2002-04-18

Collaborative Leadership in Middle Schools and Teacher Job Satisfaction: A Search for Relationships

A. Greg Bowden EdD
University of San Diego

COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION: A SEARCH FOR RELATIONSHIPS

A. GREG BOWDEN

A dissertation submitted in partial

fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Leadership Studies

University of San Diego

April 18, 2002

Dissertation Committee

Mary Woods Scherr, Ph. D., Chair

Paula Cordeiro, Ed. D, Member

Susan Zgliczynski, Ph.D, Member

ABSTRACT

This correlational study examined the relationship between the leadership practiced by middle school principals and the job satisfaction reported by their teachers. Data were collected from 10 middle school principals who completed a demographic survey and the Principal Leadership Survey-Self (PLS-S). Data were also collected from 183 teachers who completed a demographic survey, the Principal Leadership Survey-Other (PLS-O), the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Sub scale scores from the PLS-O and the SPES were used to measure collaborative leadership. Telephone interviews were conducted with nine of the teachers who reported the highest degree of job satisfaction and nine of the teachers who reported the lowest degree of job satisfaction.

Two-sample t-tests, Pearson product moment correlation coefficient, and multiple regression were used to address the following research questions: 1) Is there a relationship between the collaborative leadership practiced by middle school principals and the job satisfaction reported by their teachers? 2) Are there other variables related to teacher job satisfaction? 3) Is there a difference between principal self-rating of collaborative practice and teachers' perception of the principals' collaborative practice?

Findings from this study suggest there is a relationship between collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction. A moderate positive correlation was found between the SPES score and the MSQ score. In addition, a low positive correlation between the PLS-O score and the MSQ score was found. The additional variables of age, gender, level of education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years teaching at this school, and years working with this principal at the school failed to

significantly impact teacher job satisfaction. Both quantitative and qualitative data analyses revealed a relationship between principal self-rating of collaborative practice and teachers' perception of their principals' collaborative practice. Principals rated themselves higher in collaborative practice than did their teachers. Although the findings from this study suggest that teachers value principal collaborative practices more than any of the other job satisfaction variables, the qualitative data revealed that administrative support of teachers provided the most positive influence on teacher job satisfaction.

Dedication

Courage is not the absence of fear - but rather the judgement that something is more important than fear.

As I approach the culmination of this project, I reflect on all the people whose lives have touched mine during this long journey. All the interactions, good or bad, have contributed to my arrival at this place. Beyond all the others who have hoped and prayed for my successful completion, I dedicate this work to my wife Vicky, who supported the completion of this study through the birth of two children, two job changes, and with mountains of grace when I discovered I no longer needed to finish it to be successful. Thank you for continuing to see the possibility in me - and having the courage to remind me that I could.

I pray that God will use the skills, talents, and knowledge I have acquired to His glory in the joyous days of my life that remain.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my dissertation committee chair Dr. Mary Woods Scherr, and committee members Dr. Paula Cordeiro and Dr. Susan Zgliczynski, for all their gracious patience with me throughout this process. Their patience and guidance have served me well, and they have challenged me to meet a standard of excellence that was worthy of the effort.

Dr. Roger Duthoy has been and shall always be an inspiration for me. Having the privilege to spend four precious years as his colleague at El Rancho Middle School, I want to thank him for the ethical grounding he provided in my early administration career. In addition, he supported this project wholeheartedly.

My family has been a constant means of support during this project, both emotionally and financially, and I am pleased to recognize their contributions. To D. O. D. and Carol, thank you for your material and spiritual support. You have helped me reach a goal no one in our family has ever reached.

To Leo and June - congratulations for supporting two doctoral candidates through the process. Truly you have shown you recognize the value of education, and you can take no small credit for our achievements.

Special thanks to my friends in the Orange Unified School District - Dr. Susan Belenardo, Dr. Bill Gee, and Dr. Phil Morse. You have all inspired and encouraged me more than you can know. And a special thanks to my mentor, colleague, and friend Cheryl Cohen, for all you have allowed me to do to meet this challenge.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

CHAPTER ONE: THE STUDY PROBLEM

Introduction

Schools are challenged today more than any time in American history to provide quality teachers. The growth of the American economy during the last decade has created a shortage of qualified workers in many fields. Demographic changes including a lower birthrate and the impending retirement of the "baby boomer" generation have limited the pool of applicants for teaching positions, and made this challenge even greater. The responsibility for hiring and retaining qualified teachers in most school districts belongs to the school principal. Current demographic and economic conditions make it more difficult to hire and retain qualified teachers. It is appropriate to determine if there are strategies that can be provided to school principals to help them succeed in attracting and retaining quality teachers given the current demographic and economic constraints. Examining the research on leadership and job satisfaction may provide some answers and some suggestions to help school principals.

Background of the Problem

Since the beginning of the industrial revolution, public schools in America have used a hierarchical organizational structure for governance (Whitaker & Moses, 1990). As urban areas grew, and school populations increased dramatically, the economy of scale work of early organizational theorists such as Frederick Taylor had a great influence on school systems (Enderlin-Lampe, 1997). This influence promoted a command and control organizational theory which, when applied to education, changed

the traditional one room school house into an educational enterprise organized like the automobile manufacturing industry. Knowledge and teachers were viewed as raw materials to be used as input, and educated students were viewed as the product output. Standardization was the order of the day, and this organizational structure became the dominant structure in education.

The launching of the Soviet satellite Sputnik in 1957 and the threat generated by the cold war caused school reform to become a high priority on the national agenda. Educational success of American children in school was portrayed as the way to win the cold war. National initiatives in both math and science became the focus of the American educational agenda. Many initiatives aimed at improving both the curriculum and the management of schools using a hierarchical approach began during this time period.

Even after the United States reached the moon in 1969, school reform continued to receive public attention. Hierarchical organizational systems remained the primary governance model for most schools. Compliance with the leader's direction was seen as the best way to control the educational enterprise and ensure quality outcomes. However public schools appeared to become less successful as a result of the escalating demographic, cultural and economic changes going on around them (Wagner, 1998).

Within the last twenty years, school restructuring efforts have encouraged change from a traditional hierarchical system towards a more participatory and collaborative organizational structure as a way to improve schools (Goldring & Rallis, 1993; Patterson, 1993; Pounder, 1998; Rosenholtz, 1991; Schlechty, 1990; Short & Greer, 1997; Slavin,

2000; Wilmore & Cornell, 2001). Practicing leadership as a collaborative venture requires principals to change their practice of leadership. The desired outcome of a collaborative organization is to improve educational outcomes and to provide a more democratic work environment for all parties. Thus some logical questions to ask are: As principals change the educational environment toward a more collaborative organizational structure, will the degree of job satisfaction felt by teachers change? If there is a positive change in teacher job satisfaction, will it improve the retention rate for new teachers in the schools?

Many studies have examined the relationships between various constructs of leadership and job satisfaction (Anderman, Belzer & Smith, 1991; Bulasch, Lunenburg, & McCallon, 1994; Cascadden, 1997; Chittom & Sistrunk, 1990; Daly, 1980; Delaney, 1997; Evans, 1996; Gallmeier, 1992; Griffith, 1999; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Heller, Clay, & Perkins, 1993; Hipp, 1996; Hunter-Boykin & Evans, 1995; King & Kerchner, 1991; Koll, Robertson, & Lampe, 1996; Leithwood & Stenibach, 1993; Patrick, 1995; Pool, 1997). None of these studies have examined the relationship, if any, between collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was empirical evidence to support a relationship between the use of collaborative leadership and the job satisfaction reported by teachers.

Significance of the Problem

As the population of the United States continues to increase, so does the need for

teachers for America's public schools (Bradley, 1998). Demographic changes have a major influence on the increasing need for teachers. These demographic changes include: continued growth in the school age population, the pending retirement of the one-in-six teachers who are fifty-five years old or older, the high attrition rate of new teachers, and in California, the statewide class size reduction initiative (EdSource, 1997). Together, these changes combine to increase the need to recruit new teachers and retain the pool of existing teachers.

Two additional trends have increased the demand for all workers: the continued expansion of the American economy that has resulted in a low unemployment rate and the shrinking pool of younger workers. Recruiting efforts for new teachers are hindered by low teacher salaries, low public esteem, and demanding educational requirements (Abecrombie, 1998; Bradley, 1998; Lawton, 1998; Pounder, 1986). Further compounding the teacher supply problem is the nature of the college-age students who have been identified as "generation X". Research has found them to possess a lower level of commitment to jobs and programs than the "baby boomers," therefore they move from job to job more frequently than workers of previous generations (Loysk, 1997).

Simultaneously, public schools are threatened by many other forces. Educational programs are jeopardized by inadequate funding from state federal and state governments. For example, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act, yet provided merely one-fifth of the funding necessary to implement the mandated programs. Another threat comes from the various schemes to provide government funding for vouchers to allow students to attend private schools. The voucher initiatives are rooted in

the economic philosophy of a consumer-oriented, market-driven delivery system which suggests that privatization of the public schools will yield better educational results (Johnston, 1996).

Adding new pressure to the job of teachers is the legislative demand for school accountability. In California, the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA), signed into law in 1999 (SB 1X, Chapter 3 of 1999), authorized the creation of a new educational accountability system for public schools based on statistical manipulation of school test results on the SAT 9 norm referenced test. Although its stated goal is to help schools improve the academic achievement of all students, in reality it has provided a measure that is widely misused by the public. Both the press and the public equate the success of individual schools with student scores on standardized test results. While these tests are important, they are frequently misinterpreted by the public as the single most important measure of student achievement and thus the quality of a school. When poor school scores are published, school staffs are admonished by the community and held accountable for the low student performance. The Immediate Intervention Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) is a major part of California's Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) of 1999. II/USP grant awards provide selected schools in California an opportunity to participate in planning and implementation activities for improved student achievement. However, the agreement is if these schools do not improve in a specific time period, the site management will be taken over by a state appointed management team. This adds pressure on the teachers and principals at low performing schools.

Another change affecting schools is the shift toward the Total Quality Management doctrine by school districts, and the shift from considering parents and students the "raw material" of the school system to customers or clients of the school. While past academic practices have centered on supporting academic freedom of the teachers, now customer satisfaction of the parent clientele has become a key criterion in determining school success within the community (Marshall, 1995). These simultaneous moves toward testing accountability and customer satisfaction increase the job stress on teachers even more.

The student population in the public schools has changed as well. California demographics indicate the ethnic majority in public schools is now Hispanic (Gerald & Hussar, 1998). However, the ethnic majority of teachers in California public schools remains Anglo-American (Gerald & Hussar, 1998). Additionally there continues to be unprecedented growth in the ethnic diversity of school age children as indicated by the fact that the California Annual Language Census now provides code numbers for fifty-seven distinct languages (Camillo, 1999).

In the context of this rapidly changing environment, it is important to know what motivates people to continue with teaching as a career. This knowledge could assist in both the recruitment and retention of teachers. Employee motivation has been the subject of many research studies (Anderman et al., 1991; Chittom & Sistrunk, 1990; Daly, 1980; Heller et al., 1993; Neuman, 1997; Pool, 1997; Rinehart & Short, 1993). Satisfaction with one's job has been found to be a significant motivational factor in employment (Chittom & Sistrunk, 1990; Daly, 1980; Hunter-Boykin & Evans, 1995; Judge, 1994;

Latham, 1998; McNeese-Smith, 1996; Pool, 1997; Weld, 1998). Many factors that affect teacher satisfaction are outside the control of school site administration. These include teacher salary, employee benefits, changing student populations, state wide testing requirements, community pressure, and other external influences (Klawitter, 1985). Other factors affecting teacher satisfaction are school based, and may be directly influenced by the principal. These factors include teaching assignment, room assignment, curricular and extracurricular responsibilities, and the degree of collaborative leadership practiced by the principal (Anderman et al., 1991, Gonzalez & Short, 1996, Ingersoll, 2001).

Considering the complex and ambiguous environment in education today, is it possible for principals to positively influence teacher job satisfaction through the use of collaborative leadership? If the answer is yes, then changing from traditional hierarchical leadership to a more collaborative practice of leadership could help principals in the retention and the recruitment of qualified teachers, and potentially aid in relieving the teacher shortage. Many leadership researchers have suggested that the transition from a hierarchical form of leadership to a more collaborative one could help increase job satisfaction (Bennis & Biederman, 1997; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Enderlin-Lampe, 1997; Ingersoll, 2001; Latham, 1998; Rost, 1993). Enderlin-Lampe (1997) notes:

> The motivation of teachers can be greatly increased by increased emotional rewards that teachers indicate are so satisfying yet so infrequent in the current system. At the center of these rewards is shared decision making and the

opportunity for real voice in schooling (p. 153).

Another potential benefit of collaboration is the increased quality of the decisions made through the collaborative process (Short, 1994). Warren Bennis notes that in decision making, "none of us is as smart as all of us" (Bennis & Biederman, 1997, p. 1). Thus through collaborative processes, the principal and the teaching staff have a broader perspective of issues and potential solutions because the collective wisdom of the entire staff is utilized.

Research Questions

The research questions this study examined were the following: 1) Is there a relationship between the collaborative leadership practiced by middle school principals, and the job satisfaction reported by their teachers? 2) Are there other variables (age, gender, level of education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years teaching at this school, years working with this principal at this school) related to teacher job satisfaction? and 3) Is there a difference between principal self-rating of collaborative practice and teachers' perception of the principals' collaborative practice?

Hypotheses

Based on the three above research questions, the following research hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis One: Teachers who report that collaborative leadership is being used by their principal will have a higher degree of job satisfaction.

Hypothesis Two: There is no relationship between additional variables (age, gender, level of higher education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years

at this school, years with this principal) and teacher job satisfaction.

Hypothesis Three: Principals will have a higher perception of their use of collaborative leadership than will the teachers at their school.

Definitions

Collaborative Leadership: Leadership practices in which decision making and management of the school is shared by the principal with the teachers. One frequently cited definition describes collaboration as "a process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible" (Gray, 1989, p. 5). Another definition is found in Collaborative Leadership by Chrislip and Larson (1994) "It is a mutually beneficial relationship between two or more parties who work toward common goals by sharing responsibility, and accountability for achieving results" (p.5). Both definitions note the importance of the *agreement* of the parties to work together to solve a problem they share.

Middle School Principal: The person who acts as the governing or presiding officer of the middle school, employed by the School Board to supervise, monitor, and evaluate the operations of the school.

Middle School Teacher: A credentialed person employed to teach in a middle school.

Middle School: A public school configured variously with grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 with a philosophy of providing a developmentally appropriate curriculum to its population of pre-adolescents.

Teacher Job Satisfaction: The degree of satisfaction a teacher reported regarding his/her

job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Type of Teaching Credential Held: Credentials are certificates of authorization from the state to allow a person to teach in the public schools. Identification of no credential indicated the person had not completed the qualifications for this certificate; an "emergency credential" meant the teacher had been given a short term waiver to complete course work to qualify for the credential; a "clear credential" meant the teacher had completed all requirement for the credential.

Years at This School: Number of years this subject had been teaching at this school, exclusive of volunteer work or instructional aide service.

Years of Teaching. Number of years the subject had been teaching in either a full time or part time position.

Years with this Principal at This School. Number of years the teacher had been an employee at the current school while the current principal had been principal of this school.

Summary

Current trends indicate there will be a continuing shortage of public school teachers. Many factors contribute to this shortage, including the growing economy which provides job competition to recruit college graduates and provides competitive salaries, demographic changes in the population and the teaching ranks, the status and training requirements of teachers, and the pressure for accountability. School and student performance continues to be an area of concern in politics and the media. Schools have traditionally been governed by hierarchical organizational structures; however, analysis

of reform efforts of the last twenty years suggests teachers who are involved in school decisions increase their feelings of efficacy and experience greater job satisfaction. Involving teachers in school management will require a different kind of leadership than has been practiced in the past by school principals.

Understanding motivation and job satisfaction of teachers is of value if the goal is to make teaching a more attractive career. If collaborative leadership is related to teacher job satisfaction, then it may be one way for site administrators to keep teachers interested in remaining in the work force longer. In addition, leadership studies will benefit by understanding the role of collaborative leadership in teacher job satisfaction.

CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter will begin with a description of the conceptual foundation for this study which includes a discussion of the philosophy of middle schools, the organizational factors impacting teachers' work environment, and collaborative leadership and job satisfaction. Next the review of the literature will examine middle schools and organizational factors influencing teacher's perception of the work environment and conclude with reviews of teacher job satisfaction, the construct of collaboration, and a review of leadership measures.

Conceptual Framework

Middle School Philosophy

The National Middle School Association identified the middle school philosophy as:

> The purpose and functions of exemplary middle schools center on the intellectual, social, emotional, moral, and physical developmental needs of young adolescents (Clark & Clark, 1997; National Middle School Association, 1999). Within a few years, young adolescents undergo rapid physical growth, changes in moral reasoning, the onset of abstract thinking, and introduction to a range of social pressures, including sex, drugs, and violence (Clark & Clark, 1997).

Simultaneously, the lifelong developmental tasks of forming a personal identity or self-concept, acquiring social skills, gaining autonomy, and developing character and a set of values are begun (Hough & Irvin, 1995). Exemplary middle level programs foster appropriate programs, policies, and practices that foster the development of these tasks in positive ways (National Middle School Association, 1999).

Organizational Factors Impacting Teachers Work Life

Many terms have become associated with the efforts to improve and organize the teacher's work life as a way to improve student learning outcomes. For this discussion, four sets of terms have been identified. One set of terms focuses on the individual teacher and includes the descriptions of teacher efficacy and teacher empowerment. The second set of terms describes the way teachers are organized. These terms include, collaborative teaching, team teaching, and collaborative work groups. Another part of the conceptual framework focuses on the processes of school management, and includes the definitions of shared decision making, and SBM - school/site-based management. The terms related to teacher job satisfaction are site administrator attributes and include the definitions of leadership styles and behaviors. Each set of terms will be discussed to clarify overlapping definitions and will be defined for the purpose of this study.

Teacher Efficacy and Teacher Empowerment

Bandura (1977) developed a theoretical framework to explain and predict psychological changes achieved by different modes of treatment. His theory states that whatever forms of psychological procedures are used, the level and strength of self-efficacy of the subject is changed (increased or decreased). In other words, the action or actions taken to modify a situation will raise or lower the self-efficacy of the subject.

Building on Bandura's work, Gibson and Dembo (1984) identified teacher efficacy as a variable accounting for individual differences in teacher effectiveness. They defined teacher efficacy as the extent to which teachers believe they can affect student learning. Hipp (1996) found that a principal's direct behaviors and indirect forms of symbolic instructional leadership influence teachers' work and their outcomes.

