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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the relation between teacher’s perceptions of their principal’s level of emotional intelligence and teachers’ job satisfaction level. Nine elementary schools within a small rural school district in a southern state were the selected site for the research. Thirty-nine teachers completed two online surveys. One survey was intended to report their perceptions of their principal’s level of emotional intelligence and the second survey was intended to report their level of job satisfaction.

The primary research question was: What is the relation between elementary teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and the teachers’ level of job satisfaction? The independent or predictor variable was emotional intelligence: others emotional appraisal, use of emotion, and regulation of emotion. The dependent variable was teacher job satisfaction: supervision, contingent rewards, operating procedures and communication. A simple regression was conducted to investigate the impact of principal’s perceived emotional intelligence level and the teacher’s job satisfaction level. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to examine the factor structure of teacher’s perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and their level of job satisfaction. A one factor solution was sufficient in capturing most of the variability for both survey instruments.

The findings indicated a strong relation between teacher’s perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and the teachers’ level of job satisfaction. Further research to improve principal’s emotional intelligence and improve teacher’s job satisfaction levels is recommended to increase applicants to teacher preparation programs and to increase teacher recruitment and retention.
Chapter 1

There is an ever increasing demand for accountability and improved student academic performance (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; reauthorized 2008). Ultimately, this pressure to achieve and produce results falls upon the administrators within the public schools and the teachers in the classrooms. Principal’s impact school culture, learning and achievement as school leaders and must do more than manage the school building. They have a responsibility to motivate and encourage stakeholders, teachers, parents and students and empower them to set goals and work towards their achievement. It is imperative to have effective school leaders to support teachers and students in order to implement effective change within our schools. Fullan states "leaders must be consummate relationship builders with diverse people and groups – especially with people different from themselves. This is why emotional intelligence is equal to or more important than having the best ideas. In complex times, emotional intelligence is a must" (2002, p.7). Therefore, emotional intelligence is a necessary for effective school leadership.

Egley and Jones assert that emotional intelligence is foundational for school administrators in the educational climate of a demanding public and accountability at the local, state and national levels (2005).

Emotional intelligence is not a new concept; it has been evolving for quite some time. Edward Thorndike, a psychologist, first introduced the term “social intelligence” in the 1920’s (cited in Stein & Book, 2000, p.15). He defined social intelligence as "the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls – to act wisely in human relations” (1920, p. 228). In 1937, Thorndike and Stern unsuccessfully attempted to measure social intelligence. From that time, a myriad of researchers have furthered the concept including Leeper (1948) with “emotional thought” and Howard Gardner (1983) with “multiple intelligences” and “personal
“emotional intelligence.” The term “emotional intelligence” was first used by Mayer, DiPaolo and Salovey in 1990 after Bar-On introduced “emotional quotient” in 1985 (EQ).

**Significance of the Research**

The significance of this study is that it investigates the relations between elementary teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ emotional intelligence level and their perceived job satisfaction level. Teacher’s implement educational policy and teach standards according to national and state requirements will little direct influence on their profession. Through investigating teacher’s perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and not the emotional intelligence of their principals, this study could give a voice to teachers. Research indicates that leadership style affects job satisfaction. Fuller, Morrison, Jones, Bridger & Brown found that both transactional and transformational leadership were positively correlated with job satisfaction (1999). Leaders impact their subordinates’ performance and attitudes through their leadership behaviors and attitudes. Goldman (1998) asserts that emotional intelligence has a significant effect on leadership within organizations and that outstanding leaders use their emotional intelligence to move their organizations forward. (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). If there is indeed a high positive relation between the perceived emotional intelligence level of elementary school principals and elementary teachers’ perceived level of job satisfaction then efforts can be made to increase the emotional intelligence level of elementary school principals and hence improve teacher job satisfaction. Nadler writes that there are “specific skills and actions to raise your Emotional Intelligence” (2011, p. 304).

