995) and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1984), two widely recognised questionnaires in the field of education / educational leadership. Typical questions in the questionnaires could include: The principal ...‘acts in ways that builds my respect’, ‘gets me to do more than I am expected to do’, ‘leads a successful team’, ‘avoids getting involved when important issues arise’, ‘uses methods of leadership that are satisfying.’ Approximately 50% of the items have been written in a positive form and 50% in a negative form, to avoid response set bias.

All information gathered will be analysed and generated electronically therefore your identity will remain strictly anonymous at all times. Findings from the study will be used as part of the aforementioned thesis component, and may be published in educational journals and conference proceedings. This research aims to further educate current and future principals, administrators and consultants in their endeavours to improve school policies and practices, whilst aiming to become more effective leaders, managers of teachers and people in general.

This research project has been reviewed by the University of Wollongong’s Human Research Ethics Committee, and apart from 20-30 minutes of your time to complete the survey, we can foresee no risks for you. Your involvement in the study is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation from the study at any time. Any data provided to that point will be withdrawn. Refusal to participate in the study will not affect your relationship with the University of Wollongong. If there are any ethical concerns or complaints regarding the way this research has been conducted you can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, University of Wollongong on (02) 4221 4457.

Your involvement and contribution to this study are greatly appreciated.

Yours Sincerely,

Katie Waters
Appendix D: Survey Monkey Example

Leadership Styles & Teacher Job Satisfaction

1. Teacher Information

The relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by primary school teachers across NSW Independent schools.

Dear Teacher Colleague,

I would like to invite you as a full / part-time primary school teacher in a NSW Independent primary school to complete the following survey. As part of a Doctoral Thesis, I am conducting a study that seeks to find the relationship between principal leadership styles and job satisfaction as perceived by primary school teachers across NSW Independent primary schools.

If you choose to be included, you are asked to complete the following survey that will take approximately 20-30 minutes in total. Your consent to participate will be indicated by the completion of the survey.

Likert-type scales 1-4 (strongly agree - strongly disagree) will be used and at no time will teachers be asked to identify themselves, the principal, any member of staff or the school. The survey consists of the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (1995, Avolio & Bass) and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (1984, Lester), two widely recognised questionnaires in the field of education / educational leadership. Typical questions in the questionnaires could include: The principal...acts in ways that builds my respect,' gets me to do more than I am expected to do', 'leads a successful team', 'avoids getting involved when important issues arise', 'uses methods of leadership that are satisfying'.

Approximately 50% of the items have been written in a positive form, and 50% in a negative form to avoid response set bias.

All information gathered will be analysed and generated electronically therefore your identity will remain strictly anonymous at all times. Findings from the study will be used as part of the aforementioned thesis component, and may be published in educational journals and conference proceedings. This research aims to further educate current and upcoming principals, administrators & consultants in their endeavours to improve school policies and practices whilst aiming to become more effective leaders, managers of teachers and people in general.

This research project has been reviewed by the University of Wollongong Human Research Ethics Committee and apart from 20-30 minutes of your time to complete the survey, we can foresee no risks for you. Your involvement in the study is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation from the study at any time. Any data provided to that point will be withdrawn. Refusal to participate in the study will not affect your relationship with the University of Wollongong.

Your involvement and contribution to this study is greatly appreciated.

Your involvement and contribution to this study is greatly appreciated.
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Appendix E: Email to Director of IEU

University of Wollongong

Dear Mr Shearman,

My name is Katie Waters and I am currently working towards completion of my Doctorate studies at the University of Wollongong. As part of the required thesis I am researching “Effective Leadership” and conducting a study that seeks to find the relationship between principal leadership styles and job satisfaction, as perceived by primary school teachers across NSW independent primary schools.

Your approval is sought for a website link and the distribution of this survey to all full-time primary school teaching members / representatives of the IEU (not including Catholic school teachers). Teachers will be asked to complete an online anonymous survey that will take approximately 20-30 minutes in total. Likert-type scales 1-5 (strongly agree – strongly disagree) will be used and at no time will staff be asked to identify themselves, the principal, any member of staff or the school.

The survey consists of the MLQ (Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire) and the TJSQ (Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire), two widely recognised questionnaires in the field of education / educational leadership. Typical questions in the questionnaires could include: The principal ... ‘acts in ways that builds my respect’, ‘gets me to do more than I expected to do’, ‘leads a successful team’, ‘avoids getting involved when important issues arise’, ‘uses methods of leadership that are satisfying’. Approximately 50% of the items have been written in a positive form and 50% in a negative form, to avoid response set bias.