Teacher empowerment is a way to increase teacher efficacy. Teacher empowerment is promoted in management literature as the path to a more satisfied employee. Empowerment has been defined by Short (1994) as "a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems" (p 488). Empowerment changes the roles of both teachers and administrators. Teachers take more initiative, and respond to situations with self-generated ideas and solutions for the needs and issues they identify. Administrators spend less time identifying needs and issues for the teachers, and more time working with them as a facilitator to support their ideas and solutions. Most recently, Shen (2001) summarized the finding of a national longitudinal study on teachers and principal empowerment. Shen found that teachers are reporting more influence over instructional issues in their classrooms and principals are feeling more empowered in the processes of decentralization and site based management. However, teachers perceived their leadership as primarily confined to classroom issues, and that their leadership in school wide issues was weak. Shen (2001) concludes by stating that "although the literature is replete with the rhetoric of site-based management, teacher empowerment and distributed leadership, teachers are still not empowered in many school wide policy areas" (p.127).

Collaborative Teaching, Team Teaching, and Collaborative Work Groups

Collaborative teaching refers to the act of collaboration between teachers in the pursuit of increased student learning. Teachers who share ideas and resources would be identified as working in a collaborative teaching model. Collaborative teaching is widely practiced in the elementary schools by grade level teachers, but not as frequently in secondary schools.

Team teaching describes teachers who work together and share the same student population. Configurations can be in pairs, grade level teams, interdisciplinary teams, and school-within-school configurations. Team teaching requires shared responsibility for student outcomes.

The term collaborative work groups is used most frequently in the business specific organizational theory literature. When applied to education, it can denote types of teaming within a school. One example of this is an organizational structure based on grade level teams. Another example is the concept of "houses," where students of like interests or needs are grouped together and taught by a team of teachers.

Shared Decision Making and School/Site Based Management

Rooted in the second wave of school reform begun in the early 1990's, shared decision making (SDM) parallels many initiatives in industry designed to encourage a higher degree of ownership in problem solving by "line" workers (Lipsky, 1992). The theory suggested that improved decisions and higher satisfaction would result from allowing line workers to identify and resolve problems on their own. Practiced in schools, SDM is a process where administrators share decision making with teachers.

which is thought to be a way to increase teacher job satisfaction. Although implemented in many school districts throughout the nation, several structural issues have prevented the wide spread adoption of SDM.

Research on the success of SDM has highlighted some limiting structural issues: the lack of training provided to the teachers for how to work with the administration, the failure to provide release time for the teacher to become truly involved in complex decisions, and the failure to clearly delineate the lines of authority (Beadi, 1996; Looney, 1998; Thomas, 1995). Ambiguous delineation of authority has confounded many SDM initiatives since only the school principal continues to be held accountable for the decisions made through the shared decision making process (Looney, 1998).

Another form of SDM is school-based management, also called site-based management. This process focuses on involving site level employees in the more routine issues of day to day operation of the school. It was designed to foster change at the local school level by involving the teachers, parents, and students in the local school decision making. Most of the research on SBM reveals that it is "primarily a symbolic response" rather that a genuine reform (Clune & Witte, 1990, p. 327).

Leadership Styles and Behaviors

Leadership styles is a term that is used in both behavioral and trait-based leadership theory. Leadership styles can be understood as the pattern of behaviors, traits, attitudes, or assumptions exhibited by those in leadership positions, or by those who are successful in providing leadership. Rost (1993) presents a convincing critique of this type of analysis applied to leadership. Leadership styles rooted in trait theory focus on

the behavior of certain individuals, and uses their successes to justify the style or behavior. Leadership styles was once an accepted notion during a period in the growth and development of leadership studies. Despite its well-documented limitations (Rost, 1993) style continues to be used even today as a descriptor of different ways of "doing" leadership (Bogler, 2001).

Rost (1993) points out that leadership behavior and trait theories were developed by management scientists and social psychologists. True to the scientific process, they attempted to produce measures to identify and measure leadership and potential leadership capacity by looking at successful leaders and identifying their common behaviors. While it is possible to develop measures this way, it is not always clear what phenomenon they are measuring. The flaw in this process is assuming that leadership defined as a specific set of actions, behaviors or traits will be successful from context to context. Since reality is a socially constructed phenomenon, and leadership is a relationship, then any behaviors identified as "leadership" by this process would only be successful in one context. In addition, the notion of leadership style does not always account for the myriad unique contextual variables.

Related to the concept of leadership styles, Rost (1993) suggests that behaviorism was adopted by leadership theorists to foster respect in the academic community. Behaviorism suffers from similar limitations as the leadership styles classification, presenting the argument that specific behaviors will ensure success. As with the notion of leadership styles, importance of context to its impact on outcome is mostly ignored.

Collaborative Leadership

Chrislip and Larson (1994) trace the roots of the continuing growth in collaborative leadership to the work of W. Edwards Deming. Deming's ideas were first adopted in Japan, and proved extremely successful in improving product quality and employee satisfaction. Organizational structures were shifted from hierarchical command and control to those including employee collaboration and empowerment for problem solving. Deming's success in Japan caused management/worker collaboration to become a topic of interest and research in management and leadership circles throughout the world.

The study of leadership has continued through most of this century without an agreement on a definition of leadership. The work of Rost (1993) forms the conceptual framework for the understanding of leadership used in this study. According to Rost (1993) "leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and collaborators who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (p. 102). The critical characteristic of this definition is the change from the evaluation of leadership as an event to evaluation of leadership as a relationship.

One key difference between the notion of leadership as collaborative and other historical notions of leadership as hierarchical is the changed value of relationships. This difference is especially significant for education, which is dependent upon the quality of relationships for its success. Indeed many new theories of learning include the significance of relationship in the learning process. Rost (1993) expands the meaning of relationship to imply that there is two-way communication through the use of the words

"to reflect their mutual purposes" (p. 102). The industrial model of leadership was not concerned about the purposes of the follower; in fact, the follower continued to be viewed as a piece of machinery to be commanded and controlled. Another significant difference Rost articulates is the idea of intending "real changes," which excludes all actions performed in the name of management of the enterprise. It does not devalue or declare management unnecessary; however it simply states that meeting payroll on time is not leadership.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to a collection of attitudes that workers have about their jobs. Job satisfaction can be differentiated into at least two aspects: facet satisfaction, and overall satisfaction. Facet satisfaction is the tendency for an employee to be more or less satisfied with the various facets of the job. Facets of a job include: the work itself, pay, promotions, recognition, benefits, working conditions, supervision, co-workers, and organizational policy. Overall satisfaction can be considered as a summary indicator of a person's attitude towards his or her job. Overall satisfaction can be thought of as an average of a workers' degree of satisfaction towards all the facets of the job.

The study of job satisfaction began in the first half of this century with Hoppock's (1935) pioneering work. He began the formalized study of job satisfaction operationalized as "an individual's reaction to a job or its many facets" (Thompson & McNamara, 1997, p.7). Behavioral scientists have continued to be interested in the notion of job satisfaction: Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992) found that more than 5,000 studies of job satisfaction have been published since the 1930's.

According to Nagy (1996), Frederick Herzberg in 1959 proposed one of the earliest conceptualizations of job satisfaction. Herzberg believed that job satisfaction consisted of two distinct dimensions. One of these factors, called "hygiene" factors, involved the environmental surroundings of a job and included such extrinsic aspects as supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and status. Herzberg called the second dimension of job satisfaction "motivator" factors, which were related to job tasks, job content, and the intrinsic aspects of a job, and included such aspects as recognition for achievement, work itself, responsibility, and growth. Herzberg reasoned that satisfying hygiene factors cannot lead to job satisfaction, but may result in the avoidance of job dissatisfaction. However, satisfying motivator needs can lead to job satisfaction, but the absence of such factors cannot lead to job dissatisfaction.

Review of the Literature

Middle Schools

Middle schools are a relatively new phenomenon in school organizational format. They have evolved from the junior high school, the first of which was opened in 1909 (Lounsbury, 1998). Charles W. Eliot first suggested grade reorganization from the standard configuration of grades 1-8 housed in an elementary school and grades 9-12 housed in a secondary school in 1888. He posits a three level configuration, with the inclusion of an 'intermediate school' between the elementary and high school years. Between 1888 and 1909, school reorganization for the intermediate grades was mostly talk. However some schools began to experiment with the new format. Lounsbury (1998) recounts the development of the junior high school:

> During the 1920s, the junior high school partners in the reorganization movement were rapidly growing educational innovations. By the 1930s, the junior high school, senior high school and the combination junior-senior high school had all become accepted members of the American school family. By the close of the 1950s the separate junior high followed by the separate senior high school, had become the predominant pattern of secondary school organization in the United States. (p. 110)

Lounsbury (1998) identifies the "dominant factor which has undergirded the successful development of the junior high school movement over the long haul ... has been the desire of educators to provide an appropriate educational program for early adolescents" (p. 113). This desire continues to manifest itself in the creation of the middle school.

"The junior high sought to be a transitional or bridge institution between the elementary school and the high school" (Alexander, 1998a, p. 3). Junior high schools provided curricular and extra curricular programs designed to prepare students for participation in high school. Junior highs, composed of grades 7 & 8, or 7, 8 & 9, were considered "miniature" high schools. The junior high school replicated many of the high school organizational attributes, including departmentalization by curricular area, a focus on program delivery, and providing numerous school wide activity programs. However, junior high schools failed in their ability to meet the developmental needs of the learners because while they remained focused on program delivery, they did not attend to the individual child's learning experience.

The modern middle school concept was suggested by Alexander in 1963 (Alexander, 1998b). His concept of a school in the middle consisted of "a phase and program of schooling bridging but differing from the childhood and adolescent phases and programs" (Alexander, 1998b, p.30). Alexander (1998b) felt that "sixty years' experience with the grade 7-9 junior high school has not succeeded in establishing the model junior high school pattern as appropriate schooling for children moving from childhood to adolescence" (p. 27) He advocated a new school in the middle, one that selected from both the elementary school and secondary school domains the practices that were successful for the pre-adolescent student, as well as one that incorporated ideas to address the specific needs of this age group.

Many new and innovative ideas were tried in the ensuing years, and efforts began at the state and national level to identify the characteristic needs of the pre-adolescent students, as well as to identify and replicate the success of the best middle schools. These efforts resulted in the 1989 publication of the report Turning Points. Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century by the Carnegie Corporation's Council on Adolescent Development.

In California, concern for continued improvement in middle school education prompted the California State Department of Education to form the Middle Grades Task Force. In 1985 the Task Force began a year long process of research and public hearings with the goal of learning what constitutes effective schooling at the middle grade level. Through this process, they identified twenty-two principles of middle grade education. The result of this work was a report entitled Caught in the Middle: Educational Reform

for Young Adolescents in California Schools (California Department of Education, 1987). This report includes specific recommendations with implications for legislative initiatives, educational policies, administrative guidelines, and professional practices.

A review of these documents and other literature about middle school philosophy identifies a number of characteristics that distinguish the program from junior high programs. These key characteristics include:

1. The shift away from departmentalism, and towards a interdisciplinary teaming approach.
2. The shift away from simply delivering curriculum towards engaging students in the learning process.
3. The shift away from schools as the primary organizational unit and towards the use of smaller, more personal subgroups, or "houses" of teachers and students within the school.
4. The shift away from the impersonal nature of the secondary school to the more personal practice of an "advisory" program, where students develop a relationship with an adult staff member.
5. The shift away from a sedentary learning program to a program which accounts for the students' developmental need to move frequently.

All of these changes in the middle school program provide unique challenges for the middle school principal. Clark and Clark (1997) observed that findings from the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Study of Leadership in Middle Schools (Valentine, Clark, Irvin, Keefe & Melton, 1993) which investigated the

degree of involvement of leadership teams in decision making, did not reflect a high degree of active involvement in decision making on the part of leadership teams of staff committees. Their level of involvement was most typically limited to making recommendations or holding discussions about issues. Their use of real power to make decisions was infrequent. When this data were compared to data from the NASSP 1981 study, the degree of change in the 12 years and the level of impact of shared decision making in middle level schools across the nation was viewed as modest at best (Valentine et al., 1993). From their findings, some implications Clark and Clark (1997) identified are the need for middle school principals to share their power and responsibility with others, as well as empowering and trusting others to make good decisions. These implications are addressed through the practice of collaborative leadership.

Organizational Factors Influencing Teacher's Perception of Work Environment

Rosenholtz (1991), in her seminal qualitative study of the teacher's workplace, identifies the following domains as influencing the teachers' perception of their work environment: shared goals, teacher collaboration, teacher learning, teacher certainty, teacher commitment, and district level differences. Rosenholtz (1991) notes the importance of the staff reaching consensus on their work and goals. "In high consensus schools, principals and teachers appeared to agree on the definition of teaching, and their instructional goals occupied a place of high significance" (p.206). On the other hand, she observed that at low consensus schools the conversation centered on frustration, failure, and the tedium of the work. "Without shared governance, particularly in managing

student conduct, the absolute number of students who claimed teachers' attention seemed greater, and their experiences left bitter traces and tarnished hopes as their time and energy to teach vaporized into thin air" (Rosenholtz, 1991, p.207). This finding supported the importance of the need for principals to collaborate with their teachers in the development of school goals.

Another level of collaboration Rosenholtz (1991) identified was teacher collaboration. She observed that principals must work to overcome the traditional teaching norms of self-reliance. Teachers must be provided the opportunity to solve school and classroom problems, and encouraged to both seek and give advice. Principals can encourage and support collegial interdependence, which can "vastly expand teachers' sense of possibility and their instincts for improvisation" (Rosenholtz, 1991, p.208). At collaborative schools, teaching has been defined as inherently difficult, and the learning process of teachers is seen as an ongoing process.

Teacher learning was identified as a characteristic of schools engaged in continuous improvement. "Principals often orchestrated collaborative relations between more and less successful teachers, explicitly acknowledging that improvement was possible, necessary, and expected" (Rosenholtz, 1991, p.208). This focus on teacher learning encouraged it to become its own propagator. Failure to provide opportunity for teachers learning resulted in an increase in teacher uncertainty.

Establishing a non-routine technical culture provided an environment for teachers to focus on answers to their daily challenges and resist the temptation to look for excuses.

They (the teachers) often found what they were looking for in the sage counsel of

principals and colleagues, and in the cooperation, trust, and support of parents. With more non-routine and humanistic treatment came personal promises fulfilled: the sweet promise of helping children learn, the glittering promise of societal contribution, the warm promise of freedom from failure, from lack of faith in themselves and their technical culture (Rosenholtz, 1991, p.209).

Rosenholtz (1991) noted that "without learning opportunities, task autonomy, and psychic rewards, teachers sense of commitment seemed choked ... most lost faith in their talent and values..." (p.209) Schools with these attributes had teachers who "held an ideology that seemed the reverse of fatalism: everything was possible" (p.209).

Finally Rosenholtz observed district level differences had influenced teachers' perceptions of their work environment. Superintendents are at the top of the educational management hierarchy, and have authority to change and model leadership in their districts. Rosenholtz (1991) identified superintendents on a leadership continuum from serving as "makers of professionalism" to:

> those who thought they should regulate every aspect of teachers' daily lives... coaxing improvement from principals and teachers seemed achieved through superintendents' technical knowledge, encouragement, and presence... there was, in fact, some indication that being treated professionally turned more than a few of them around. (p. 209)

This indicates the symbolic authority of the superintendent, and how much influence superintendents have on teachers perception of the work environment.

Teacher Job Satisfaction

Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) developed a two-factor theory of job satisfaction which identified the two factor continua as motivation and hygiene. Motivation referred to the set of intrinsic factors comprising the content of the work. Hygiene referred to the set of extrinsic factors comprising the context of the work. Concepts of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction each had a range from none to high. Ellis (1984) also distinguished between extrinsic and intrinsic rewards, and concluded that intrinsic rewards play a greater role in teacher motivation and job satisfaction. If job satisfaction is a significant motivator for teachers, then school leaders should be interested in methods to improve teacher job satisfaction.

Teachers are responsible for the delivery of education in the schools, and many improvement efforts have focused on the quality of teachers and teaching. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986) reported that half of all teachers leave the profession within the first seven years. More recently, Snyder & Wirt (1998) suggested thirty to fifty percent of teachers left the profession in the first five years due to job dissatisfaction. Other researchers have studied the burnout rate of teachers and its relation to the high demands of their jobs (Pounder, 1986). Large class sizes, low public image, and the way societal problems are encroaching on the school environment were frequent complaints of teachers. Improving teachers' levels of job satisfaction may encourage more teachers to stay in teaching.

The need for teachers in California has increased because of the 1996 class size

reduction plan introduced in kindergarten through third grade (EdSource, 1997). This plan, which reduced the class size ratio in kindergarten through third grade from 30:1 to 20:1, has increased the demand for teachers in these grades by fifty percent, significantly beyond the supply produced by the higher education facilities. As a result, many districts have had to employ non-credentialed teachers in these positions. Lured by the smaller primary grade classes, many special education teachers have moved to the regular educational program. The loss of qualified special education teachers to the regular program has meant that special education positions are frequently filled by new, non-credentialed teachers. Consequently, students with the greatest needs receive their instruction from the least qualified and experienced teachers.

Teacher job satisfaction is influenced by many factors. Teachers do not share the same motivational characteristics of employees in business, and special attention needs to be given to the motivational characteristics they do value (Ellis, 1984; Gallmeier, 1992; Lester, 1990). The degree to which they are or are not met directly influence the job satisfaction of the teachers, and, therefore, their job performance and their willingness to collaborate with the administration on any school improvement effort (Latham, 1998; Maidani, 1991).

Neuman (1997) presented evidence that teachers' satisfaction was influenced more by intrinsic than extrinsic factors. As there is no product produced, nor a profit to be made, the motivations for career selection by teachers were likely different from the motivators which cause others to go into business careers. Clay (1984) found people entered teaching for a variety of reasons ranging from personal growth potential to youth

development opportunities, and that the best teachers cited intrinsic rewards that make teaching not a job but a calling.

The idea that leadership behaviors in an organization can influence employee job satisfaction is documented in many different fields (Bruce & Scott, 1998; Daly, 1980; Evans, 1996; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Heller et al., 1993; Judge, 1994; Lester, 1990; McNeese-Smith, 1996; Patrick, 1995; Pool, 1997; Savery, 1993; Wagner, 1998). Many surveys of job satisfaction attempt to measure the relationship with the leader by including a section about the leadership styles or behaviors practiced by the supervisors or principals. Although a study of the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal leadership style was conducted by Heller et al. (1993), the theoretical framework used Hersey and Blanchard's (1984) concept of situational leadership did not measure collaboration. In addition, this quantitative study showed no significant relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

Pool (1997) found that the most powerful predictor of job satisfaction for the population he studied was work motivation, "a positive correlation emerged, illustrating that those participants with a strong motivation to work are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs" (p. 277). Smith (1999) found that the more democratic the leadership style used by the principal, the higher the level of teacher motivation.