Improving teacher recruitment and teacher job satisfaction would be a significant step in improving school climate and ultimately teacher retention rates (Johnson, 2006). Enrollment in teacher education preparation programs has dropped significantly over the past 10 years.
According to the Learning and Policy Institute, between the years 2009 and 2014 enrollment in teacher education preparation programs fell by 35% nationally (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Davis, 2016). According to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, enrollment in teacher preparation programs has dropped steadily over the last 20 years and by 66% in the last decade. There is not one identifiable cause for the drop in individuals pursuing a career in education. One of the reasons for this drop could be the economic cuts to education as the teacher layoffs during this time period indicate a lack of job stability. Another reason for the trend could be the nationwide reforms in education which increased accountability and pressures on teachers. Lastly, the increasing level of job satisfaction among current teachers could be negatively impacting enrollment in teacher preparation programs. Interestingly, the drops in enrollment for teacher education programs and the drop in teacher’s level of job satisfaction have occurred simultaneously and at almost the same levels (Freedberg, 2013). The education profession needs to be attracting the best and the brightest into the field, preparing them well for the classroom and retaining them in order to ensure quality public education. Although teacher preparation programs are beyond the purview of principals, building level leadership of a principal has an immense impact on the support and resources available to new teachers during their induction.

Improving teacher job satisfaction could also have a direct effect on retention rates. Decreasing the attrition rate of teachers would be a huge cost saving factor for school systems. According to the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF), 46% of all new teachers leave the profession within 5 years and the estimated cost of teacher attrition is around $7.3 billion per year (2007). The most common experience level of teachers in the United States was only 5 years for the 2011-2012. Ironically, prospective principals are required to have
only 3-5 years of classroom teaching experience. Can a person with such limited classroom experience adequately lead teachers and school buildings to ensure adequate levels of academic progress for students?

Prospective teachers are on the decline, teachers are not satisfied with their jobs, and they are leaving the profession. Information is needed regarding why enrollment in teacher preparation programs is down and why teachers are leaving in order to impact a positive change. The teaching profession needs strong leadership within the schools. Identifying whether or not there is a relation between a principal’s emotional intelligence level and the perceived job satisfaction level of teachers could provide insight into making much needed progress in today’s schools. For instance, in a study of 201 Missouri public elementary teachers, Perrachione, Peterson, and Rosser emphasize positive school environment, adequate support and small class size as a major step in promoting teacher retention (2008). According to Fullan, “When you are allowing the teaching profession to decline, you get a self-perpetuating future that goes downwards because good people don’t go into it, and those who do go in don’t find it satisfying” (Freedberg, 2013). Increased principal emotional intelligence through training and on-going leadership development could be a low cost, high impact strategy to improve teacher job satisfaction and through that raise both enrollment in teacher preparation programs and the retention rate of teachers.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the possible relation between teachers’ perception of their principal’s emotional intelligence level and their job satisfaction. A teacher’s rating of their administrators’ emotional intelligence was compared to their job satisfaction rating. Data was not collected from a random sample so the generalizability of the study is
limited; however, a representative sample of elementary teachers from a school system in southeast Georgia was utilized.

**Statement of Research Question and Hypotheses**

The guiding research question for the study was: What is the relationship between elementary school teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and teachers’ level of job satisfaction? The corresponding research hypothesis was:

$H_1$: There will be a statistically significant ($p=.05$) correlation ($R^2$) between the dependent variables and the predictor variables.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between elementary teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and the teachers’ level of job satisfaction.

It is expected that emotional intelligence variables: empathetic response, mood regulation, interpersonal skill, internal motivation and self-awareness) will positively relate to teacher job satisfaction variables: supervision, work conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security and recognition).

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this present study, the following operational definitions were employed:

*Adaptability* – problem solving, reality testing, and flexibility (Bar-On, 2000).

*Emotional Intelligence (EI)* – “an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures” (Bar-On, 1997, p. 14).

Interpersonal intelligence – empathy, interpersonal relationship and social responsibility (Bar-On, 2000).

Leadership – the process of influencing an individual or group in efforts to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2007, p. 3).

Stress management - stress tolerance and impulse control (Bar-On, 2000).

Teacher Job Satisfaction – teachers’ perceptions of occupational prestige, self-esteem, autonomy at work and professional self-development (Bogler, 2001).