All information gathered by the researcher will be generated electronically and the identity of teachers, schools and principals will remain strictly anonymous at all times. Findings
from the study will be used as part of the aforementioned thesis component, and may be published in educational journals and conference proceedings in the hope to further educate current and future principals, administrators and consultants in their endeavours to improve school policies and practices, whilst aiming to become more effective managers of teachers and people in general.

This research project has been reviewed by the University of Wollongong’s Human Research Ethics Committee. For your perusal, a link to the survey has been provided. In addition, an information letter for teachers has been included in this email. If your approval is granted, it is intended that this letter will be emailed to teachers, providing them with a direct link to the survey in order to participate. A link to the survey has been copied into the email.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/6357JSK

Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me via email at katiew@uow.edu.au or by phone on 02 4221 1555, or contact one of the supervisors listed below. If there are any ethical concerns you can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, University of Wollongong on (02) 4221 4457.

Yours Sincerely,
Katie Waters
(Doctorate Candidate)

INVESTIGATORS

A/Prof Narottam Bhindi
Faculty of Education
02 4221 5477
nbhindi@uow.edu.au

Prof Lori Lockyer
Faculty of Education
02 4221 5511
llockyer@uow.edu.au

Katie Waters
Faculty of Education
02 4221 1555
katiew@uow.edu.au
Appendix F: Survey Link on IEU Website
Appendix G: Full Survey

Leadership Styles & Teacher Job Satisfaction

1. Teacher Information

The relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by primary school teachers across NSW independent schools.

Dear Teacher Colleague,

I would like to invite you as a full / part-time primary school teacher in a NSW Independent primary school to complete the following survey. As part of a Doctoral Thesis, I am conducting a study that seeks to find the relationship between principal leadership styles and job satisfaction as perceived by primary school teachers across NSW Independent primary schools.

If you choose to be included, you are asked to complete the following survey that will take approximately 20-30 minutes in total. Your consent to participate will be indicated by the completion of the survey.

Likert-type scales 1-4 (strongly agree – strongly disagree) will be used and at no time will teachers be asked to identify themselves, the principal, any member of staff or the school. The survey consists of the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (1995, Avolio & Bass) and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (1984, Lester), two widely recognised questionnaires in the field of education / educational leadership. Typical questions in the questionnaires could include: ‘The principal acts in ways that builds my respect’, ‘gets me to do more than I am expected to do’, ‘leads a successful team’, ‘avoids getting involved when important issues arise’, ‘uses methods of leadership that are satisfying.’

Approximately 50% of the items have been written in a positive form, and 50% in a negative form to avoid response set bias.

All information gathered will be analysed and generated electronically therefore your identity will remain strictly anonymous at all times. Findings from the study will be used as part of the aforementioned thesis component, and may be published in educational journals and conference proceedings. This research aims to further educate current and upcoming principals, administrators & consultants in their endeavours to improve school policies and practices whilst aiming to become more effective leaders, managers of teachers and people in general.

This research project has been reviewed by the University of Wollongong Human Research Ethics Committee and apart from 20-30 minutes of your time to complete the survey, we can foresee no risks for you. Your involvement in the study is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation from the study at any time. Any data provided to that point will be withdrawn. Refusal to participate in the study will not affect your relationship with the University of Wollongong. If there are any ethical concerns or complaints regarding the way this research has been conducted you can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, University of Wollongong on (02) 42214457.

Your involvement and contribution to this study is greatly appreciated.

Yours Sincerely,

Katie Waters
(PhD Candidate)

Faculty of Education
University of Wollongong
Wollongong, NSW, Australia
Email: katiew@uow.edu.au
**Leadership Styles & Teacher Job Satisfaction**

**1. How did you find out about this survey?**
- Principal
- Fax
- School Email
- IEU Website
- Colleague
- Other

**2. What is your current teaching position?**
- Full Time (K-9) Primary Teacher
- Part Time (K-9) Primary Teacher

3. **Sydney Regions (ONLY).**
   Please choose your school's location from the drop box menu.

4. **NSW regions (NOT INCLUDING SYDNEY)**
   Please choose your school’s region from the drop box menu.

**2. Part A - General Information**

The General Information in Part A will be used to find similarities across regions, gender types, age groups and levels of teaching experience.