In an effort to understand the teacher's work environment, Rosenholtz (1991) devised a theoretical framework for motivation she termed workplace commitment. She described internal motivation as a criterion for a high level of commitment to work. Low internal motivation caused people to create negative self-fulfilling prophecies, which

affected their performance. Dissatisfaction with one's work caused one to "defect" from the workplace. Defection occurs on a continuum that includes withholding services to leaving the position for another job

Collaboration

Collaboration and cooperation are each composed of similar Latin root verbs. Both contain *co*, which translates as *with*. *Laborate* comes from the verb laborare, *to work*, and *operate* comes from the verb operari, which also means *to work*. One can make a case that they are so closely related as to be synonymous. Pounder (1998) notes that the two major features of collaboration important to understanding collaborative leadership are parity and reciprocity

> Parity involves establishing equal status among all participants. In order for collaboration to occur, all parties must have some power resources at their disposal. If one side can coerce the other because it alone possesses resources, neither collaboration nor leadership occurs. Leadership for collaboration involves an influence relationship where parity is possible. Reciprocity identifies the exchange between the collaborators. Collaboration involves an active exchange in which both leaders and followers believe they are receiving privileges, benefits, and rewards for the effort they have provided. Such an exchange is necessary for collaboration, because parties must believe they are meeting their needs and accomplishing their mutual purposes (p. 138).

In "The Evolution of Cooperation", Axelrod (1984) had chronicled the development of a computer modeling contest designed to study cooperation processes.

The contest required entrants to develop an algorithm, or a problem solving formula. The goal of the algorithm was to learn if the benefit of cooperating could be understood in mathematical terms. His object was to develop a theory of cooperation that could be used to discover what is necessary for cooperation to emerge. The Cooperation Theory Axelrod developed investigated individuals who pursued their own self interest without the aid of a central authority to force them to cooperate with each other. Axelrod concluded that the basic problem was pursuit of self-interest by each individual, which leads to a poor outcome for all. As a conceptional model to define the boundaries of the contest, he adopted the famous Prisoner's Dilemma game.

The Prisoner's Dilemma is a computer simulation based on the scenario of a group of prisoners working to escape from capture. What is in each individual prisoner's personal interest discourages him from working with each other, an event called "mutual defection." However, all the prisoners benefit by escaping through mutual cooperation and working together. The players receive points based on their decision to cooperate or defect, and scores can be tallied after a number of moves. Points are weighted so the temptation to defect is strong; however, the highest score comes from cooperating (Axelrod, 1984).

Although Axelrod's (1984) study used computers as the players instead of people, a number of the important conclusions can be extended to human relationships and collaboration. Axelrod explained the value of his work by noting that, "it is the very complexity of reality which makes the analysis of an abstract interaction so helpful as an aid to understanding" (p. 19). Based on the contests he held, Axelrod developed several

formal propositions. One proposition was that, "if the future is important, there is no one best strategy" (Axelrod, 1984, p.15). For those searching for a formula to help decide whether to cooperate or not, this is depressing news. However, his most promising finding was that if the key properties of Cooperation Theory are known by participants in advance, the evolution of cooperation can be speeded up. The four key properties distilled from the tournaments which can accelerate the evolution of cooperation are:

1. Avoidance of unnecessary conflict by cooperating as long as the other player does.
2. Provocability in the face of an uncalled for defection by the other.
3. Forgiveness after responding to a provocation.
4. Clarity of behavior so that the other player can adapt to your pattern of action (Axelrod, 1984, p. 20)

This analysis of the evolution of cooperation identifies the more successful strategies for engaging in cooperation that can be used as one begins to practice collaborative leadership (Axelrod, 1984, Enderlin-Lampe, 1997).

Modern leadership scholars and popular authors on leadership have included the notion and effect of collaboration as a component in their constructs of leadership. However, the effects of democracy on the leadership process was observed by Alexis DeToqueville in the early eighteenth century. DeToqueville (1990), a Frenchman who came to the U.S. in 1831 and later wrote "Democracy in America", a two-volume study of the American people and their political institutions, is frequently quoted by journalists and politicians as an expert on American democracy. He commented on the power of

more people being involved in the leadership process (Rubin, 1998). Today the innovative writings of Warren Bennis include comments and quotes such as "none of us is as smart as all of us" (Bennis & Biederman, 1997, p.1). Recognition of the phenomenon of synergy, the whole adding up to more than the sum of the parts, has helped address the complexity and the ambiguous nature of the problems leadership faces today.

Recent studies of educational leadership have highlighted the importance of relationship in the leadership process. The attention given to collaboration as a key element in the practice of leadership signifies a change in the historical practice of leadership. Instead of the principal of a school commanding and controlling the teachers to achieve student success, collaborative relationships are being fostered to enhance teacher job satisfaction and thereby improve student learning.

The Nature of Collaboration

One frequently cited definition of collaboration is "a process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible" (Gray, 1989, p. 5). Another definition is found in Collaborative Leadership by Chrislip and Larson (1994), "It is a mutually beneficial relationship between two or more parties who work toward common goals by sharing responsibility, and accountability for achieving results" (p.5). Both definitions note the importance of the *agreement* of the parties to work together to solve a problem they share.

Much of the literature and research on collaboration in education focuses on

broad types of collaboration: public-private partnerships, future commissions, interagency collaborations, electronic networks, school-community partnerships, networks and linkages, and regional governmental collaboration. In the educational community, collaboration generally refers to partnerships formed between employees of the school and businesses or other governmental agencies not normally connected with the schools.

In this study, the researcher examined job satisfaction of teachers and determined its relationship to the degree of collaboration between middle school principals and their teachers. Collaboration was thus examined within the context of the principal-teacher relationship.

Types of Collaboration

Major types of collaboration identified in the literature include community collaboration, nonprofit collaboration, and interagency collaboration. Community collaboration and interagency collaboration occur in both the private (for profit) sector and the public (nonprofit) sector. There is a small but significant difference between the private sector types of collaboration and the public sector types of collaboration. Private sector collaborations, which could be identified as "more for less", are most often economic alliances. The goal is for an increase in financial benefits for the participants. Frequently these collaborations are codified by legal contractual language. Examples of these kinds of collaboration include: two aerospace firms combining resources to bid for a government contract, or agreement between two airlines to share ticketing codes so both will benefit from more destinations and a larger market share. In both examples, the

motivational factor is profit, as are most motivations for private sector decisions.

Public sector collaborations spring from a different set of motivations. Frequently in public sector organizations, dollars to expand existing programs are extremely limited, and other ways of providing needed services must be found. Collaborations in the public sector could be labeled "more with less" Coordination of services can save money, while actually increasing the level of service provided.

A list of the major types of public sector collaboration, beginning with the macro view and proceeding toward the micro view, would start with Interagency collaboration. This is collaboration between separate agencies, and agencies who do not typically work together, such as the Department of Social Services and the Community Council of Churches. Interagency collaboration has received much attention from authors and leadership scholars as it is the most dynamic form of collaboration and can provide the groundwork for real change in service delivery (Bruner, 1994; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Cordeiro, 1996; Pounder, 1998; Rubin, 1998). It can allow problem solving to exist outside existing funding streams.

Collaboration between divisions of the same agency has also received some attention (Gray, 1996). This kind of collaboration can provide a better use of resources from the funding agency, although departments within an agency working with each other is not a revolutionary thought.

Collaboration within the department or work group has recently received more attention as work groups and teams have become models of organization (Robinson & Schaible, 1995; Rosenholtz, 1991). This type of collaboration holds a different meaning

in the computer world, where it is the process of sharing work over computer networks (London, 1995).

Finally, the type of collaboration between the administrative leader and the workers has received great attention for its potential of increasing productivity and/or job satisfaction at a low cost (Kagan, 1993; Leithwood, 1994; London, 1995). These benefits are especially valuable to the public sector, where funding is scarce and is not always well coordinated by the various sources.

Terms used to identify types and degrees of collaboration in the educational community include: shared decision making, school-based management, and site-based management. Empowerment is another term used to describe the principal collaborating with teachers by "giving power" to them. Empowering teachers is thought to increase teacher efficacy and teacher performance. Efficacy is frequently defined as the self perceived ability to "make a difference" This outcome is frequently cited as one indicator of successful school leadership.

Collaborative Leadership Strategies

Clark and Clark (1997) found that principals who were successful in school improvement efforts shared power and responsibility with others. Additionally, "school leaders who practice transformational leadership facilitate collaborative decision making by providing time for collaborative decision making, empowering and trusting others to make good decisions, and allowing others to assume leadership positions" (p. 322). Leithwood (1994) states:

Compelling evidence suggests that collaborative school cultures contribute

> significantly to teacher development. ...evidence, in support of the claim that school administrators can have a significant impact on schools, was compelling.. (p.144).

Leithwood (1994) asked principals to identify strategies they used to foster greater collaboration, and they identified six, including strengthening the culture, using bureaucratic mechanisms, fostering staff development, frequent and direct communication, sharing power and responsibility, and using rituals and symbols to express cultural values. "Sharing power and responsibility may provide a stimulus for developing shared meaning (affecting the strength of the culture)" (Leithwood, 1994 p.145)

Goldring and Rallis (1993) in their evaluation of principals of dynamic schools concluded an important task of the principal in charge is to facilitate teacher leadership, and "principals implementing change in dynamic schools (i.e., principals-in-charge) institute systematic school wide staff development activities and emphasize staff collaboration and collegiality more than their counterparts in less dynamic schools" (p. 47). An evaluation of principal leadership that focuses on teacher empowerment might ask: What decision-making structures have been established in the school? How do people feel about participation? Do teachers engage in creative problem solving when issues arrive? Short and Greer (1997) state that "evidence such as this will indicate whether the principal is engaging the processes that create a more empowering environment in the school" (p.186).

Crow (1998) stated "leadership as an influence relationship makes sense in

collaborative settings . . Two major features of collaboration are critical to our understanding of leadership: parity and reciprocity. Leadership for collaboration involves an influence relationship where parity is possible" (p.138). Crow also recognizes the costs of expanding leadership to become more collaborative. Increases in time, effort, and other resources are necessary for the influence relationship to work.

Leadership Measures

An analysis of the leadership literature reveals an abundance of instruments used to measure the domain of leadership. Authors have sought to use questionnaires and surveys to evaluate leadership skills, leadership ability, leader attributes, leadership behaviors, leadership culture-and a myriad of other components which have been used to define aspects of leadership. Many of the measures lack reliability and validity data, and thus seem less suitable for use in other studies. Many of the instruments were author created and have not been used in replication studies. The most frequently used measures have included the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire XII (LBDQ) (Stodgill & Coons, 1957), the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) (Murphy, Impara & Blake, 1999), the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Kouzes & Posner, 1988), the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI) (Myers & Briggs, 1991), the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass, Avolio & Bruce, 1990), and the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIRMS) (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985)

A primary criticism of the leadership instruments is that many were developed in the 1960's and 1970's when there was a different prevailing view of leadership than what currently exists. Although some measures have been revised in an effort to resolve this

limitation, they remain suspect because of their reliance on flawed theoretical frameworks. A secondary criticism of the leadership instruments is the absence of an instrument to identify and measure collaborative leadership as a separate concept unique to the composite profile of leadership. The School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) (Short & Rinehart, 1992) contains a dimension of empowerment called decision making, and these questions refer to the degree of collaboration perceived by the teacher in the decision making process. The questions expose the degree of collaboration practiced by the principal as perceived by the teacher

Summary

Middle schools are a relatively new phenomenon. Their unique design and focus on the importance of relationship suggests they will benefit from the practice of collaborative leadership. The field of leadership studies continues to uncover the nature of leadership. One more recent discovery is the importance and value of collaboration within the leadership relationship. Collaboration has become a key focal point in the practice and study of leadership. Collaboration can provide higher quality decisions by synthesizing the input of all affected parties.

Demographic and economic changes in America continue to create a need to quantify employee job satisfaction in any employment setting, and it should be an important measure in education as well. Two factors often measured to determine teacher job satisfaction are teacher motivation and efficacy.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will present the research design, measures and procedures utilized in subject recruitment and data collection and data analysis for this study. A brief explanation of the research design with descriptions of the dependent and independent variables is presented. The selected measures with their associated indices of reliability and validity are described. The procedures used for the recruitment of subjects and data collection are described. Techniques utilized for analysis of the data are summarized. The chapter closes with a discussion of the methodological assumptions and limitations.

Research Design

This study used both quantitative and qualitative approaches to explore the relationship between collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction. The review of the literature suggested a relationship existed between the two study variables, but not as cause and effect, precluding the use of a causal or predictive model design. Therefore the quantitative portion of the study used descriptive correlational design to describe how the variables were related to one another. According to Polit and Hungler (1998), "a correlation is an interrelationship or association between two variables....a tendency for variation in one variable to be related to variation in another" (p. 176). Although this relationship never signifies cause and effect, the information contained in the results of this kind of study may prove useful as a summary of the variables as they currently exist.

The goal of the quantitative portion of this study was to measure the relationships among the identified variables. In this study, two independent variables of principal leadership as measured by the Principal Leadership Survey - Other (PLS-O) and as measured by the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), and one dependent or criterion variable of teacher job satisfaction as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), were selected for analysis. Two of the survey instruments selected (SPES and MSQ) have been widely used in educational research. The third survey instrument (PLS) had only been used in one other study. To further enrich understanding of the quantitative data, interview data were collected from nine teachers who reported the highest job satisfaction and from nine teachers who reported the lowest job satisfaction.

Measures

The study utilized six paper and pencil measures to obtain quantitative information about the additional, independent and dependent variables. These measures included: the Demographic Survey - Principal (Appendix I); the Demographic Survey - Teacher (Appendix J); the PLS-S (Appendix K); the PLS-O (Appendix L); the SPES (Appendix M); and the MSQ (Appendix N). Additionally, structured telephone interviews (Appendix O) were used to collect the interview data.

Demographic Surveys

The Demographic Survey: Principals (see Appendix I) consisted of short response questions about personal attributes. The first question asked the principals' willingness to allow teachers at their schools to be invited to participate in the study. Additional

questions included: age, gender, highest level of education, type of administrative credential held, years of experience as principal and years experience as principal at this school. This information was gathered for descriptive purposes. Lastly, a question was included to ask the principal to participate in a telephone interview.

The Demographic Survey: Teacher (see Appendix J) consisted of short response questions about personal attributes. These included: age, gender, highest level of education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years teaching at this school, and years working with this principal at this school. This information was gathered for descriptive purposes, and for analysis as additional variables that impacted the independent variable of teacher job satisfaction. Lastly, a question was included asking the teachers to participate in a telephone interview.

Principal Leadership Survey - Self and Other

Burnicki (1996) developed the Principal Leadership Survey - Self and Other (see Appendix K & L) after "a review of the literature failed to identify any instruments that pertained to reciprocal leadership behavior exhibited by principals and teachers" (p.83). Burnicki identified that in shared leadership, which frames leadership in a democratic, participative context, examination needed to go beyond analysis aimed solely at interviewing the formally designated leader. Constructed to survey principals' and teachers' perceptions of a principal's leadership behavior, the PLS was developed based on factors associated with leader behavior and member behavior identified in the literature. Factors identified and translated into operationalized items included: sharing vision, developing values, seeking improvement, building relationships, developing

collaboration, and building accountability. Burnicki (1996) stated

> In an attempt to reduce the need for reinterpretation of items on the respondent's part, survey items were developed that are specific to an educational context and attempt to measure behaviors identified through the literature as important to the development of shared leadership and a collaborative culture as they are applied in an educational context. Respondents were asked to make qualitative judgements about themselves and members in their schools using a five-point Likert-type scale. Survey items were listed randomly on the survey in an attempt to lessen response effect and response set and to improve the reliability of responses (p. 84)

A number of procedures were used during development of the PLS to strengthen the validity of the instrument. Current literature on principal behaviors and teacher participation in shared leadership was used as the source material for survey items describing principal and teacher behaviors. A panel of educational practitioners categorized these behaviors into six dimensions, and those which received agreement from three of the five panel members were included on the survey instrument. Using this process, overall agreement of four of the five administrators was obtained on 86% of the items. The validation process ensured that the survey items were both supported by and measured the concepts in the literature.

To insure the reliability of the instrument, a pilot study was performed on a random sample of teachers to determine the inter-item consistency. The pilot study generated values for inter-item reliability for each of the six dimensions. Reported

reliability for the PLS-O, using Chronbach's Alpha, ranged from .8097 to .9307. A reliability coefficient value closer to 1.0 indicates more freedom from error variance in the survey instrument, and measures the true differences among the sample in the dimensions assessed by the instrument. One of the results of the validity and reliability test was the reduction of the number of items in each dimension to seven. This change allowed for data comparisons both within school and across schools.

School Participant Empowerment Scale

The School Participant Empowerment Scale was used to collect information regarding the independent variable of collaborative leadership (see Appendix M). Short and Rinehart (1992) studied empowerment of teacher leaders in the context of school restructuring. The authors were encouraged to develop the SPES by the lack of valid and reliable instruments designed to measure participant empowerment. The conceptual framework of the SPES included notions about empowerment as the opportunities a person has for choice, principals granting teachers greater status, and teachers becoming more active in democratic participation to influence school governance.

Using a population of 211 teachers in public schools, the researchers identified 68 beliefs about what makes teachers feel empowered in schools. Factor analysis of the responses identified six dimensions or sub scales: (a) decision making, (b) professional growth, (c) status, (d) self-efficacy, (e) autonomy, and (f) impact. Marker items were selected from each of the six sections, and the 38-item SPES was constructed. Total scale internal consistency estimates of reliability was .94, and reliabilities of the six factor scales ranged from .81 to .89.

Subjects were than asked to list ways in which they felt empowered in the schools in which they taught. A 110-item master list was compiled, and 75 of these items were judged by the authors to represent empowerment components from past research on the empowerment construct.

The authors took several steps to establish content validity of the resulting 75 item empowerment characteristics list. The authors explained:

> To evaluate each item's general representativeness of the construct of empowerment, the panel of four experts rated each of the items on how well it represented empowerment in schools. Each item was rated on a 5-point continuum of representativeness, from highly representative (1) to highly unrepresentative (5). To determine each item's conceptual fit with theoretically derived components of empowerment, the panel assigned each item to one of the 11 dimensions of empowerment: (a) knowledge base, (b) competence, (c) status, (d) influence, (e) autonomy, (f) control, (g) responsibility, (h) collaboration, (I) involvement in decision making, (j) impact, and (k) choice (Short & Rinehart, 1992, p. 953).