Teacher Retention – keeping or retaining teachers in their chosen profession beyond their first five years (Kim & Roth, 2011).

Methods

In this study, elementary teachers within a small school district in southeast Georgia received an email from the researcher via their school email. The email requested their participation in responding to two survey instruments developed by the researcher. The surveys were accessed through Qualtrex. The survey data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 18.0.

Limitations/Delimitations

This study was limited to a small county in southeast Georgia. Certified elementary teachers within the school system were chosen to participate. Investigating principals and teacher job satisfaction are sensitive matters. The researcher ran the risk of limited participation of teachers due to the participants’ potential fear of the outcome.

The results of the study may have limited generalizability since the teachers were not randomly selected. The results may be generalized to elementary schools and teachers with
similar demographics; however they may not be generalized to other types of schools not included in this study.

The delimitations of this study were: (a) participants were males and females teaching at corresponding elementary schools in a southeastern district in Georgia; (b) teacher participants completed an on-line survey measuring their principal’s emotional intelligence level; (c) teacher participants completed an on-line survey measuring their teacher job satisfaction.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the study including the significance of the research, statement of purpose, statement of the research question and hypotheses, definition of terms, delimitations and limitations.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature on related research including leadership theories and styles, emotional intelligence of leaders, the influence of emotional intelligence on leadership, teacher job satisfaction, teacher retention, school climate, and factors affecting teacher job satisfaction. The literature review concludes with research on the concept of emotional intelligence and its value or lack of value in leadership effectiveness.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology used to conduct the study, including a description of the research design, population and sampling process, instruments, data collection procedures, and informed consent documentation from study participants.

Chapter 4 presents a description and analyses of the collected data in terms of the research questions.

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, conclusions from the results of the study and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

According to the U.S. Department of Education, approximately 13% of public school teachers either move or leave the profession each year. In a study released by the Alliance for Excellent Education in 2014, the estimated cost of teacher attrition in Georgia from 2008 – 2009 was $37,485,313 to $81,591,743 and over $2.2 billion for the United States. Since the 1980’s the attrition rates for first year teachers has increased 40%. For the 1987-88 school year, the most common experience level for a public school teacher was 15 years and for the 2011-12 school year, the most common experience level had decreased to only five years. There are many factors that influence teacher retention – induction, mentoring and the relationship that teachers have with their administrators. Determining the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of school administrators’ emotional intelligence level and their perceived job satisfaction level should enhance the understanding of what is needed for effective leadership in today’s schools to support teacher performance and increase retention which would positively impact student learning and achievement.

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature that is applicable to leadership, emotional intelligence, and the relationship between the two constructs as it applies to teacher job satisfaction within a school context. The first section provides historical information on the recent evolution of leadership and characteristics of authentic transformational leadership. The second section of this chapter reviews the literature and research on emotional intelligence. A progression of the theory is provided and how it specifically applies to the workplace and leadership situations. The third section investigates teacher job satisfaction, the factors that influence teacher job satisfaction levels and how they are related to principal leadership. The final section summarizes the literature, providing an overview of the interrelatedness of
leadership and emotional intelligence as related to teacher job satisfaction and the school setting. Additionally, areas which may need further investigation are suggested.

**Teacher Job Satisfaction**

Public school education is under attack and teachers within the classroom are feeling the effects. According to the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013), teacher job satisfaction has plummeted 23 percent since 2008 with a drop of five percentage points from 2011 to 2012. The impact of the decline in teacher job satisfaction is widespread and has become catastrophic.

In December of 2015, the Georgia Department of Education released a survey entitled, “Georgia’s Teacher Dropout Crisis”. The survey was conducted by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission in response to 44% of public school teachers leaving the profession within their first five years of employment. Within three weeks, over 53,000 teachers from across the state of Georgia had responded to the on-line survey, a very high response rate. Teachers were representative of the workforce in Georgia and identified the following as reasons for high attrition rates: number and emphasis upon mandated tests, teacher evaluation method, level of teacher participation in decisions related to the profession, non-teaching school responsibilities, level of compensation and benefits, level and quality of support, resources and professional learning, school level and district leadership and the level of preparedness upon entering the profession.