**1. School's religious affiliation**
- Christian (various denominations)
- Catholic Independent
- Non-denominational
- Other

**2. School Type**
- All Girls
- All Boys
- Co-Ed
**Leadership Styles & Teacher Job Satisfaction**

**3. Is the principal you are rating male or female?**
- Male
- Female

**4. Your Age**

**5. Your Gender**
- Male
- Female

**6. Total years of teaching experience**

**7. Current Year Level**
- K-6 Classroom Teacher
- K-6 Specialist Teacher
- Other

**8. Total years working with principal being rated**

**3. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Rater Form (5x-Short)**

The following questionnaire is used to describe the leadership style of a principal you have worked alongside within the last 5 years. If you have changed schools and have worked with various principals during that time, you may fill out multiple questionnaires but only refer to one principal at a time.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing.
### Leadership Styles & Teacher Job Satisfaction

#### 1. The Principal I Am Rating...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is absent when needed</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Talks optimistically about the future</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Instills pride in me for being associated with his/her</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### 2. The principal I am rating......

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Spends time teaching and coaching</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in &quot;if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it&quot;</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Acts in ways that builds my respect</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### 4. MLQ Cont.....
# Leadership Styles & Teacher Job Satisfaction

## 1. Continued.

**The Principal I am rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Keeps track of all mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Displays a sense of power and confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Redirects my attention toward failures to meet standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Avoids making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Helps me to develop my strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Delays responding to urgent questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 2. The principal I am rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Works with me in a satisfactory way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Heightens my desire to succeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Increases my willingness to try harder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Leads a group that is effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Leadership Styles & Teacher Job Satisfaction

#### 5. Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

The following questions are aimed to find out your levels of job satisfaction in relation to working with the principal rated in the previous questions.

#### 1. In relation to your levels of job satisfaction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My work provides me with an opportunity to advance professionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My work provides an opportunity to use a variety of skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The principal turns one teacher against another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No one tells me that I am good at my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My work consists of routine activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am not getting ahead in my present teaching position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Working conditions at this school can be improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I receive recognition from the principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I do not have the freedom to make my own decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The principal offers suggestions to improve my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Lesler (1984)

#### 2. In relation to your levels of job satisfaction....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I receive full recognition for successful work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I get along well with my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The administration in my school does not clearly define its policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The principal gives me assistance when I need help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Working condition in my school are comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My work provides me the opportunity to help students learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I like the people with whom I work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My work provides limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The students respect me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The principal does not back me up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Lesler (1984)

#### 6. TJSQ Cont.....
### Leadership Styles & Teacher Job Satisfaction

**1. In relation to your levels of job satisfaction:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>My work is very interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Working conditions at this school could not be worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>My work discourages originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The administration in my school communicates its policies well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>My work does not provide me the chance to develop new methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>The principal treats everyone equally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>My colleagues stimulate me to do better work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I am provided with opportunities for promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I am responsible for planning my work each day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The physical surroundings in my school are unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. In relation to your levels of job satisfaction:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Staff at this school can be highly critical of one another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I do have responsibility for my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>My colleagues provide me with suggestions or feedback about my teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>The principal provides assistance for improving work standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I do not get cooperation from the people with whom I work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>My work encourages me to be creative/imaginative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>The principal is not willing to listen to suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I am indifferent towards my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>The work I do at this school is very pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I receive too many meaningless instructions from the principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Loeber (1984)

---

### TJSQ Cont...
## Leadership Styles & Teacher Job Satisfaction

### 1. In relation to your levels of job satisfaction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. I dislike the people with whom I work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I receive too little recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. My work provides a good opportunity for advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. My interests are similar to those of my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I am not responsible for my actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. My principal makes available the resources I need to do my best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I have made lasting friendships among my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Working conditions in my school are good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. The principal makes me feel uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I try to be aware of the policies of my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Lester (1964)

### 2. In relation to your levels of job satisfaction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. When I do a good job, the principal recognises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. The principal explains what is expected of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. The principal praises good work by staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. I am not interested in the policies of my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I get along well with the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Other staff members seem unreasonable to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Lester (1964)
Leadership Styles & Teacher Job Satisfaction

3. In general, how satisfied are / were you with your job whilst working with the leader you make reference?

- 0. Very Dissatisfied
- 1. Dissatisfied
- 2. Neutral
- 3. Satisfied
- 4. Very Satisfied

8. General Comments

This section allows you to make comments you feel important that may not have been included in the questionnaire.

NOTE: Please be reminded to make NO reference to the names of any teachers, schools or principals. This type of information is not relevant and will not be included in the study.

1. Your Comments.
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