A second study used 211 secondary teachers from three different high schools in three different states. The instrument was administered to this sample, and subjects used a 5-point Likert-type response scale. The results of this data collection were submitted to a principal component analysis followed by an oblique rotation. Upon selection of the items for inclusion on the final empowerment instrument, both split-half and Chronbach's alpha were calculated for the total instrument and for each sub-factor of the

instrument.

A third study was performed to determine discriminant validity. Teacher ratings from two schools participating in an empowerment intervention were compared with teacher ratings from a school not participating in any empowerment intervention. The summed ratings from the instrument differed significantly between the two groups of teachers [$F(1,172)=4.84$, $p<.02$].

The results of this study supported the interpretation that the SPES may tap six dimensions of empowerment within school organizations are identified in the literature. However other dimensions of empowerment identified in the literature did not become apparent through this empirical test. Significantly for the inclusion of the SPES in this study, items which reflected the collaboration component were identified as belonging to the decision making factor (Short & Rinehart, 1992).

The authors state this instrument has been used in more than 75 studies. Some of these include An Analysis of the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Klecker & Loadman, 1998); A Study of Teacher Empowerment in 180 Restructuring Schools: Leadership Implications (Klecker & Loadman, 1998); School-Based Decision Making and the Empowerment of Secondary School Teachers (Wall & Rinehart, 1998) and Exploring the Links Among Teacher Empowerment, Leader Power, and Conflict (Short & Johnson, 1994).

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, Long Form, was used to collect data regarding the dependent variable of teacher job satisfaction (see Appendix N).

Weiss, Davis, England and Lofquist (1967) developed the MSQ during their work with the Work Adjustment Project. This Project was funded by the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and welfare. The goal of the project was to develop a psychology of work and apply it to assist disabled individuals in choosing appropriate jobs, occupations, and careers (Weiss et al., 1967). The instruments developed during by this project were also constructed to be applicable to the vocational counseling of the non-disabled.

The Theory of Work Adjustment (Weiss et al., 1967; Weiss, 1969) consists of two major components the individual, and the work environment Interaction between these two components is recognized by the Work Adjustment Theory The Theory allows for prediction of work adjustment status at one specific point in time, as well as how an individual might fare in different work environments.

The Theory of Work Adjustment addresses both the style and structure of the work personality as well as interaction of these factors with work environments in the process of an individual's adjustment to work. The authors were concerned with the development of the work personality, and the effects of radical environmental change on an individual's work personality. This individual-environment matching model revolves around four basic components: "1) the work personality of the individual; 2) the work environment as measured for a variety of job possibilities; 3) measured work adjustment, as defined by job satisfaction and job satisfactoriness; and 4) work adjustment outcomes, in terms of tenure outcomes on specific jobs" (Weiss et al., 1967, p.2; Weiss, 1969).

An individual's abilities and needs define their work personality. The work

environment consists of two components: ability requirements, and rewards or satisfactions they provide. "An individual's work adjustment status at any point in time can be assessed by measuring his job satisfaction and job satisfactoriness" (Weiss et al., 1967, p.3). Job satisfactoriness is the organization's assessment of the individual and how well his performance meets the organization's needs. "Satisfaction is the individual's assessment of the environment in terms of how well it meets his needs. Work Adjustment Project research has shown that satisfaction and satisfactoriness are uncorrelated indicators of work adjustment" (Weiss et al., 1967, p.3). Finally, tenure outcomes - length of stay at a particular job - can be identified as either voluntary or involuntary. Voluntary tenure decisions, when a person stays at a job or quits, is a function of his job satisfaction. Involuntary tenure decisions, retention, promotion, transfer of separation, are a function of his satisfactoriness. "The highly satisfied individual will remain on the job; the individual whose job satisfaction is low will quit" (Weiss et al., 1967, p. 4).

The MSQ Long Form is a 100 item rating scale which required 15-20 minutes to complete. The 1967 version was used in this study, as it has an adjustment in the response categories to prevent it from being markedly negatively skewed. This "ceiling effect" was caused by the response categories used in the 1977 version. The MSQ Long-Form measures job satisfaction on twenty, five-item scales. The scale used for data analysis in this study are the 20 item General Satisfaction scale. Price and Mueller (1986) found the MSQ to have good construct validity, and reported the general satisfaction reliability as 0.9.

Structured Telephone Interviews

To further explore individual teacher perceptions about the relationship of their job satisfaction to their principals practice of collaborative leadership, questions were developed for telephone interviews (Appendix O). As reality is a socially constructed phenomenon, the questions were designed to explore the reality experienced by each subject. The results from these interviews strengthened and enhanced the results of this study by providing context-specific comments. These comments demonstrate how the teachers view the concepts of collaborative leadership, job satisfaction, and their relationship to each other. In addition, they allowed the researcher to identify unexpected variables which can help explain the results of the study more accurately.

The nine teachers with the highest scores on the MSQ and the nine teachers with the lowest scores on the MSQ who had expressed a willingness to participate in an interview were contacted. The structured interviews were administered during taped telephone conversations.

Teacher interview questions were selected to help define the role the principal plays in teacher job satisfaction. Teachers were asked the following questions: 1) "What factors can you identify as contributing to your job satisfaction?" 2) "Are there any other factors that relate to teacher job satisfaction?" 3) "What influence does your principal have on your job satisfaction?" 4) "Is there a relationship between your job satisfaction and the leadership behaviors of your principal?" In addition, teachers were given the opportunity to make any other comments they felt would be important to the study.

Procedure for Subject Recruitment and Data Collection

Following Human Subjects review approval from the University of San Diego, several sampling methods were used to select subjects for this study. In Phase I of the study a convenience sampling of all middle school principals in an urban California geographic region were invited to participate in the study (see Appendix A).

The researcher sought and received an endorsement of the study from the California League of Middle Schools (see Appendix G & H). This endorsement was used to encourage participation in the study by demonstrating a professional organization valued this research project.

Names and addresses of middle school principals were obtained from the County Department of Education. There were 84 middle schools in Orange County and all principals in the County were invited to participate in Phase I of the study. Subjects were recruited via mail over a two month period. A minimum sample size of 25 principals was desired. This sample size was based on the need to have 10-15 respondents to each question necessary for regression analysis. The actual number of principals who agreed to participate was ten.

Principal subjects received an introductory letter (see Appendix A) in which they were asked for their willingness to participate and then their willingness to allow their teachers to participate in the study. If they agreed to allow their staff to participate in the study, the principals were instructed to complete the Demographic Survey: Principal (see Appendix I), the PLS-S (see Appendix K), and a consent form (see Appendix B). All forms were coded. The Demographic Survey: Principal was identified by a different

color for each school, and a number for the individual participant. This coding allowed the researcher to match the teacher responses from a particular school with the appropriate principal.

Based upon the scores of the PLS, principals were to be stratified into 3 groups: those reporting high degree of collaborative practice, those reporting average degree of collaborative practice, and those reporting low degree of collaborative practice. From this stratification, a purposive quota sampling of school sites was to be selected to achieve a sample of teachers whose principals self-reported high and low levels of collaborative leadership. Principals who reported an average level of collaboration were to be eliminated from the study in an effort to strengthen any effect of the difference. However, an insufficient number of principals volunteered, and this step of the process for selecting participants for Phase II of the study was eliminated.

In Phase II of the study, the schools whose principals self-reported both high and low levels of collaborative leadership and who previously agreed to further data collection involving their teachers were to be contacted to arrange the details of teacher data collection. Since the number of principals participating in the study was only ten, subject recruitment changed so that all of the principal subjects and their teachers were included in Phase II. Each principal determined if the consents and surveys were to be distributed by the researcher at the site on a specific date and time, or if surveys were distributed in the teacher's mail boxes at their school. During Phase II each teacher at the volunteered sites received an introductory letter (see Appendix C), the consent form (see Appendix D), the Demographic Survey: Teachers (see Appendix J), the PLS-O (see

Appendix L), the SPES (see Appendix M) and the MSQ (see Appendix N). A three week period of time was set to recruit and survey teacher subjects at each site, however some data arrived via the mail two months after the planned due date. These surveys were included in the data analysis.

All teachers at the selected schools were invited to participate in Phase 2 quantitative data collection. A minimum sample size of 250 was established as the goal to be obtained. This sample size was based on the minimum number of subjects necessary for a regression analysis (10-15 subjects for each independent variable entered into the equation). This minimum sample size was not achieved. All forms were coded. The Demographic Survey: Teacher was identified by a different color for each school, and a number for the individual participant. This coding allowed the researcher to identify the volunteers for the telephone interviews, and to match the teacher responses from a particular school with the appropriate principal.

In Phase III of the study, a sub-sample of teachers was selected to participate in structured telephone interviews with the researcher. The subjects were identified by using their scores on the MSQ. Teachers with the nine highest job satisfaction scores, and the nine lowest job satisfaction scores, were invited to participate in the interviews. The telephone interviews were taped and later transcribed. Telephone interviews lasted no longer than thirty minutes.

Using a script (Appendix O), the researcher first explained the purpose and goal of the interview to the subject, and ask if there were any questions about the process. The subject was informed that the interview would be taped and that tapes would be

destroyed following transcription. The researcher proceeded asking the scripted questions of the interviewee. At the conclusion of the interview each subject was thanked for their participation in the study.

Duration of Participation

The duration of subject participation for the principals was for the time it took to read and sign the consent, and to complete the Demographic Survey: Principals and the PLS-S. This time was approximately 20 minutes. The duration of subject participation for the teachers was for the time needed to explain the study, read and sign the consent form, and the time needed to complete the Demographic Survey: Teacher (see Appendix J) and the three quantitative instruments. Each principal determined if the surveys were to be distributed by the researcher at the site, or if they were to be distributed in the teacher's mail boxes. If the presentation to the teachers was made in person by the researcher, introduction to the study and explanation of the procedures took approximately 20 minutes. Additionally, another forty-five minutes was needed to complete the quantitative measures. The Demographic Survey: Teacher contained 8 short answer questions, and two short answer responses. The PLS-O was a 42 item rating scale which took 15 minutes to complete. The SPES was a 38 item rating scale which took 15 minutes to complete. The MSQ Long Form was a 100 item rating scale which required 15-20 minutes to complete.

Risks and Benefits of the Study

There was no risk to the subjects involved in this study. Informed consent was obtained prior to the data collection. Subjects were reminded of their right to withdraw

at any time without jeopardy. All data were kept in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's home. Participant names were not attached to any of the data collection instruments with the exception of the Demographic Survey: Teacher. Data regarding subjects phone numbers was destroyed at the conclusion of the study. To ensure confidentiality, data were not disaggregated by school. In the results of the study, individuals were not identified in any way. This protected both principal and teacher participants from any use of the study data for evaluation purposes by their school districts. Data were analyzed with the population of teachers as the unit of analysis.

There are three potential benefits as a result of this study. First, it provided for the involved schools the opportunity to generate intellectual discussion regarding the practice of collaborative leadership, and the potential benefits to teachers. Second, it provided an interpretation of the importance of collaborative leadership to teachers as one component of their perceived job satisfaction. Principals have little influence over many of the working conditions of teachers, and should be interested in the ways they can influence teacher job satisfaction. If there is a positive relationship found between the two variables, then this study could provide rationale for encouraging both the study of collaborative leadership in schools of administration and leadership, and the practice of collaborative leadership by principals in the public schools. Finally, school district personnel may wish to examine their support and understanding of collaborative leadership as practiced by their principals, and the relationship it has to the teacher's degree of job satisfaction.

Data Analysis

The researcher used a personal computer and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2000) for Windows, Release 10.0 to enter and analyze the demographic data, the principal results from the PLS-Self, the teacher results from the PLS-Other developing collaboration sub scale, and the teacher results from the SPES decision making sub scale. The MSQ data were entered and scored by Vocational Psychology Research at the University of Minnesota. Data used for analysis included scores from the PLS-S, the PLS-O, the SPES, and the MSQ.

The quantitative data were analyzed by a variety of methods. The data from the principal's responses to the PLS-Self were intended to be sorted using the criteria bands of high use of collaboration, average use of collaboration, and low use of collaboration. After this sort was performed, the responses of average use of collaboration were to be removed from further analysis, to heighten the potential effect of principals reporting high and low use of collaboration. The small number of principal responses (n=10), the limited range of their PLS-S scores, and the potential elimination of a significant number of the teachers' responses from further data analysis prevented this step of the data analysis process from completion. Therefore, the planned sorting of principals by criterion bands of high, average, and low use of collaboration was eliminated. All of the data from principal respondents and the teachers from their respective schools were included.

To address research question one: Is there a relationship between collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction? and hypothesis one: teachers who report that

collaborative leadership is being used by their principal will have a higher degree of job satisfaction, a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was utilized with the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score (teachers scoring their principals' leadership) and the SPES decision making sub scale score, and the MSQ general satisfaction score to determine if a relationship exists between collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction. In addition, regression analysis was performed using the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score and the SPES decision making sub scale score as independent variables, and the MSQ general satisfaction score as the dependent variable to determine if a degree of predictability existed.

To address research question two: Are there additional variables (age, gender, level of higher education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years at this school, years with this principal) relating to teacher job satisfaction?, and hypothesis two: There is no relationship between additional variables (age, gender, level of higher education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years at this school, years with this principal) and teacher job satisfaction, Pearson Product moment correlation coefficient was utilized with each of the additional variables and the MSQ score. In addition, linear regression was used to determine if any of the additional variables held predictive value towards teacher job satisfaction.

To address research question three: Is there a difference between principal self-rating of collaborative practice and teachers' perception of the principals' collaborative practice? and hypothesis three: Principals will have a higher perception of their use of collaborative leadership than will the teachers at their school, paired sample t-tests were

used. T-tests are used to decide whether two sample means are different from each other. If the two samples are related, a dependent t-test is used. A dependent samples (paired) t-test including the principals' score from the PLS-S and the teachers' score from the PLS-O was used to determine if a there was a difference between the two groups. In addition, telephone interviews were conducted using scripted interview questions, and the answers to these questions were analyzed for topics, categories and patterns which provide support or refutation of the research questions and the data findings. Selected participant comments reflecting their experienced reality were added to enhance the results of the study

Assumptions

The primary assumption of this study was that the subjects would accurately report their perceptions to the researcher. Statistical assumptions of the study included those that were appropriate for the use of correlation analysis, multiple regression and paired sample t-test. A major assumption was that the quantitative instruments measured what they claimed to measure.

Limitations

The most significant limitation of this study was the reliance on principal and teacher perceptions to identify the degree of collaboration practiced by their principal. Berger and Luckmann (1966) have identified reality as a socially constructed phenomenon, and so it is possible each school surveyed and each subject had slightly differing working definitions of collaborative leadership and job satisfaction.

The slippery nature of the word *collaboration* provides a limitation for the study.

While principals might have thought they were collaborating, their teachers may not have thought they were. Development of a common language surrounding collaborative processes and a repertoire of common practices associated with collaborative leadership would have helped to clarify boundaries and better define the process, and to accurately measure its presence of absence.

Another major limitation was the use of a purposive stratified convenience sample. The population to be studied was selected on the following criteria: the willingness of the school district to allow access to the subjects, the willingness of the principals to participate and to allow their staff members the opportunity to participate, and, finally, the willingness of the individual teachers to participate. Principals were selected for inclusion based on their response to the Principal Leadership Survey - Self. Only principals who self reported a high degree or a low degree of collaborative practices were to be included in the study.

The potential for inflated principal self reporting, and inconsistent teacher reporting of collaborative leadership practices created further limitations. If a principal practiced collaborative leadership, and yet rated himself or herself as a low collaborator, they might have been excluded from the sample. On the other hand, if a principal rated himself or herself self as a high collaborator, and they did not practice collaborative leadership, then they could be included in the sample. Similarly, a principal may have perceived he or she practiced a certain degree of collaboration, and this finding may not have been supported by any teacher data.

As this study is limited to a certain geographic region of California, its

generalizability will be limited to like populations of principals and teachers.

Summary

Using a correlational research design, this study examined the degree of collaboration between middle school principals and their teachers, and the relationship between the degree of collaboration and the level of teacher job satisfaction. Principals and teachers completed demographic survey forms. The PLS-S was used to measure principal self-perception of collaborative leadership practice. The PLS-O and the SPES were used to measure the degree of principal collaborative leadership practice perceived by teachers, and the MSQ Long Form was used to measure teacher level of job satisfaction.

The quantitative portion of the study used the Pearson product moment correlational coefficient to identify the relationship between collaborative leadership and job satisfaction, linear regression analysis to determine the degree of predictability between the additional variables and teacher job satisfaction, and a dependent t-test to determine if there was a difference between the principals' perception of their practice of collaborative leadership and the teachers' perception of their principal. Additionally, telephone interview questions added to the contextual understanding of the results.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This correlational study examined the relationship between the leadership practiced by middle school principals and the job satisfaction reported by their teachers. Middle school principals who participated in the study completed a demographic survey and the Principal Leadership Survey-Self (PLS-S). Teachers participating in the study completed a demographic survey, the Principal Leadership Survey-Other (PLS-O), the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), 1967 Revision. Sub scale scores from the PLS-O (developing collaboration) and the SPES (decision making) were used to measure the perception of collaborative leadership practiced by the principals and experienced by the teachers. Interviews were conducted with the teachers who reported the highest degree of job satisfaction and the teachers who reported the lowest degree of job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ general satisfaction score.

The research questions this study examined were:

1) Is there a relationship between the collaborative leadership practiced by middle school principals and the job satisfaction reported by their teachers?

2) Are there other variables (age, gender, level of education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years teaching at this school, years working with this principal at this school) related to teacher job satisfaction?

3) Is there a difference between principal self-rating of collaborative practice and teachers

perception of the principals' collaborative practice?

This chapter presents the results of the demographic surveys, the statistical analysis of data, and a summary of findings from interviews conducted with the teachers.

Demographic Summary of Participants

Principals

Principals of all 75 middle schools in Orange County were invited to participate. Eleven principals volunteered to participate, and 10 principals gave the surveys to their teachers or had the researcher make a presentation to them. The age of the ten principal participants ranged from 41 to 61, with a mean of 52 years. Eight of the principals held masters degrees and two held doctorates. All the principals held clear administrative credentials. The years of experience as principal ranged from one to 20 years, with a mean of 10 years. Years as principal at the school ranged from one to 17 years, with a mean of six years. Three of the 10 principals were in their first year at this school. Table 1 shows a summary of this data.