Some of the direct quotes from teachers who participated in the survey included the following:

“My principal does not make me feel valued.” – Elementary teacher, 20+ years
"I went into education to teach children. I feel like all I do now is document everything I do all day for each child and do all kinds of paperwork that no one ever looks at or is not necessary for students to learn . . . " – Elementary teacher, 15+ years

“The profession has become less and less encouraging; it expects A LOT in return and maintains a punitive culture that essentially strikes fear, anxiety and burn out.” – High school teacher

Not only are teacher attrition rates rising, enrollment in teacher-preparation programs is also in decline. According to the U.S. Department of Education, nationwide enrollments in university teacher-preparation programs have fallen 10 percent from 2004 to 2012. California lost 53 percent of its student enrollment in teacher-preparation programs between 2008-09 and 2012-13. Teacher attrition and the decline of enrollment into teacher-preparation programs is an alarming trend that quite likely will lead to teacher shortages.

How do we improve teacher job satisfaction and attract future teachers to the profession as well as keep the most effective teachers who are currently in the profession? First, we must understand what job satisfaction entails. It has its’ beginnings in human motivation theory. Many researchers divide the various factors of job satisfaction into two categories: extrinsic and intrinsic factors (Herzberg, 1959; Hirschfeld, 2000). Hertzberg’s Two-Factory Theory suggests that there are certain factors in the workplace that can cause job satisfaction and a separate set of factors can cause dissatisfaction. Intrinsic motivators, which represent less tangible and more emotional needs, tend to create motivation when they are present. Extrinsic motivators, which represent more tangible needs, tend to reduce motivation when they are absent (Hertzberg, 1959). Intrinsic motivators or factors for satisfaction include achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. When these motivators or factors are present,
employees are motivated or satisfied with their work. Extrinsic motivators or factors for
dissatisfaction include company policies, supervision, relationship with supervisor and peers,
work conditions, salary, status, and security. When these factors are not present, employees are
not motivated or satisfied with their work. (Hertzberg, 1968).

Although all of the intrinsic and extrinsic motivators are not within the scope of a
principal’s power, several from both categories are within his/her realm of influence. Principals
have a direct impact on recognition, and advancement, and an indirect impact on the job itself,
and a teacher’s achievement and growth. There are also extrinsic motivators that principals may
directly or indirectly impact. Principals directly impact a teacher’s supervision, relationship with
supervisor, work conditions, status and security and indirectly impact their relationship with
peers. There are numerous ways in which principals can improve teacher job satisfaction levels
through the improvement of intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. For example, recognizing a
teacher’s hard work and dedication, citing areas of strength when suggesting areas to improve
upon, suggesting trainings or programs to advance their careers or strengthen their instructional
abilities are all linked with intrinsic motivation. There are also ways in which a principal could
improve teacher job satisfaction by strengthening extrinsic motivators. For instance, creating a
school climate of shared leadership, evaluating teachers in a non-threatening manner, providing
opportunities for staff and faculty to create a cohesive team, and developing a safe, collaborative
work environment. Even though what motivates people can vary from person to person, in terms
of motivation and types of motivation, many aspects which could improve a teacher’s motivation
or level of job satisfaction are within the influence of a principal and his/her leadership abilities.

Schools with high morale also have teachers who: have better attitudes towards
colleagues and students; work harder at meeting the needs of all students; and usually have a
higher level of self-efficacy (MacNeil, Prater & Busch, 2009). School culture is almost synonymous with teacher morale. A positive school culture is one in which teachers and staff are inspired and motivated, feel a sense of value, contribution and belonging, share a common vision for the school, are academically focused and are supported in their efforts. When a school has a positive culture, the vision and values of the school are understood and stakeholders know their obligations and expect each other to meet or exceed those obligations (Rhodes, Stevens, & Hemmings, 2011).

Principals with a high level of emotional intelligence are a critical component in fostering a positive school culture. Emotionally intelligent principals create an environment of respect, confidence, and purpose for everyone in the building in order for the school to be successful (Bipath, 2008).

Leaders and Leadership

Until the 1930’s there was not much academic interest in the area of leadership. However, according to Bass and Bass (2009) since the mid 1990’s over 55,000 publications on leadership are listed on the “On-line Computer Library Center” (p. 6). The sheer volume of publications suggests that interest in studying and improving leadership has increased dramatically.

Although much has been written on leadership in the past 50 years, developing a clear definition of leadership has been elusive. In 1989, DePree defined a leader in the following manner, “The first responsibility of a leader is to define reality. The last is to say thank you” (p. 11). There were also several goals that DePree felt leaders should strive for, “leaders should leave behind them assets and a legacy, leaders are obligated to provide and maintain momentum, leaders are responsible for effectiveness, leaders must take a role in developing, expressing, and
defining civility and values” (pp. 13 – 21). In 200, Gardner put forth a more specific definition of leadership, “Leadership is the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers” (p. 2). More recently, Drucker (2001) described leadership as clearly defining and articulating vision and direction, as a responsibility and not a privilege and that leadership is based upon trust. Although there are multiple definitions of leadership, there are also some common components. These components include leadership as a process; leadership involves influence, leadership occurs in a group context and that leadership involves goal attainment (Northouse, 2007). Northouse subsequently explains leadership as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 3).

The primary image of leadership in the beginning was a male working in a large corporate organization. Now, the concept of leadership has expanded beyond the leader to include, followers, peers, supervisors, work setting, climate, culture, and stakeholders. Leadership itself has also evolved from characteristics and styles into a “dyadic, share, relational, strategic, global, and a complex social dynamic” (Avolio, 2007; Yukl & Becker, 2006). Largely, the evolution in leadership theory and what constitutes a leader has changed as the work and work force changed. As technology became more prevalent, so did the need for information exchange as well as information access. Consequently, leaders were no longer needed to protect information and operate in a top down structure but rather to share the information and facilitate the integration of talents of their followers in a transparent manner. Leadership research and theories have also evolved and current trends include authentic, cognitive science, complexity leadership, and leadership that is shared, collective or distributed. (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009).
Transformational Leadership

In a study conducted by a subsidiary of IBM, only 38% of their employees rated their leaders as effective (Zielinska, 2012). This statistic is disconcerting because their research also indicated that employee engagement was significantly higher when employees believed their leaders were effective. Why would anyone follow a leader they believe to be ineffective? Although there are numerous theories on leadership, most researchers agree that leadership is a legitimate factor crucial for the effectiveness of organizations (Bennis, 2003; Yukl & Mahsud, 2010).

Northouse (2010) categorizes leadership theories into trait based or process/behavior based. Trait based leadership theories view leadership as being most related to personal qualities such as personality, ability, and even physical characteristics. Process or behavior based leadership theories view leadership as more of an interaction between leader and followers.

In 1991, Kirkpatrick and Locke presented six leadership traits that distinguish leaders from non-leaders: drive which incorporates ambition, energy, tenacity and initiative; leadership motivation, both personalized and socialized; honesty and integrity; self-confidence and emotional stability; cognitive ability; and knowledge of the business. These traits distinguish individuals with the potential for leadership and are not limited to a specific leadership theory or style. Nonetheless, additional factors are needed to actualize leadership potential: skills in the area of decision making, problem solving and performance appraisal; ability to create a vision of what the organization should be; and developing a strategy to achieve the vision.

Transformational leadership is a process/ behavior based leadership theory and has been defined as leadership which is focused on improving the performance of followers and developing followers to their fullest potential (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Transformational leaders
have a strong set of values and ideals and they motivate their followers to work towards the greater good and not their own personal interests (Kuhnert, 1994).

Transformational leadership is rooted in the work of Burns (1978) who identified leadership as the action of leaders persuading followers to work together toward goals that represent the values, needs, aspirations, and expectations of leaders, followers and the organization. Burns also states that the leadership role is most effective if the leader is continually supporting the development of leaders within the organization thus enabling these transforming leaders to implement real change (1978). A leader engages in transformation when the motives, actions, values, and goals of the followers are altered and shaped through the “teaching role of leadership” (Burns, 1978, p. 425).