Teachers

Orange County has approximately 3000 middle school teachers. The total number of teachers at schools whose principals allowed their staff to participate was 387 teachers. Of these 387 teachers, 183 completed and returned surveys. The 183 teacher participants ranged in age from 23 to 70, and their mean age was 42.8 years. One hundred twenty eight of the teachers were female, and 53 were male. Eighty of the teachers held a bachelor's degree. Ninety-five held a Master's degree, and three held doctorate degrees. Nine of the teachers held a preliminary credential, and 172 of the teachers held a clear

teaching credential. Years of teaching experience ranged from one to 40 years, with a

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Principal Participants (n = 10)

Characteristic	n	%	Characteristic	n	%
Gender			Type of Administrative Credential		
Female	5	50	Clear	10	100
Male	5	50	Years of Experience as Principal		
Age			1-9	5	50
40-49	3	30	10-19	4	40
50-59	6	60	20-29	1	10
60-69	1	10	Years at This School		
Level of Higher Education			1-5	6	60
MA/MS	8	80	6-10	2	20
EdD/PhD	2	20	11-19	2	20

mean of 14 years. Years at the school ranged from one year (reporting this year as one) to 36 years with a mean of eight years. Years with this principal were reported from one to 18, with the mean of three.

Three hundred eighty teachers were invited to participate, one hundred eighty-three completed surveys were returned resulting in a 48% response rate. Twenty of the teachers returned their uncompleted survey forms and the incentive coupons to the researcher. Seventy-four unused survey forms were picked up from the schools, and approximately 100 teachers kept the packets, but did not complete the forms. The subject identity protections built into the study precluded follow-ups on the non-respondents. Table 2 shows a summary of this data.

Table 2
Demographic Characteristics of Teacher Participants (n = 183)

Characteristic	n	%	Mean	Characteristic	n	%	Mean
Age			43	Years teaching experience			14
20-29	31	17		1-9	83	46	
30-39	42	24		10-19	40	22	
40-49	38	21		20-20	31	17	
50-59	61	34		30-39	25	14	
60-69	4	2		40-49	1	1	
70-79	2	1		Years at This School			7.5
Gender				1-9	126	70	
Female	128	71		10-19	41	23	
Male	53	29		20-29	11	6	
Level of higher education				30-39	3	2	
BA/BS	80	45		Years with This Principal			3.1
MA/MS	95	53		1-3	129	72	
EdD/PhD	3	2		4-6	26	14	
Type of teaching credential				7-9	13	7	
Emergency	9	5		10-15	7	4	
Clear	165	95		15-20	5	3	

Results

Collaborative Leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaction

Research Question One: Is there a relationship between collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction?

Hypothesis One: Teachers who report that collaborative leadership is being used by their principal will have a higher degree of job satisfaction. Measures used to identify

collaborative leadership as experienced by the teachers were: the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale, and the SPES decision making sub scale. These sub scales were used as they most closely measured collaborative leadership. The measure used to identify teacher job satisfaction was the MSQ general satisfaction score.

Measures of correlation are used for measuring association between variables, and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) is a statistic that measures the linear relationship between quantitative variables. The resulting scores are expressed as positive and negative correlations, with -1 indicating a perfect negative correlation and +1 indicating a perfect correlation. A score of zero shows that no correlation exists between the variables. Hinkle and Jurs (1994) states "the correlation coefficient (r) provides both a measure of the relationship between variables, as well as an index of the proportion of individual differences in one variable that can be associated with the individual differences in another variable" (p.118). The coefficient of determination (r^2) measures the amount of a variance in one variable that can be associated with the variance in another variable.

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient between the teachers' scores on the MSQ general satisfaction scale and the SPES decision making sub scale was $r = .465$ ($r^2 = .216$), and was significant at the .01 level. This score can be interpreted as a moderate positive correlation between the score of the teachers on the MSQ general satisfaction scale and the SPES decision making sub scale. The r^2 indicates that 21% of the variance in the MSQ general satisfaction score was associated with the SPES decision making sub scale score from the teachers.

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient between the MSQ general

satisfaction score and the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score was r=.311 (r^2= 096) and was significant at the .01 level. This score can be interpreted as a low positive correlation between the MSQ general satisfaction score and the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score. The r^2 indicated that 9.6% of the variance in the MSQ general satisfaction score can be associated with the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score.

These results indicate there was a moderate positive between the collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction. In addition, the correlation scores suggest that the SPES score was more strongly related to job satisfaction then was the PLS-O score. This data is presented in Table 3

Table 3
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient for Collaborative Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Measure	1.	2.	3.
1. School Participant Empowerment Scale	--		
2. Principal Leadership Scale - Other	376**	--	
3. Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire	465**	311**	--

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Regression analysis is used when one expects that two variables may be related, and multiple regression analysis is used when two or more quantitative independent variables are used to predict a single criterion score. Regression analysis was done on teacher data using the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score and the SPES decision making sub scale score as independent predictor variables, and the MSQ general satisfaction score as the dependent variable. The regression model summary was

R=.491, R^2=.241, α=.05. R represents the multiple correlation coefficient, and shows the strength of the relationship between the variables. R^2 represents the accuracy of the prediction, meaning 24.1% of the variability in the MSQ score is explained in terms of the scores on the SPES and the PLS-O. The results of this analysis can be interpreted to mean a set of predictors can be identified which are related to the criterion variable of job satisfaction. The scores show that the SPES score was a better predictor of job satisfaction than was the PLS-O. Analysis of the beta weights shows the PLS-O is not a significant predictor, and only the linear regression produced with the SPES is predictive. This data is presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Regression Analysis Summary for Collaborative Leadership Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction[a]

Variable	B	SEB	β
School Participant Empowerment Scale	6.611	1.160	.406*
Principal Leadership Survey - Other	2.392	1.021	.167

a. Dependent Variable: Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
Note. R^2 = .24 (n = 173, p < .05). *p < .01

Additional Variables Influencing Teacher Job Satisfaction

Research Question Two: Are there additional variables (age, gender, level of education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years teaching at this school, years working with this principal at this school) related to teacher job satisfaction?

Hypothesis Two: There is no relationship between additional variables (age, gender, level of higher education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching

experience, years at this school, years with this principal) and teacher job satisfaction. Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to measure the relationship among the additional variables and the MSQ general satisfaction score.

Pearson product moment correlation coefficient scores produced by this analysis ranged from - 07 to + 05, indicating that no significant correlation existed between the additional variables and the MSQ score for job satisfaction. Table 5 contains the results of this analysis.

Table 5
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient for Additional Variables and Job Satisfaction

Measure	1. Age	2. Gender	3. Years Education	4. Type of Teaching Credential	5. Years Experience	6. Years at This School	7. Years with This Principal
MSQ	- 07	- 06	- 05	- 05	- 04	- 05	05

Note: The purpose of this procedure was to identify significant correlations with the job satisfaction measure (MSQ), so other correlation results were omitted.

Because the correlation between two variables is rarely perfect, Polit and Hungler (1998) suggest that it is frequently desirable to try and improve the ability to predict a Y value by including more than one X as a predictor variable. In this study, several additional variables were identified having the potential to improve this prediction ability. These additional variables (age, gender years education type of teaching credential years experience, years at this school, years with this principal) were used to develop a linear regression model to see if a one of the variables could better predict teacher job satisfaction. Linear regression was run using the enter method which produced a multiple

correlational coefficient (R). R represents the strength between several independent variables and the dependent variable, but does not indicate the directionality. R^2 indicates the proportion of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by the combined simultaneous influence of the independent variables and is called the coefficient of determination.

The coefficient table reports unstandardized coefficients as well as standardized coefficients. Unstandardized coefficients (B), also called partial regression coefficients, represented the expected change in the dependent variable with one unit change in one of the independent variable when all other variables are controlled. While unstandardized coefficients allow interpretation in the original units of measurement, they have the disadvantage of making it difficult to compare the effects of the independent variables, as variables may vary widely in means and standard deviations and thus in their values. In addition, unstandardized coefficients are not good indicators if the predictors are measured in different units.

The standardized coefficients (β), also called beta weights, represent the expected change in the dependent variable in standard deviation units when the other independent variables are controlled. Beta weights have the advantage of being directly comparable in relative importance of effect on the dependent variable; however, they can't be interpreted in the original measurement scale. If an independent variable has a beta weight of .5, this means that when other independent variables are held constant, the dependent variable would increase by half a standard deviation also. Thus, the ratio of the beta weights is the ratio of the predictive importance of the independent variables. In general, the greater the

absolute value of the beta weights, the greater the influence of the dependent variable.

None of the additional variables had a significant influence on teacher job satisfaction; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. However, the SPES score had a greater impact on job satisfaction than any of the other additional variables (β = .424, p < .01). The results of this analysis are in Table 6.

Table 6
Regression Summary for all Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction[a] (n=173)

Variable	B	SEB	β
Age	-.108	.129	-.099
Gender	1.307	1.936	-.048
Level of Higher Education	-2.224	1.769	-.094
Type of Teaching Credential	-.592	4.104	-.010
Years of Experience	4.038E-02	.163	.035
Years at This School	-4.31E-02	.184	-.024
Years with This Principal	.209	.280	.057
SPES	6.967	1.248	.424*
PLS-O	2.337	1.097	.159

a. Dependent Variable: Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
Note. R^2 = .267 (n = 173, p < .05). *p < .01

Collaborative Practice: Principal and Teacher Perceptions

Research Question Three: Is there a difference between principal self-rating of collaborative practice and teachers perception of the principals collaborative practice?

Hypothesis Three: Principals will have a higher perception of their use of collaborative leadership than will the teachers at their school.

T-tests are used to decide whether two sample means are different from each other. If the two samples are related, a dependent t-test is used. A dependent samples (paired) t-test including the principals' score from the PLS-S and the teachers' score from the PLS-O was used to determine if a there was a difference between the two groups. The researcher found that there was a difference between the principal self-rating of collaborative practice and teachers perception of the principals collaborative practice ($t = -9.378$, $df = 182$, $p < .000$, two-tailed).

A descriptive analysis of this data reveals clearly the difference in the scores between the principals and the teachers. The number of teachers who reported scores higher, the same, and lower than the principal of their school is listed in Table 7. Based on this summary, principals report that they use of collaborative leadership more frequently than their teachers did. Most teachers (71.5%) report their principals using a lower rate of collaborative leadership than the principals' self report.

Table 7
Principal Teacher Score Distribution for PLS-S and PLS-O Scores (n=183)

Number of Teachers	Higher than his/her Principal	Same as his/her Principal	Lower than his/her Principal
183	38	14	131

Telephone Interview Results

Telephone interviews were conducted with 18 of the study participants to expand the researchers' understanding of the respondents' reported job satisfaction. The sample for data collection consisted of nine of the teachers reporting the highest and nine of the teachers reporting the lowest job satisfaction. This sample, which represented the two

extremes of satisfaction scores, was selected to accentuate the contrasts that might exist between the two groups, as well as to discover what made a difference in their degree of reported job satisfaction.

The telephone interviews were taped and transcribed. Interviews lasted no longer than forty-five minutes. Teachers were contacted at the times they designated as convenient on the Demographic Survey: Teacher (see Appendix J). Using a script, the researcher explained the purpose and goal of the interview to the subjects and asked whether the respondents had any questions about the process. The subjects were informed that the interview was going to be taped and that tapes would be destroyed following transcription. At the conclusion of the interview the subjects were thanked for their participation in the study.

Four questions were asked during the interview: 1) "What factors can you identify as contributing to your job satisfaction?" 2) "Are there any other factors that relate to teacher job satisfaction?" 3) "What influence does your principal have on your job satisfaction?" and 4) "Is there a relationship between your job satisfaction and the leadership behaviors of your principal?" In addition, subjects were given the opportunity to provide other comments they had on the study topic. The goal of these questions was to address Research Question One: Is there a relationship between collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction? and Hypothesis One: There is a relationship between collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction.

Highest Job Satisfaction Scores

An analysis of the interviews conducted with those teachers who had the highest

job satisfaction revealed two important themes: the need for administrative support and the desire for collaboration, which also included two sub-themes: shared decision-making and empowerment. The theme of administrative support was the most frequently mentioned theme by the high job satisfaction teachers. Administrative support meant different things to different teachers: the principal giving courage to, indicating faith in, or showing confidence in the teachers and the principal providing material support to a new program or idea the teacher desired to implement.

Most of the high job satisfaction teachers who were interviewed stated that their principals' support contributed to their job satisfaction. Typical comments included: "the principal is extremely supportive," "in my opinion, job satisfaction . . . is based on the support of an administrator" and "just having somebody like that who is so supportive of us and a good leader . . . makes a big difference as far as the school running smoothly and making the teachers as happy as possible." These comments indicated that the teachers felt that administrative support directly contributed to their job satisfaction.

Most of the high job satisfaction teachers were more specific in their descriptions of the ways their principals support their ideas and decisions regarding programs. In reference to her principal, one teacher stated: "She's extremely supportive of what we want to do" and "she's incredibly supportive of us in what we need to do". This last comment indicated the teacher valued the principal's approach to a new program recently implemented at her school. Another teacher commented: "She's very supportive of us, and she has given us all . . . well she's basically given [control] . . . to us . . . she really likes what we're doing so . . . yes, she has a lot of influence [on job satisfaction]."

Clearly, this teacher valued the way the principal had given discretion on the details of the program to the teachers, and felt this empowerment influenced the job satisfaction of the teachers. Finally, one other participant reported that the administration is "extremely supportive in what I want to do in my programs. I think that's my biggest thing is how supportive my administration is." This comment indicated the power the school administration had to influence the satisfaction of this teacher.

Collaboration was the other important theme, frequently mentioned following comments on support. Comments from one teacher on collaboration included: "He does it in a way that makes it a challenge, it's not an authoritarian type –'you will do this,' " but instead "it's 'hey, you know, how can we do this together?' "These quotes indicate the inclusive style of leadership practiced by her principal. Another teacher also described the leadership practiced by his principal: "It's not a threatening leadership" and "it's not smoking guns, it's how we can accomplish something; it's a WE approach." These comments capture the shared nature of collaborative leadership, and indicate the level of inclusion and trust these teachers felt from their principal.

Shared decision making was also valued by teachers and considered hallmarks of collaboration. One teacher commented: "she's leading us, but not as a dictator . . . not telling us what to do, but being very supportive", indicating how her principal worked to effectively involve the teachers in the decision making process as informed participants. Another teacher also valued being an active participant in the leadership process: " the staff has a voice . . . we get to take part in leadership."

One teacher clarified the restraint exercised by her principal in a decision making process:

> She takes all of our questions and concerns seriously; she doesn't just push her agenda through and make whatever she wants to happen, happen. It shows that she was working for us, even though she wanted this, she didn't just go and make it happen. So she's leading us, but not as a dictator . . . not telling us what to do, but being very supportive.

This teacher knew the principal could have forced her decision on the group, but instead chose to step back and allow the teachers to fully participate in the process.

Finally, the empowerment felt by the teachers who were allowed to participate in a collaborative process was described by several other teachers. Inclusion as a peer in the decision making process was described as "I think that's kind of the whole approach that he has: not working under him, you're working with him". The most powerful description of teachers being fully included in collaborative leadership came from a teacher who said "I don't really look at him as a principal, even, just he's a colleague. And it's very satisfying." This teacher appreciated the inclusion she experienced and felt both she and the principal were working in a collegial manner.

Lowest Job Satisfaction Scores

An analysis of the interviews conducted with those teachers who had the lowest job satisfaction scores revealed four important themes: the need for administrative support, the desire for collaboration, effective principal teacher communication, and the desire for autonomy.

Most of the low job satisfaction teachers, as well as the high satisfaction teachers, stressed the importance of administrative support. For example, one teacher's views: " I really appreciate having someone who's experienced and [who is] . . . supportive of me and those situations." This teacher was referring to conflict situations with students. Another teacher had experienced a lack of principal support: "I'm three years into teaching and it is a tremendous amount of work and there have been days when I didn't know if I could go back to school and face another day because I'd had a principal yell at me the day before, and totally supported unreasonable parents." Clearly the failure of the principal to support this teacher had a negative impact on her job satisfaction.

Several of the low job satisfaction teachers stated that the degree to which their principal communicated with them contributed to their job satisfaction. One teacher reported: "I think that open communication . . . is pretty critical." Another teacher explained: "the only thing that I would like a little more, not that my principal wasn't willing to listen, but I feel sometimes like it's intimidating to have to go into the office and ask for help. I think that would be, if there was an openness, that would be a great thing." If this principal made a greater effort to communicate in an open manner, the level of intimidation might be reduced.

Many of the low job satisfaction teachers discussed their interest in collaboration. Two teachers offered specific examples of the collaboration they desired. One teacher explained: "A principal that leads, I think, often asks for input . . . to be a facilitator I think is more to my liking in terms of being satisfied." Another teacher stated her preference regarding decision making: "when a decision is going to be made, at least my

input is solicited", indicating that she knew that she would not agree with all decisions, but valued the opportunity for input.

Several of the low job satisfaction teachers valued their autonomy. One teacher said: "I'm pretty much independent . doing it independently of any feedback from the principal", indicating that she was left alone. Another teacher also described her approval of a principal who left her alone: "He's just what I would call an excellent principal. He runs the school, minds his business, and as long as you're doing your job, you never hear anything adverse from him." Another teacher liked "the fact that I'm my own boss. I can go in my classroom and do my own thing without somebody standing there and telling me what to do and watching over me all the time." The wide latitude afforded by this principal was recognized and appreciated. Finally, in describing autonomy, one teacher said "He leaves me alone much of the time. He's not breathing down our necks all the time", indicating the degree of supervision provided by the principal was acceptable.

Summary of Interview Findings

The first finding from this data is that both the high job satisfaction and the low job satisfaction groups identified administrative support and collaboration as important for job satisfaction. The second finding is that the low job satisfaction group identified communication and autonomy important for their job satisfaction. An observation about these results is that the high reporting group had more internal agreement on what leadership behaviors led them to be satisfied with their job. Stated another way, the responses they provided were much more similar to each other than were those from the low job satisfaction group.

Based on the results of this analysis, a relationship exists between collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction. Although administrative support was the most significant theme, collaboration was mentioned by both high job satisfaction and low job satisfaction groups as having a significant influence on their job satisfaction.

Limitations

These conclusions are limited by several factors. First, the small sample size is an issue affecting the generalizability of these results for both principals and teachers. Second, determining motivations for participation was somewhat problematic. Some principals were assigned to participate by their district office, one was completing a state mandated self-study and desired demographic information this study would provide, and some volunteered. Third, the degree of candor of the participating principals is unknown. Principals who volunteered to participate in a study exploring collaborative leadership could be reluctant to complete a survey describing what parts of their job they were not good at performing, and so it was expected that the principals' responses would be skewed to the higher side. Four, since the study participants were all selected from a limited geographic area, the lack of diversity further impairs the generalizability of the results to other populations.

Besides these limitations, there are specific limitations in the teacher survey data. First is the way each principal presented the study, and whether they were enthusiastic or obligatory in their explanation of the study. In addition, not all principals gave the same amount of encouragement and support to the teachers to ensure they completed the study. Second, the motivations of the teacher participants should be examined. Did the teachers

who participated have reason to express their positive or negative opinion about their principal, or feel compelled to defend or critique them through this study?

Finally, two of the instruments selected for use in this study had their own sets of limitations. The PLS was developed by a doctoral candidate, and has only been used in one other study. Finally, the MSQ is the most widely used instrument to measure teacher job satisfaction; however, it was developed for a specific population with specific job retraining needs. In addition, the roles of both teachers and principals have changed significantly since the version used in the this study was developed in 1967, and this could contribute to less than accurate results

Summary

Based on these data, the results of the study can be summarized as follows: Hypothesis One: Teachers who report that collaborative leadership is being used by their principal will have a higher degree of job satisfaction. This study found a moderate positive correlation between the School Participant Empowerment Scale decision making sub scale score and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire general satisfaction score. In addition, this study found a low positive correlation between the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score and the MSQ general satisfaction score. Hypothesis Two: There are additional variables (age, gender, level of education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years teaching at this school, years working with this principal at this school) related to teacher job satisfaction. This study found no significant correlations between these variables and teacher job satisfaction. Hypothesis Three: Principals will have a higher perception of their use of collaborative leadership than will

the teachers at their school. The qualitative data supports the existence of a relationship between principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents a brief summary and interpretation of the results the study, followed by a discussion linking the findings with those discussed in the literature review. Strengths and limitations of the study as they relate to the external and internal validity of the research are discussed. The chapter concludes with implications for further research and for the practice of middle school leadership.

Summary and Interpretation of the Results

The reform and restructuring of America's public schools has been a continuing effort during over the last 50 years. The middle school has continued to be a focal point of this reform, widely recognized as a critical turning point in the social, emotional and intellectual development of young adolescents. During this same period, the general notion or paradigm of leadership has also undergone significant revision. The focus has shifted from the natural attributes of the leader to relationship between the leader and those choosing to be led.

The size of the labor pool has been reduced by both a strong economy with a low unemployment rate, and the entry of the baby boomer generation into the range of retirement age resulting in large numbers of retirements from the workforce. The resulting scarcity of workers requires employers to give more attention to employee retention and satisfaction in the workplace. The confluence and effect of these events has forced principals to examine how they practice leadership.

This correlational study examined the relationship between the leadership practiced by middle school principals and the job satisfaction reported by their teachers. Middle school principals (n=10) involved in the study completed a demographic survey and the Principal Leadership Survey - Self (PLS-S). Teachers (n=183) participating in the study completed a demographic survey, the Principal Leadership Survey - Other (PLS-O), the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), 1967 Revision. Sub scale scores from the PLS-O (developing collaboration) and the SPES (decision making) were used to measure the perception of collaborative leadership practiced by the principals and experienced by the teachers. Based on the findings from the MSQ, a sub population of teachers was selected to participate in telephone interviews to enrich understanding of the characteristics contributing to teacher job satisfaction. The sub sample represented teachers who reported the highest degree (n=9) and teachers who reported the lowest degree (n=9) of job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ

This study focused on three basic research questions:

Research Question One: Is there a relationship between the collaborative leadership practiced by middle school principals, and the job satisfaction reported by their teachers?

Research Question Two: Are there other variables (age, gender, level of education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years teaching at this school, years working with this principal at this school) related to teacher job satisfaction?

Research Question Three: Is there a difference between principal self-rating of collaborative practice and teacher's perception of the principals collaborative practice?

Collaborative Leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaction

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient between the teachers' scores on the MSQ general satisfaction scale and the SPES decision making sub scale was $r = .465$ ($r^2 = .216$), and was significant at the .01 level. This score can be interpreted as a moderate positive correlation between the score of the teachers on the MSQ general satisfaction scale and the SPES decision making sub scale. The r^2 indicates that 21% of the variance in the MSQ general satisfaction score was associated with the SPES decision making sub scale score from the teachers.

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient between the MSQ general satisfaction score and the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score was $r = .311$ ($r^2 = .096$) and was significant at the .01 level. This score can be interpreted as a low positive correlation between the MSQ general satisfaction score and the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score. The r^2 indicated that 9.6% of the variance in the MSQ general satisfaction score can be associated with the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score.

Regression analysis was done on teacher data using the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score and the SPES decision making sub scale score as independent predictor variables, and the MSQ general satisfaction score as the dependent variable. The regression model summary was $R = .491$, $R^2 = .241$, $\alpha = .05$. R represents the multiple correlation coefficient, and shows the strength of the relationship between the

variables. R^2 represents the accuracy of the prediction, meaning 24.1% of the variability in the MSQ score is explained in terms of the scores on the SPES and the PLS-O. The results of this analysis can be interpreted to mean a set of predictors can be identified which are related to the criterion variable of job satisfaction. The scores show that the SPES score was a better predictor of job satisfaction that was the PLS-O. Analysis of the beta weights shows the PLS-O is not a significant predictor, and only the linear regression produced with the SPES is predictive.

These results indicate there was a moderate positive correlation between the collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction. In addition, the correlation scores suggest that the SPES score was more strongly related to job satisfaction than was the PLS-O score. While it was anticipated that the two measures which rated the teacher's perceptions of the principal's leadership practices would compare similarly to the MSQ, this was not the case. The SPES decision making sub scale score provides evidence that principals who empower teachers to make decisions may influence their job satisfaction.

Short (1998) identified the importance of empowering leadership, finding that "teachers perceive greater empowerment when they feel that they have an effect and influence on school life" (p.71). This kind of effect can best occur in the context of collaborative leadership. Lambert (1998) adds "leadership capacity...requires attention to two areas: (1) structures and processes for participation and (2) opportunities to become skillful participants" (p.17). Principals need to provide teachers opportunities in practicing leadership to increase their proficiency and give them influence on school life.

Short (1998) mentions the importance of "tapping into the discretionary effort that people have to give to a situation but can choose not to give". Teachers who perceive that their input will be genuinely considered may be more likely to choose to give their discretionary efforts.

Additional Variables Influencing Teacher Job Satisfaction

Additional variables evaluated in the study included age, gender, level of education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years teaching at this school, years working with this principal at this school. Data on these variables were collected by the Demographic Survey-Teacher (see Appendix J) developed by the researcher. This study found there were no statistically significant correlations between any these variables and teacher job satisfaction. However, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient scores for the three survey instruments (PLS-O, SPES, and MSQ) differed by teacher gender.

The most significant difference was between the SPES and the MSQ scores. The male score was r=.379, which is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed), and can be interpreted as a moderately low correlation, while the female score was r= 518, which is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed), and can be interpreted as a moderate correlation. In fact, the correlation between the SPES and the MSQ for females was the highest correlation score in this study. This gender based difference has several implications. First, for administrators, it could indicate that females are generally more satisfied with their teaching jobs then are males, and that males are generally less satisfied with their teaching jobs than are females. The difference could also be caused by a disparity in

interpretation of the meaning of the questions, as well as a difference in the value placed by the genders on the notion of empowerment that the SPES intends to measure. Finally, another influence could be the difference males and females place on the value of relationships and, therefore, the need for collaboration in the workplace. This could have several implications for the practice of collaborative leadership in middle schools, and even for the selection of middle school teachers.

Collaborative Practice: Principal and Teacher Perceptions

As there were only ten principals who were involved in the study, the validity of the conclusions made from this sample is questionable. Three of these principals were in their first year as principal of their current school, having worked with their staff for only 3 months at the time the study was conducted. Thus, questions on how well the staff actually knew the principal and could identify and evaluate their authentic collaborative leadership behaviors casts further doubt on the conclusions drawn from this data.

This study revealed a difference between the principal self-rating of collaborative practice and teachers' perception of the principals collaborative practice. The important finding is that most teachers rank their principals much lower in collaborative leadership than the principals ranked themselves. Most teachers (71.5%) report their principals using a lower rate of collaborative leadership than the principals' self-report. A difference between the principals perception of his or her leadership style and the teachers' perception of his or her style has been found in other studies. Gallagher (1984) found that even though a principal perceived himself as a leader who had a concern for people, was an open communicator, and believed in participatory decision making, the teachers

perceived his behavior differently. Shen (2001), while evaluating teacher empowerment, also found major discrepancy between teacher and principal perceptions. Shen concluded that the rhetoric of teacher empowerment and shared decision making had apparently given principals the impression that the wish to have such a collaborative environment had been translated into practice, when indeed, teachers did not feel this was so.

Telephone Interview Results

In addition to the quantitative survey instruments, this research project used telephone interviews to further interpret and add meaning to the data. These interviews were conducted with the teachers who scored both the highest scores and the lowest scores on the MSQ general satisfaction sub scale. While the theme of collaboration emerged in many of these interviews, the most salient theme mentioned by the teachers as significantly influencing their job satisfaction was that of administrative support. The pervasive nature of the comments on this topic suggests that administrative support was the most important issue for the teachers interviewed. This finding mirrors the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) Statistical Analysis Report on Job Satisfaction Among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation (Perie & Baker, 1997). The NCES study also found that "more administrative support and leadership, good student behavior, a positive school atmosphere, and teacher autonomy are all associated with higher teacher satisfaction" (Perie & Baker, 1997, p. 51). More recently, Ingersoll (2001) found that "inadequate support from school administration, students discipline problems, limited

faculty input into school decision-making, and to a lesser extent, low salaries, are all associated with higher rates of turnover" (p. 501).

This study demonstrated a significant difference between the high and low job satisfaction teachers in the themes mentioned as contributing to job satisfaction. Nine teachers were interviewed in each group. The similarity in the themes of the high reporting group and the diversity of themes in the low reporting group, indicates that teachers who have identified their relationship with the principal as valuable are more satisfied with their job. Smith (2000) found that

> there was not a statistically significant difference in teacher job satisfaction based upon the principal's leadership style. However, the mean scores implied that teachers in the sample who perceived their principals as Style 2 (High Task/High Relationship based on the LEAD-Other instrument) were most satisfied with their jobs. (p. 69)

Strengths and Limitations of the Study

Sampling

All research studies face the challenge of finding and hearing the voices of all the views of the population under consideration. This study was no exception. Barriers to participation included: the time involved to participate in the study; the lack of understanding of the data collection process, and the fear of potential misuse or abuse of the results.

An unforseen sampling error was the self-elimination of principals from the study. As stated previously, there are many reasons to avoid participating in a research study, and

one reason could be principals who elected not to participate lacked confidence in their leadership skills. Perhaps they were unwilling to expose themselves to an analysis of their leadership by their teachers. Although it is difficult to analyze why principals did not participate, observations can be made about those who did. One interesting anomaly was the extraordinary number of participating schools that had been recognized as California Distinguished schools. Of the 11 schools whose principals originally agreed to participate in the study, seven had been recognized as California Distinguished Schools, and one had been recognized as a National Blue Ribbon School. The disproportionate number of schools recognized for these honors in the study population clearly indicates that the principals who chose to participate in this study lead schools with a history of successful academic programs. One conjecture about the participants' leadership is that they may be looking for new ways to improve their school and their skills, and may have participated in this study with this result in mind.

The convenience sample allowed those leaders who are less interested and/or less capable to choose nonparticipation and so valuable data about leaders of average or lower performing schools as recognized by the state of California were not collected for this study. The data used in this study included the responses of only 10 middle school principals, and 183 middle school teachers. If all targeted principals and teachers had participated, the study population could have been as large as 84 principals, and approximately 3000 teachers. The large difference between the total population size and the actual number of participants compels the researcher to analyze why this difference exists. The discussion that follows will address possible causes for small sample size.

Small sample size is one limitation that can affect the validity and the generalizability of the results. The convenience sample used in this study provided only a limited access to the populations under study. Access to the teachers was inconsistent from district to district, school to school. In this study, the convenience sample was selected as a method to insure interested participants and appropriate institutional support for their participation. One result of the decision to use a convenience sample was that many principals eliminated themselves and consequently their teachers from the study for unknown reasons.

Instrumentation

Selection of the instruments used in this study was guided by three criteria: reliability, validity, and use with similar populations. Two of the selected instruments met these criterion. The third instrument was selected as it had separate surveys for both principals and teachers.

The MSQ was selected as the job satisfaction measure. The MSQ is the most widely used instrument to measure teacher job satisfaction; however, it was developed for a specific population with specific job retraining needs. It was designed for subjects who have experienced a type of disability in a career, and needed counseling to find a different career. In the interviews with teachers who participated in this study several of them said they felt it was not an instrument that matched well with the job in which they are currently engaged. It is unlikely that the population of middle school teachers would have the same characteristics as the population that was used to develop this instrument. In addition, the roles of both teachers and principals have changed significantly since the

version used in the this study was developed in 1967, and this could contribute to less than accurate results. Although widely used in assessing populations of teachers for their degree of job satisfaction, perhaps the MSQ was not the best choice for this study.

Unlike the MSQ, the SPES was developed specifically with populations of teachers. The conceptual framework used to develop the SPES centered on teacher empowerment, described as providing opportunities for choice that enhance teachers feelings of self-efficacy, granting teachers greater status through involvement in school governance, and allowing teachers to become more actively involved in a democratic governance process. The SPES description of empowerment aligns closely with collaborative leadership as discussed in the conceptual framework of this study. The SPES authors were encouraged to develop the instrument due to the lack of valid and reliable instruments designed to measure participant empowerment.

The SPES contained a sub scale called decision making. The authors stated that "items reflecting the collaboration component appeared to be part of the Decision Making factor" (Short & Rinehart, 1992, p. 956). The decision making sub scale measured processes most closely related to collaborative leadership, and was, therefore, selected to identify the principals role in engaging collaboratively with the teachers for this study.

The PLS-S and the PLS-O were developed by Burnicki (1996) as part of a study on shared leadership. The instruments were to measure to what degree a collaborative culture exists in schools using the context of a specific school reform initiative. Their purpose was to identify what teachers and principals do to develop democratic, collaborative strategies for academic improvement within schools. The author developed

a theoretical framework based on a democratic professional community model. This is the second time this instrument has been used in a research study.

Experience of Principals

Another limitation was the few years of experience the participating principals had accumulated. Participants' years of experience as principal ranged from one to 20 years, with an aggregate mean of 10 years. Years as principal at the school ranged from one to 17 years, with a mean of six years. However, three of the 10 participants were in their first year as principal at this school. It would be important to know if this low experiential base is reflective of all middle school principals in California. Data collection began in late November, what was likely the third month the new principals were working with their staffs. These teachers did not have adequate time to know about and predict their principal's leadership practices.

Implications for Future Research

Efforts to study the phenomenon of collaborative leadership in middle schools and teacher job satisfaction would benefit from instruments constructed specifically to measure these phenomena. Therefore, the first recommendation for a similar study is to develop valid instruments to measure school leadership and teacher job satisfaction. Significant problems exist with this study as the MSQ did not match the population under study and used dated educational terminology. Additionally, the difference in correlation scores for the PLS and the SPES indicate that the sub scales selected for use in this study were not similar enough to quantify the phenomenon of collaborative leadership which was being

measured. Matching instruments to the population and the phenomenon under study are essential prerequisites to producing a quality study.

The second recommendation is to develop strategies for data collection that ensure sufficient sample size. Adequate sample size is essential to producing generalizable data, and ensuring the data collected are valid and reliable.

Implications for Practice by Middle School Principals

Based on the findings of this study, it is suggested that middle school principals assess their personal use of collaborative leadership and the role it plays in their teachers' job satisfaction. Developing awareness of the constraints of external factors over which they have little control, principals should work to control the factors they can to increase teacher job satisfaction. Evidence exists in this and other studies (Goldring & Rallis, 1993; Patterson, 1993; Pounder, 1998, Rosenholtz; 1991, Schlechty, 1990; Short & Greer, 1997) for a change from a hierarchical leadership style to a more participatory and collaborative one. The change from hierarchy to collaboration is a successful school improvement reform strategy identified by many researchers.

Perie and Baker (1997) identified workplace conditions and compensation factors that may be manipulated by policy to influence teacher satisfaction. The authors found that "workplace conditions which are open to policy are related to satisfaction" (p.51). This definition includes the leadership practices of the middle school principal. Perie and Baker (1997) state that "teacher satisfaction may be shaped in part by workplace conditions that are within the reach of policy at the school and district levels" (p.52). This conclusion clearly demonstrates that it is within the authority of the principal to institute

changes which can result in increased teacher job satisfaction. Perie and Baker (1997) also found that salary and benefits are only moderately related to teacher job satisfaction. "This is not to say that salary and benefits are not important to teachers, only that satisfaction with teaching as a career is weakly related to differences in compensation" (p.51).

Shen (2001) found that "the disparity between junior and senior teachers in their perceptions of empowerment does raise the issue of equity in school governance" (p. 127). He suggest one strategy to mitigate the high turnover rate of new teachers is to empower them and treat them as professionals early on in their careers. Shen suggests that principals involve teachers more in decision-making on school wide issues, and "adopt leadership behaviors and policies that maximize teacher empowerment" to benefit from "increased teacher job performance and productivity, improved teacher morale, and ultimately higher student motivation and achievement" (p. 127).

In the current environment of low unemployment, high attrition rate of new teachers, and the variability of salary from school district to school district, it is important that middle school principals and university instructors who prepare them develop strategies to improve their consistent and effective use of collaborative leadership as one way to increase teacher job satisfaction. Study of leadership theory, providing learning experiences using a collaborative model of leadership, and action research on the value of teacher job satisfaction would all benefit aspiring middle school leaders. Additionally, a firm grounding in the variety of collaborative processes and their importance in the middle school setting could increase the effectiveness of future leaders.

Summary

This study found a relationship exists between principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction. A moderate positive correlation exists between collaborative leadership and teacher job satisfaction as measured by the SPES decision making score and the MSQ general satisfaction score. In addition, this study found a low positive correlation between the PLS-O developing collaboration sub scale score and the MSQ general satisfaction score. Other variables studied relating to teacher characteristics (age, gender, level of education, type of teaching credential held, years of teaching experience, years teaching at this school, years working with this principal at this school) did not significantly influence teacher job satisfaction. However, females showed a higher degree of correlation between the SPES and MSQ than did the males.

This study found there was a difference between principal self-rating and teacher rating of their principal on the PLS-O. Overall the principals reported themselves as practicing a higher degree of collaborative leadership than did their teachers.

The telephone interview questions provided insight into the importance of administrative support and the collaboration with teachers and components of teacher job satisfaction. Teachers appreciate principal efforts to collaborate and share decision making with them. They also are aware of when they do not have the support of their principal. However, their most significant influence on teacher job satisfaction was the degree to which they felt support from the principal.

The results of this study suggest that middle school principals who practice collaborative leadership may increase their teachers' job satisfaction. While other

characteristics influence teachers' job satisfaction including salary and benefits, student behavior, school atmosphere, degree of teacher autonomy, many of these are out of the principal's control. Therefore, principals should capitalize on the areas they have control over, including the use of collaborative leadership, and should exercise this control to benefit the teachers and the school.