Bass and Avolio (1990) indicate four key characteristics of transformational leadership: inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration and idealized influence. Inspirational motivation is more than leading charismatically it is the ability to effectively communicate vision and goals in a manner by which they become share by the followers or employees. The transformational culture is one of closeness, like that of a family unit with a shared sense of purpose. Bass, Waldman, Avolio and Bebb (1987) identified evidence of a domino effect with respect to transformational leadership flowing down the organizations structure. Their study found that many of the middle management leaders exhibited similar transformational behaviors as their supervisors within the organization (Bass et al., 1987).

The transformational leader is not a micromanager; rather their focus is on innovation. In the school setting, a transformational leader would have a shared vision and empower their teachers to identify the needs and goals necessary to work towards school improvement and student success. Many years after his original writings about leadership, Burns still asserts that
the purpose of transformational leadership is deep and long-lasting change guided and measured by values (2003). Transformational leadership is needed in our schools today to guide principals and teachers through the multitude of changes that are occurring.

Deutschendorf (2014) noted a “positive relationship between emotionally intelligent leadership and employee satisfaction, retention and performance” (p. 1). He identified five factors that are critical for emotionally intelligent leadership: self-awareness, awareness of others, listening skills, awareness of emotional atmosphere and the ability to anticipate reactions and respond effectively. Many of the qualities of a transformational leader; motivation, empathy, integrity, and intuitive abilities, are also qualities of emotional intelligence (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). A study on emotional intelligence and effective leadership by Batool found that there was a positive relation between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. The researcher suggests that managers and supervisors could use their emotional intelligence more effectively, enhance their emotional intelligence and effectively lead with a transformational leadership style (2013). Leban and Zulauf also found a link between Bass and Avolio’s transformational leadership characteristics and the branches of emotional intelligence (2004). However, due to the newness of the emotional intelligence theories and measures of emotional intelligence, more research needs to be done with regard to the possible relation between transformational leadership and emotional intelligence.

Emotional Intelligence

The theories of EI are relatively new and researchers have not come to a consensus about how best to conceptualize its constructs (Grubb & McDaniel, 2007). Although there is a vast diversity among the three most prevalent models of EI; each having its own theoretical paradigms and sources of measurement, there are also commonalities. The theories of emotional
intelligence share an awareness of self and others emotionally and behaviorally to impact situations positively (Greenockle, 2010). The three theories of emotional intelligence that have received the most interest are Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) ability model, Goleman’s (1995) competency model, and Bar-On’s (2000) trait or mixed model.

Salovey and Mayer were the first to use the term “emotional intelligence” in 1990 and their model of EI began with a focus around three mental processes: appraisal and expression of emotion, regulation of emotion, and the utilization of emotion. Their theory expanded upon Howard Gardner’s Multiple Intelligence theory which was introduced in 1983 and included the following intelligences: musical, linguistic, spatial, mathematical-logical, intrapersonal, body-kinesthetic, naturalist, intrapersonal and interpersonal. Salovey and Mayer identified EI as an aspect of social intelligence involving an individual’s “ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (1990, p. 5).

Since its conception, the Salovey and Mayer trait model of EI has evolved as they pursued their research into not only intelligence but also emotions. This model sites four branches of emotional intelligence: identifying emotions, reasoning with emotions, understanding emotions and managing emotions (Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey, 2002).

Salovey and Mayer define emotional intelligence as “the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (1990, p. 189). Originally, their theory included five components but was reduced to four through their continued research (Caruso et al., 2002). The key components of emotional intelligence
according to Salovey and Mayer are: emotional perception, assimilating emotions in thought, understanding and analyzing emotion, and reflective regulation of emotion (Mayer, et al., 2000).

Daniel Goleman, a psychologist and science writer for the New York Times, became interested in the work of Salovey and Mayer which lead to the publication of his book, *Emotional Intelligence: Why it Can Matter More Than IQ* (1995). This book popularized EI and is considered “responsible for bringing the topic of emotional intelligence into the mainstream” (Allen, 2003, p. 27). Goleman’s theory explored the definitions and characteristics of emotional intelligence and found it to be more important than cognitive or technical ability when predicting a person’s success (1995).