Both school reform efforts and leadership theory continue to evolve. Research should continue to focus on how best to provide effective leadership to improve our schools. In a tight job market, where the demand for new teachers exceeds the supply, and where almost one third of all teachers leave the profession during their first five years of employment, principals and other school leaders should consider their positive influence potential on teachers. School improvement efforts should focus on teacher job satisfaction as a positive influence on student outcomes and teacher retention. Middle school principals should evaluate the crucial role teacher job satisfaction plays in supporting effective instruction.

REFERENCES

Abecrombie, K. (1998). Baltimore offering teachers housing bonuses. Teacher Magazine, 17(38), 5.

Alexander, W. (1998). The junior high school: A changing view. In R. David (Ed.), Moving forward from the past: Early writings and current reflections of middle school founders (pp. 3-13). Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Alexander, W. (1998). The new school in the middle. In R. David (Ed.), Moving forward from the past: Early writings and current reflections of middle school founders (pp. 27-34). Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Anderman, E., Belzer, S., & Smith, J. (1991). Teacher Commitment and Job Satisfaction: the Role of School Culture and Principal Leadership. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Axelrod, R. M. (1984). The evolution of cooperation. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bass, B., Avolio, M., & Bruce, J. (1990). Multifactor leadership questionnaire. Redwood City, CA, Mind Garden, Inc.

Beadi, N. (1996). From 'teacher as decision maker' to teacher as participant in 'shared decision making': Reframing the purpose of social foundations in teacher education. Teachers College Record, 98(1), 77.

Bennis, W., & Biederman, P. W. (1997). Organizing genius: The secrets of creative collaboration. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 37(5), 662-683.

Bradley, A. (1998). Hot market for teachers. Teacher Magazine, X(2), 10-11.

Bruce, R. A., & Scott, S. G. (1998). The moderating effect of decision-making style on the turnover process: an extension of previous research. Unpublished html.

Bruner, C. (1994). Thinking collaboratively: Ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children's services. Washington, DC: Education and Human Service Consortium, Institute for Educational Leadership.

Bulasch, C., Lunenburg, F., & McCallon, R. (1994). The Influence of the Principal's Leadership on School Climate and Students Achievement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Burnicki, A. (1996). Shared leadership: Defining and building a collaborative culture for reform with principals and teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY.

California Department of Education (1987). Caught in the middle: Educational reform for young adolescents in California public schools (Task Force Report). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Carnegie Corporation's Council on Adolescent Development. (1989). Turning points: Preparing american youth for the 21st century. The report of the task force on education of young adolescents. Waldorf, MD: Author.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. The Report of the task force on teaching as a profession. Hyattsville, MD: Author.

Camillo, D. (1999). Language codes for the annual language census. [html] Available: http://www.cde.gov/demographics/lccoord/lccodes.htm. [11/14/99].

Cascadden, D. S. T. (1997). Principals as Managers and Leaders: Implications for Teaching Educational Administration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Chittom, S. A., & Sistrunk, W. E. (1990). The Relationship Between Secondary Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Their Perceptions. Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Chrislip, D. D., & Larson, C. E. (1994). Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Clark, S. N., & Clark, D. C. (1997). Collaborations and teacher empowerment: implications for school leaders. In J. L. Irvine (Ed.), What current research says to the middle level practitioner (pp. 317-325). Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Clay, C. (1984). Attracting and maintaining a quality teaching staff: A synthesis of research. Burlingame, CA: Association of California School Administrators.

Clune, W., & Witte, J. (1990). Choice and control in American education. New York: The Falmer Press.

Cordeiro, P. A. (Ed.). (1996). Boundary crossings: Educational partnerships and

school leadership (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cranny, C. J., Smith, E. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). Job satisfaction. New York, NY: Lexington.

Crow, G. M. (1998). Implications for leadership in collaborative schools. In D. G. Pounder (Ed.), Restructuring schools for collaboration: Promises and pitfalls (pp. 135-153). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Daly, R. E. (1980). A causal analysis of satisfaction, performance, work environment and leadership in selected secondary schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Delaney, J. G. (1997). Principal leadership: a primary factor in school based management and school improvement. NASSP Bulletin, 81(586), 107-111.

De Toqueville, A. (1990). Democracy in America. New York, NY: Random House Inc.

EdSource. (1997). California's teachers: Recruitment, preparation, & credentialing 4/97. [html]. EdSource, Inc. Available: www.ed-data.k12.ca.us [11/07/98].

Ellis, T. I. (1984). Motivating teachers for excellence. (Report No. ED259449). Eugene, OR.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Center for Advanced Technology in Education.

Enderlin-Lampe, S. (1997). Shared decision making in schools: Effect on teacher efficacy. Education, 118(1).

Evans, T. J. (1996). Elementary teachers' and principals' perceptions of principal leadership style and school social organization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western

Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.

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

Gallmeier, K. (1992). The effectiveness of principal leadership style on teacher motivation. Springfield, VA: ERIC.

Gerald, D. E., & Hussar, W. J. (1998). Projections of educational statistics to 2008. (NCES 98-106) Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76(4), 569-582.

Goldring, E. B., & Rallis, S. F. (1993). Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Gonzales, E., & Short, P. M. (1996). The relationship of teacher empowerment and principal power bases. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 23(3), 210-215.

Gray, B. (1989). Collaboration: Finding common ground for multiparty problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gray, S. T. (1996). The art of collaboration. Association Management, 48(2), 20.

Griffith, J. (1999). The school leadership/school climate relation: Identification of school configurations associated with change in principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 35(2), 267-291.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Management

Behavior of Principals. Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217-247.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the Principal's Contribution to School Effectiveness: 1980-1995. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9(2) 157-191.

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

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1984). Leadership styles: Attitudes and behaviors. Training and Development Journal, 36(5), 50-52.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hinkle, D. W. & Jurs, S. (1994). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Geneva, IL: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Hipp, K. A. (1996). Teacher Efficacy: Influence of Principal Leadership Behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York, NY.

Hoppock, R. H. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.

Hough, D., & Irvin, J. (1995). "Does it work?" What research says. Middle School Journal, 26(3), 69-70.

Hunter-Boykin, H. S., & Evans, V. (1995). The relationship between high school principals' leadership and teachers' morale. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 22(2), 152-163.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: an

organizational analysis. American Educational Research Journal, 38(3), 499-534.

Johnston, B. J. (1996). Types of educational leadership in a postindustrial society. Urban Review, 28(3), 213-232.

Judge, T. A. (1994). Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 39(1), 186-189.

Kagan, S. L. (1993). Leadership Training for Collaboration. Paper presented at the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory Regional Early Childhood Forum, Chicago, IL.

King, B., & Kerchner, C. T. (1991). Defining Principal Leadership in an Era of Teacher Empowerment. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Klawitter, P. M. (1985). The relationship between principal's leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.

Klecker, B. J., & Loadman, W. E. (1998). "Defining and measuring the dimensions of teacher empowerment in restructuring public schools." Education, 118(3): 358-371.

Koll, P., Robertson, P. E., & Lampe, S. J. (1996). The practical side of research: Studying administrative leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 80, 102-112.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B.Z. (1988). Leadership practices inventory. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Lambert, L. (1998). Building leadership capacity in schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Latham, A. S. (1998). Teacher satisfaction. Educational Leadership, 55(5), 82-83.

Lawton, M. (1998). Math, science teaching recruits are elusive. Teacher Magazine, 17(42), 5.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30(4), 498-519.

Leithwood, K., & Stenibach, R. (1993). The Relationship Between Variations in Patterns of School Leadership and Group Problem-solving Processes. Paper presented at the annual meeting American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Lester, P. E. (1990). Fifty ways to improve teacher morale. The Clearing House, 63(6), 274-276.

Lipsky, D. K. (1992). We need a third wave of education reform. Social Policy, 22(3), 43-45.

London, S. (1995). Building collaborative communities. Charlottesville, VA: Pew Partnership for Civic Change.

Looney, J. (1998). 1998 task force review of shared decision-making. (Special Report). Sacramento, CA: Association of California School Administrators.

Lounsbury, J. (1998). How the junior high school came to be. In R. David (Ed.), Moving forward from the past: Early writings and current reflections of middle school founders (pp. 110-114). Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Loysk, B. (1997). Defining generation x. Research Alert, 15(7), 1.

Maidani, E. A. (1991). Comparative study of Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction among public and private sectors. Public Personnel Management, 20(4), 441-449.

Marshall, E. M. (1995). The collaborative workplace. Management Review, 84(6), 13-17.

McNeese-Smith, D. (1996). Increasing employee productivity, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Hospital and Health Services Administration, 41(2), 160-176.

Murphy, L., Impara, J., & Plake, B. (1999). Tests in print V: An index to tests, test reviews, and the literature on specific tests. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Myers, I. B., & Briggs, K. C. (1991). Myers briggs type indicator. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Nagy, M. S. (1996). What to do when you are dissatisfied with job satisfaction scales: A better way to measure job satisfaction., [Internet:html]. International Personnel Management Association Assessment Council. Available: http://www.ipmaac.org/acn/apr96/techaff.html [January 5, 2000].

National Middle School Association. (1999). NMSA research summary #3: Exemplary middle schools. (Internet:html). Columbus, OH. Available: http://www.nmsa.org/services/affiliates/research_sum3.pdf (12/27/99).

Neuman, K. L. (1997). Teacher satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cleveland State University, Cleveland.

Patrick, J. E. (1995). Correlation between administrative style and school climate. (Reports - Research/Technical ED 387 853). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Patterson, J. L. (1993). Leadership for tomorrow's schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Perie, M. & Baker, D. (1997). Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation (Report No. NCES 97-471). Pittsburgh, PA, US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED412 181)

Polit, D., & Hungler, B. (1998) Nursing research: Principles and methods. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Williams and Wilkins.

Pool, S. W. (1997). The relationship of job satisfaction with substitutes of leadership, leadership behavior, and work motivation. The Journal of Psychology, 131(3), 271-284.

Pounder, D. G. (Ed.) (1998) Restructuring schools for collaboration. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Pounder, D. G. (1986). The Challenge for School Leaders: Attracting and Retaining Good Teachers. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southeast Educational Research Association, Baton Rouge, LA.

Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). Handbook of organizational measurement. Lexington, MA: Pitman Publishing.

Rinehart, J. S., & Short, P. M. (1993). Job Satisfaction and Empowerment Among Teacher Leaders, Reading Recovery Teachers, and Regular Classroom Teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Robinson, B., & Schaible, R. M. (1995). Collaborative teaching. College Teaching, 43(2), 57-59.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1991). Teacher's workplace. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership for the twenty-first century. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Rubin, H. (1998). Collaboration skills for educators and nonprofit leaders. Chicago, IL: Lyceum Books, Inc.

Savery, L. K. (1993). Difference between perceived and desired leadership styles: The effect on employee attitudes. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 8(6), 28-32.

Schlechty, P. C. (1990). Schools for the twenty-first century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Shen, J. (2001). Teacher and principal empowerment: National, longitudinal, and comparative perspectives. Educational Horizons 79(3), 124-129.

Short, P. M. (1994). Defining teacher empowerment. Education, 114(4), 488-492.

Short, P. M. (1998). Empowering leadership. Contemporary Education, 69(2), 70-72.

Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1997). Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Short, P. M., & Johnson, P. E. (1994). Exploring the links among teacher empowerment, leader power, and conflict. Education, 114(4), 581-593.

Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52(4), 951-961.

Slavin, R. (2000). Putting the school back in school reform. Educational Leadership, 58(4), 22-27.

Smith, J. M. (2000). Analysis of the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, NC.

Smith, T. M. (1999). A study of the relationship between the principal's leadership style and teacher motivation: The teachers' perspective. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Snyder, T. D., & Wirt, J. G. (1998). The condition of education 1998, [Internet pdf]. National Center for Educational Statistics. Available: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs98/condition98/c9859a01.html (9/30/99).

SPSS. (2000). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Chicago, IL: Author.

Stodgill, R., & Coons, A. (Eds.). (1957). Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Thomas, B. J. (1995). Teachers' opinion about shared decision making since Chicago school reform 1988. (Report, Research: Tests/Evaluation Instruments). Springfield, VA: ERIC.

Thompson, D., & McNamara, J. (1997). Job satisfaction in educational organizations: A synthesis of research findings. Educational Administration Quarterly, 33(1), 7-38.

Valentine, J., Clark, D., Irvin, J., Keefe, J., & Melton, G. (1993). Leadership in middle level education, Vol. 1: A national survey of middle level leaders and schools.

(Report). Reston, VA : National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Wagner, T. (1998). From compliance to collaboration. (April 22, 1998), [Internet: Education Week on the Web]. Available: www.teachermagazine.org [February 13, 1999].

Wall, R., & Rinehart, J. (1998). School-based decision making and the empowerment of secondary school teachers. Journal of School Leadership, 8(1), 49-64.

Weiss, D. J., Davis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: xxii). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Work Adjustment Project industrial Relations Center.

Weiss, D. J. (1969). Occupational Reinforcers, Vocational Needs, and Job Satisfaction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Weld, J. (1998). Beyond the salary carrot. Teacher Magazine, 17(38), 33.

Whitaker, K. S., & Moses, M. C. (1990). Teacher empowerment: a key to restructuring. Clearing House, 64(2), 127-130.

Wilmore, E., & Cornell, T. (2001). The new century: Is it too late for transformational leadership? Educational Horizons, 79(3), 115-123.

Appendix A

Invitation to Participate - Principal

Invitation to Participate - Principal

Dear (Principal),

My name is Greg Bowden, and I am Principal at Crescent Intermediate School in Anaheim. Like you, I am faced with the challenge of hiring and retaining quality teachers. To help find solutions to this challenge, I would like to invite you to participate in a dissertation study regarding middle school principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction. This study will examine the relationship between your leadership practices and your teachers job satisfaction.

All Orange County middle school principals are being invited to participate in this study. If you wish to participate, you will need to agree to allow me to survey your staff for part of this study. This letter introduces the project, and provides the survey forms needed in order to participate. To participate in this study, you will:

✔ *read and sign the Consent Form*

✔ *complete the Demographic Survey: Principal Form*

✔ *complete the Principal Leadership Survey - Self Form*

✔ *return all the above listed forms in the postage paid envelope provided.*

Some schools will be selected for participation in the second phase of this study, where the teachers are given an opportunity to participate. I will collect data from teachers in person (I will come to your school), or by mail. Teachers will be asked to complete a Consent Form and four survey instruments: the Demographic Survey, the Principal Leadership Survey - Other, the School Participant Empowerment Scale, and the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. They will be asked if they are willing to participate in telephone interviews as well.

The data will be aggregated by all participants, thus neither you, your school, nor the teachers at your school will be identified in the results. I will be happy to come to your school and present the results of the study if you are interested.

I hope you will participate in this important study to find ways to address teacher job satisfaction. All participants will receive a coupon from In'n Out Burger as a thank you for their time. Thank you for your time and your commitment to our profession.

Sincerely,

Greg Bowden

Appendix B

Principal Consent Form

University of San Diego

PRINCIPAL CONSENT TO ACT AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT

Greg Bowden, a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at the University of San Diego, is conducting a research study of leadership practiced by middle school principals, and its relationship to teacher job satisfaction. This study will examine the relationship between your principals leadership practices and your job satisfaction.

Two research instruments will be used to collect data for this study: the Demographic Survey: Principal, and the Principal Leadership Survey - Self. The completion time for this instruments will be approximately twenty minutes. Selected participants will participate in a thirty minute taped telephone interview. Report of the findings after the data is analyzed will last no more than one half hour.

There is no risk to you by participating in this study. It will not be possible to identify individuals or individual schools in the result.

The benefits you will experience include:

- *the opportunity to discuss areas of professional practice - leadership and teacher job satisfaction.*
- *the opportunity to consider what job satisfaction means to your teachers.*
- *the opportunity to contribute information that will benefit the study and practice of leadership in schools.*

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time. Your decision to not participate will in no way jeopardize your job or status within the school. Prior to signing this form you will have the opportunity to ask questions about the research.

There are no other agreements, written or verbal, related to this study beyond that expressed on this consent form.

I, the undersigned, understand the above explanations and, on that basis, I give consent to my voluntary participation in this research.

_____ _____

Signature of Subject Date

_____

Location (e.g. San Diego, CA)

_____ _____

Signature of Principal Researcher Date

Appendix C

Invitation to Participate - Teacher

Invitation to Participate - Teacher

Dear Teacher,

My name is Greg Bowden, and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of San Diego. I am also Principal at Crescent Intermediate School in Anaheim. As a school principal, I am faced with the challenge of hiring and retaining quality teachers. To help find solutions to this challenge, I would like to invite you to participate in a dissertation study regarding middle school principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction. This study will be examining the relationship between your principals' leadership practices and your job satisfaction.

Your school has been selected to participate based on your principals' consent. If you wish to participate, you will:

✔ *read and sign the Consent Forms (one each for the surveys and telephone interviews)*
✔ *complete the Demographic Survey: Teacher Form* ❶
✔ *complete the Principal Leadership Survey - Other Form* ❷
✔ *complete the School Participant Empowerment Scale Form* ❸
✔ *complete the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Form* ❹
✔ *return all the above listed forms in the postage paid envelope provided.*

The data will be aggregated by all participants, thus neither you, your school, nor your principal will be identified in the results. Based on the principals' request, I will come to your school and present the results of the study.

I hope you will participate in this important study to find ways to address teacher job satisfaction. As a participant, you will receive a coupon from In'n Out Burger as a thank you. Thank you for your time and your commitment to learning.

Should you choose not to participate, kindly return the survey forms and the gift coupon to me in the postage paid envelope.

Sincerely,

Greg Bowden

Appendix D

Teacher Consent Form

University of San Diego

TEACHER CONSENT TO ACT AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT - SURVEYS

Greg Bowden, a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at the University of San Diego, is conducting a research study of collaborative leadership practiced by middle school principals, and its relationship to teacher job satisfaction. The study will determine if a relationship exists between leadership and job satisfaction.

Four research instruments will be used to collect data for this study: the Demographic Survey: Teacher, the Principal Leadership Survey, the School Participant Empowerment Scale, and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Completion time for these instruments will be approximately one hour. There is no risk to you by participating in this study. Data collected will not be analyzed by school, or analyzed in any smaller grouping than the entire teacher population surveyed. It will not be possible to identify individuals or schools in the results.

The benefits you will experience include:

- *the opportunity to discuss areas of professional practice - leadership and teacher job satisfaction.*
- *the opportunity to consider what job satisfaction means to you.*
- *the opportunity to contribute information that will benefit the study and practice of leadership in schools.*

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time. Your decision to not participate will in no way jeopardize your job or status within the school. Prior to signing this form you will have the opportunity to ask questions about the research.

There are no other agreements, written or verbal, related to this study beyond that expressed on this consent form.

I, the undersigned, understand the above explanations and, on that basis, I give consent to my voluntary participation in this research.

_____ _____

Signature of Subject Date

_____

Location (e.g. San Diego, CA)

_____ _____

Signature of Principal Researcher Date

Appendix E

Teacher Consent Form - Telephone

University of San Diego

TEACHER CONSENT TO ACT AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT - TELEPHONE

Greg Bowden, a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at the University of San Diego, is conducting a research study of collaborative leadership practiced by middle school principals, and its relationship to teacher job satisfaction. The study will determine if a relationship exists between leadership and job satisfaction.

Participants will participate in a thirty minute taped telephone interview. There is no risk to you by participating in this study. Quotes and descriptions provided to the researcher in the interviews will not be ascribed to individual participants, and references to specific persons or schools will be edited so that it will not be possible to identify individuals or their schools in the results.

The benefits you will experience include:

- *the opportunity to discuss areas of professional practice - leadership and teacher job satisfaction.*
- *the opportunity to consider what job satisfaction means to you.*
- *the opportunity to contribute information that will benefit the study and practice of leadership in schools.*

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time. Your decision to not participate will in no way jeopardize your job or status within the school. Prior to signing this form you will have the opportunity to ask questions about the research.

There are no other agreements, written or verbal, related to this study beyond that expressed on this consent form.

I, the undersigned, understand the above explanations and, on that basis, I give consent to my voluntary participation in this research.

_____ _____

Signature of Subject Date

_____

Location (e.g. San Diego, CA)

_____ _____

Signature of Principal Researcher Date

Appendix F

Letter of Permission to School Districts

Letter of Permission to School Districts

Dear ( ).

My name is Greg Bowden, and I am Principal at Crescent Intermediate School in Anaheim Hills. Like many of your principals, I am faced with the challenge of hiring and retaining quality middle school teachers. To help find solutions to this challenge, I am conducting a study regarding middle school principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction. The purpose of this study is to provide middle school principals with empirical evidence regarding the use of collaborative leadership, and measuring its relationship to the job satisfaction reported by teachers.

Pending district approval, all Orange County middle, intermediate, and junior high school principals will be invited to participate in this study. Principals will complete a Demographic Survey and the Principal Leadership Survey - Self. Teachers at the schools selected for participation in the second phase of this study will be give the opportunity to participate. I will collect data from teachers in person or by mail, based on the principals' preference. Teachers will be asked to complete a Consent Form and four survey instruments: a Demographic Survey, the Principal Leadership Survey - Other, the School Participant Empowerment Scale, and the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. They will be asked if they are willing to participate in a brief telephone interviews as well. Data collection will take no longer than one hour.

This study does not involve students in any manner. The data will be aggregated by all participants, thus neither the principal, the school, nor the teachers at the school will be identified in the results. I would be happy to come to your district and present the results

of the study if you are interested.

I hope you will consider allowing this important project. I plan to begin in September with the data collection process. If you require more information about the study, I would be glad to provide it. Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

A. Greg Bowden, Ed. D. Candidate

University of San Diego

Appendix G

Letter to Request Endorsement

Letter to Request Endorsement

California League of Middle Schools

Dear Sirs,

My name is Greg Bowden, and I am Principal at Crescent Intermediate School in Anaheim Hills. Like many of your principal members, I am faced with the challenge of hiring and retaining quality middle school teachers. To help find solutions to this challenge, I am conducting a study regarding middle school principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction. The purpose of this study is to provide middle school principals with empirical evidence regarding the use of collaborative leadership, and measuring its relationship to the job satisfaction reported by teachers.

All Orange County middle school principals will be invited to participate in this study. Some schools will be selected for participation in the second phase of this study, where the teachers are given an opportunity to participate. I will collect data from teachers in person or by mail. Teachers will be asked to complete a Consent Form and four survey instruments: the Demographic Survey, the Principal Leadership Survey - Other, the School Participant Empowerment Scale, and the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. They will be asked if they are willing to participate in telephone interviews as well.

The data will be aggregated by all participants, thus neither the principal, the school, nor the teachers at the school will be identified in the results. I would be be happy to come to your conference and present the results of the study if you are interested.

I hope you will consider endorsing this important project. If you require more information, I would be glad to provide it.

Sincerely,

A. Greg Bowden, Ed. D. Candidate

University of San Diego

Appendix H

Letter of Endorsement from California League of Middle Schools

November 22, 2000

A. Greg Bowden, Ed.D. Candidate
2421 Denise Ave.
Orange, Ca 92667-1812

Dear Greg,

I am pleased to inform you that at the last meeting of the Board of Trustees of the California League of Middle Schools, the board took an endorse position with regard to your research proposal. You may use the name of the League in your efforts to collect information for your project. We wish you much success with your effort and hope to see a copy of your findings when available.

Sincerely yours,

Peter F. Murphy
Executive Director, CLMS

Appendix I

Demographic Survey: Principal

Demographic Survey: Principal

PART I DIRECTIONS: Please fill in each blank with the appropriate answer.

I am willing to have teachers at my school invited to participate in the study:
Yes ❑ (please continue with remainder of the questions)
No ❑ (please stop)

1. Age _____

2. Gender F - ❑ M -❑

3. Highest level of education BA/BEd ❑ MA/MS/MEd ❑

Ed D/Ph D ❑

4. Type of administrative credential held none ❑ preliminary ❑

clear ❑

5. Years of experience as principal - Less than 1 year ❑ Number of

years_____

6. Years experience as principal at this school _____

Appendix J

Demographic Survey: Teacher

Demographic Survey: Teacher

DIRECTIONS: Please fill in each blank with the appropriate answer.

1. Age _____

2. Gender F - ❑ M -❑

3. Highest level of education B.A/BEd.❑ MA/MS/MEd.❑

Ed.D/Ph.D ❑

4. Type of teaching credential held none ❑ emergency ❑ clear ❑

5. Years of teaching experience - Less than 1 year ❑ Number of years

_____

6. Years teaching at this school _____

7. Years working with this principal at this school _____

8. I am willing to discuss these topics with the researcher by

telephone: Yes ❑ No ❑

If yes, contact me at (____) ____ - _____

Best time to call: _____

Name _____ (only for telephone

interviews)

Appendix K

Principal Leadership Survey - Self

Principal Leadership Survey--Self

Please read each of the following statements carefully, then rate ***yourself*** in terms of ***how frequently*** you engage in the practice described. Record your answers by circling the letter that corresponds to the frequency you have selected.

You are given 5 choices:

1. If you **RARELY** or **NEVER** do what is described in the statement, circle the letter **A**.
2. If you do what is described **ONCE IN AWHILE**, circle the letter **B**
3. If you **SOMETIMES** do what is described, circle the letter **C**.
4. If you do what is described **FAIRLY OFTEN**, circle the letter **D**.
5. If you do what is described **VERY FREQUENTLY** or **ALWAYS**, circle the letter **E**.

In selecting your answers, be realistic about the extent to which you actually engage in each behavior. Do not answer in terms of how you *would like* to see yourself or in terms of what you *should* be doing.

Answer in terms of how you *typically behave*. For example, if you believe you stay current on the most recent developments affecting your school *fairly often*, circle the letter **D**. If you believe you stay current on the most recent developments affecting your school *once in awhile*, circle the letter **B**.

Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers, what is needed is your thoughtful assessment of each item in the survey.

The teaching staff in your school will also complete the Principal Leadership Survey--Other. Their responses will be treated confidentially. However, your name must appear on each of the PLS--Other surveys before they are distributed.

Circle the letter that describes to what extent you believe you engage in the following actions and behaviors.

	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
1. I ensure that policies, rules, and procedures reflect the values and mission of the school.	A	B	C	D	E
2. I spend time and energy to ensure that people adhere to the values commonly held.	A	B	C	D	E
3. I show others how their long-range future interests can become reality by participating in a common vision.	A	B	C	D	E
4. I give members of teams support for their efforts.	A	B	C	D	E
5. I positively contribute to the implementation of group action plans/projects.	A	B	C	D	E
6. I encourage teachers to feel good about their professional accomplishments.	A	B	C	D	E
7. I treat others with dignity and respect.	A	B	C	D	E
8. I share current educational journal articles and explain their significance to school projects.	A	B	C	D	E
9. I keep informed of innovations in teaching and learning.	A	B	C	D	E
10. I base curriculum decisions on evidence obtained from professional journals and research.	A	B	C	D	E
11. I inform others of my beliefs on how to effectively run the school I lead.	A	B	C	D	E

	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
12. I describe the kind of future I would like us to create together.	A	B	C	D	E
13. I stimulate others to think about old problems in new ways (with a new perspective).	A	B	C	D	E
14. I clearly communicate a positive, hopeful outlook for the future of our school.	A	B	C	D	E
15. I appeal to others to share their dreams for the future	A	B	C	D	E
16. I refer to the school's goals when conversing informally with teachers.	A	B	C	D	E
17. I involve others in planning actions that are taken.	A	B	C	D	E
18. I display actions that reflect my philosophy of education.	A	B	C	D	E
19. I ensure that work groups set clear goals, make plans, and establish milestones for the projects I lead.	A	B	C	D	E
20. I involve teachers in decisions which affect them to ensure that actions are congruent with teachers' concerns.	A	B	C	D	E
21. I believe the building planning team makes a significant contribution to the school.	A	B	C	D	E
22. I look for innovative ways to improve what we do.	A	B	C	D	E

	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
23. I enroll in inservice programs so that I can improve performance in the classrooms.	A	B	C	D	E
24. I challenge the way we do things.	A	B	C	D	E
25. I work to secure intangible resources (time, opportunities) for persons or groups that are working on improvement projects.	A	B	C	D	E
26. I tell stories about outstanding achievements of students and teachers which exemplify the importance of the school's mission.	A	B	C	D	E
27. I use knowledge obtained through experience and collaborative discussion with colleagues to inform curriculum decisions.	A	B	C	D	E
28. I experiment and take risks with new approaches in my work even if there is a chance of failure.	A	B	C	D	E
29. I direct attention to unnoticed aspects of the school environment.	A	B	C	D	E
30. I express my appreciation when others do a good job.	A	B	C	D	E
31. I apply general policies, rules, and regulations uniformly.	A	B	C	D	E
32. I get teachers to develop a sense of ownership for the projects they undertake.	A	B	C	D	E

	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
33. I analyze the relationship between student performance and standardized test result of student achievement (PET, PEP, RCT, Regents).	A	B	C	D	E
34. I break down projects I manage into achievable, manageable chunks.	A	B	C	D	E
35. I stay current on the most recent developments affecting our school.	A	B	C	D	E
36. I consistently practice the values I espouse.	A	B	C	D	E
37. I have as my primary responsibility students' successful academic performance.	A	B	C	D	E
38. I communicate my confidence in the abilities of school members to achieve goals.	A	B	C	D	E
39. I develop cooperative relationships among teachers.	A	B	C	D	E
40. I show concern for teaching conditions by meeting with teachers (teacher groups) to revise undesirable conditions.	A	B	C	D	E
41. I look ahead and forecast what I believe the future will be like.	A	B	C	D	E
42. I create an atmosphere of mutual trust among teachers working on a project.	A	B	C	D	E

Collaboration Sub scale: 4, 7, 17, 21, 32, 39, 42.

Appendix L

Principal Leadership Survey - Other

Principal Leadership Survey--Other

Name of Principal: _____

the name of the person you will assess appears in the space labeled "Name of Principal." Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality.

Please read each of the following statements carefully, then rate ***your principal*** in terms of ***how frequently*** she or he engages in the practice described. Record your answers by circling the letter that corresponds to the frequency you have selected.

You are given 5 choices:

1. If she/he **RARELY** or **NEVER** do what is described in the statement, circle the letter **A**.
2. If she/he do what is described **ONCE IN AWHILE**, circle the letter **B**.
3. If she/he **SOMETIMES** do what is described, circle the letter **C**.
4. If she/he do what is described **FAIRLY OFTEN**, circle the letter **D**.
5. If she/he do what is described **VERY FREQUENTLY** or **ALWAYS**, circle the letter **E**.

In selecting your answers, be realistic about the extent to which the principal actually engages in each behavior. Do not answer in terms of how you *would like* to see your principal or in terms of what your principal *should* be doing.

Answer in terms of how your principal *typically behaves*. For example, if you believe your principal stays current on the most recent developments affecting your school *fairly often*, circle the letter **D**. If you believe your principal stays current on the most recent developments affecting your school *once in awhile*, circle the letter **B**.

Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers, what is needed is your thoughtful assessment of each item in the survey.

Circle the letter that describes to what extent you believe you engage in the following actions and behaviors.

This principal:	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
1. ensures that policies, rules, and procedures reflect the values and mission of the school.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**

This principal:	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
2. spends time and energy to ensure that people adhere to the values commonly held.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
3. shows others how their long-range future interests can become reality by participating in a common vision.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
4. gives members of teams support for their efforts.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
5. positively contributes to the implementation of group action plans/projects.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
6. encourages teachers to feel good about their professional accomplishments.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
7. treats others with dignity and respect.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
8. shares current educational journal articles and explain their significance to school projects.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
9. keeps informed of innovations in teaching and learning.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
10. bases curriculum decisions on evidence obtained from professional journals and research.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
11. informs others of her/his beliefs on how to effectively run the school she/he leads.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
12. describes the kind of future he/she would like us to create together.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**

This principal:	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
13. stimulates others to think about old problems in new ways (with a new perspective).	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
14. clearly communicates a positive, hopeful outlook for the future of our school.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
15. appeals to others to share their dreams for the future.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
16. refers to the school's goals when conversing informally with teachers.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
17. involves others in planning actions that are taken.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
18. displays actions that reflect her/his philosophy of education.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
19. ensures that work groups set clear goals, make plans, and establish milestones for the projects she/he leads.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
20. involves teachers in decisions which affect them to ensure that actions are congruent with teachers' concerns.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
21. states that the building planning team makes a significant contribution to the school.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
22. looks for innovative ways to improve what we do.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
23. enrolls in inservice programs so that she/he can improve performance in the classrooms.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**

This principal:	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
24. challenges the way we do things.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
25. works to secure intangible resources (time, opportunities) for persons or groups that are working on improvement projects.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
26. tells stories about outstanding achievements of students and teachers which exemplify the importance of the school's mission.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
27. uses knowledge obtained through experience and collaborative discussion with colleagues to inform curriculum decisions.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
28. experiments and take risks with new approaches in her/his work even if there is a chance of failure.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
29. directs attention to unnoticed aspects of the school environment.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
30. expresses her/his appreciation when others do a good job.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
31. applies general policies, rules, and regulations uniformly.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
32. gets teachers to develop a sense of ownership for the projects they undertake.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**

This principal:	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
33. analyzes the relationship between student performance and standardized test result of student achievement (PET, PEP, RCT, Regents).	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
34. breaks down projects manage into achievable, manageable chunks.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
35. stays current on the most recent developments affecting our school.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
36. consistently practices the values she/he espouses.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
37. has as her/his primary responsibility students' successful academic performance.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
38. communicates her/his confidence in the abilities of school members to achieve goals.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
39. develops cooperative relationships among teachers.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
40. shows concern for teaching conditions by meeting with teachers (teacher groups) to revise undesirable conditions.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
41. looks ahead and forecast what she/he believes the future will be like.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
42. creates an atmosphere of mutual trust among teachers working on a project.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**

Collaboration Subscale: 4, 7, 17, 21, 32, 39, 42.

Appendix M

School Participant Empowerment Scale

School Participant Empowerment Scale

Please rate the following statements in terms of how well they describe how you feel. Rate each statement on the following scale:

1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3= Neutral 4= Agree 5= Strongly Agree

1) I am given the responsibility to monitor programs.	1 2 3 4 5
2) I function in a professional environment.	1 2 3 4 5
3) I believe that I have earned respect.	1 2 3 4 5
4) I believe that I am helping kids become independent learners.	1 2 3 4 5
5) I have control over daily schedules.	1 2 3 4 5
) I believe that I have the ability to get things done.	1 2 3 4 5
7) I make decisions about the implementation of new programs in the school.	1 2 3 4 5
8) I am treated as a professional.	1 2 3 4 5
9) I believe that I am very effective.	1 2 3 4 5
10) I believe that I am empowering students.	1 2 3 4 5
11) I am able to teach as I choose.	1 2 3 4 5
12) I participate in staff development.	1 2 3 4 5
13) I make decisions about the selection of other teachers for my school.	1 2 3 4 5
14) I have the opportunity for professional growth.	1 2 3 4 5
15) I have the respect of my colleagues.	1 2 3 4 5
16) I feel that I am involved in an important program for children.	1 2 3 4 5
17) I have the freedom to make decisions of what is taught.	1 2 3 4 5
18) I believe that I am having an impact.	1 2 3 4 5
19) I am involved in school budget decisions.	1 2 3 4 5
20) I work at a school where kids come first.	1 2 3 4 5
21) I have the support and respect of my colleagues.	1 2 3 4 5
22) I see students learn.	1 2 3 4 5
23) I make decisions about curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
24) I am a decision maker.	1 2 3 4 5
25) I am given the opportunity to teach other teachers.	1 2 3 4 5
26) I am given the opportunity to continue learning.	1 2 3 4 5
27) I have a strong knowledge base in the areas in which I teach.	1 2 3 4 5
28) I believe that I have the opportunity to grow by working daily with students.	1 2 3 4 5
29) I perceive that I have the opportunity to influence others.	1 2 3 4 5
30) I can determine my own schedule.	1 2 3 4 5
31) I have the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers in my school.	1 2 3 4 5
32) I perceive that I am making a difference.	1 2 3 4 5
33) Principals, other teachers, and school personnel solicit my advice.	1 2 3 4 5
34) I believe that I am good at what I do.	1 2 3 4 5
35) I can plan my own schedule.	1 2 3 4 5
36) I perceive that I have an impact on other teachers and students.	1 2 3 4 5
37) My advice is solicited by others.	1 2 3 4 5

38) I have an opportunity to teach other teachers about innovative ideas. 1 2 3 4 5

Subscale	**Items**
Decision Making	1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 30, 33, 35, 37, 38
Professional growth	2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 31
Status	3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 34
Self Efficacy	4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 32
Autonomy	5, 11, 17, 23
Impact	6, 12, 18, 24, 29, 36

Appendix N

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Author does not allow publication of this copyright instrument in dissertations.

Appendix O

Telephone Interview Questions Script

Telephone Interview Questions Script

1) What factors can you identify as contributing to your job satisfaction?

2) Are there any other factors that relate to teacher job satisfaction?

3) What influence does your principal have on your job satisfaction?

4) Is there a relationship between your job satisfaction and the leadership behaviors of your principal?