Similar to Salovey, Goleman’s theory is competency based and includes 18 competencies within four clusters: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management (1995; 1998). Goleman’s theory of emotional intelligence focuses on self and the relationship and perception of self with respect to interacting with others.

Bar-On (2002) introduced a mixed model of EI in 1997 that is both an emotional and social intelligence model, it is sometimes referred to as a trait model. He defines emotional intelligence as “a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills, and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate to them, and cope with daily demands” (Bar-On, 2006, p. 15). The Bar-On model has ten components which combine both mental and emotional intellect to predict a person’s likelihood of success: self-regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, empathy, interpersonal relationships, stress tolerance, impulse control, reality testing, flexibility, and problem-solving (Bar-On, 2000). These ten components fall into five main components and are defined as: intrapersonal skill – a person’s awareness and understanding of their emotions and
feelings; interpersonal skill - the awareness and understanding of others emotions with empathy which leads to developing a positive relationship; adaptability – having the ability of adapting or changing feelings depending upon the situation; stress management – being able to cope with stress and controlling the emotions brought on by stress; and general mood – being optimistic and able to feel and express positive emotions (Allen, 2003; Bar-On 2006).

The Salovey and Mayer ability model of emotional intelligence is the model used for the current study investigating EI and its relationship to job satisfaction as perceived by teachers. This model was chosen because it contains constructs of both social and emotional intelligence and due to the extensive research conducted on its measurement instruments. The Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS) is based upon the ability model of emotional intelligence. Much research on EI has been conducted with the WLEIS and it has been utilized in over 13 different countries.

**Emotional Intelligence in School Leadership**

Research suggests that EI has a significant relationship with a person’s “job performance, motivation, decision making, successful management, and leadership” (Assanova & McGuire, 2009, p. 3). All of the EI theories acknowledge the importance of a leader’s cognitive and technical abilities. Additionally they purport that it is an individual’s emotional constructs that enable them to be effective and successful leaders. People must respond to a myriad of emotions which affect actions and behaviors; doing so in a positive manner contributes to an organization’s success (Assanova & McGuire, 2009, p. 3). The ability to understand emotions, from self and others, enables a person to channel unproductiveness and negativity into productive, positive outcomes.
The research indicates that emotions impact not only our thinking but our actions as well and the ability to manage these emotions is critical for judicious thinking and problem solving, attributes that are fundamental to effective leadership. Bardach (2008) asserts that “A leader who is able to identify the motivators within himself and others will often find himself experiencing greater levels of organizational success than leaders who may be deficient in these areas” (p. 12). Ultimately, a leader who possesses emotional intelligence impacts those he/she leads in the organization in a positive manner enabling greater success (Assanova & McGuire, 2009; Bardach, 2008).

Effective leaders understand that their ability to affect positive work related outcomes is largely based upon how they lead. These leaders know that their beliefs regarding human nature and behavior are fundamental aspects of being an effective leader. Leadership requires awareness that their role involves developing relationships and positive sentiments at work, communicating effectively, using their authority and position in appropriate fashion, making well-informed decisions which leads to a positive climate and a productive staff (Assanova & McGuire, 2009; Bardach, 2008). Curry suggests that leaders are assumed to be competent in the abilities necessary for their position, but they are more often judged by their ability to handle themselves and others or their level of emotional intelligence (2003).

An abundance of research has been conducted on school leadership. The studies indicate that a principal’s practices and leadership abilities can improve school climate which leads to increased teacher job satisfaction and improved student achievement (Egley & Jones, 2005). Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005) found that several practices utilized by principals, lead to the improvement of student achievement, indicating that principal leadership can and does impact the performance of the schools that they lead. Additionally, according to Fullan key
components of principal leadership include: understanding the importance of relationships, understanding the process of change, having a moral purpose; an ability to share knowledge and communicate effectively, and the ability to blend the components together appropriately and effectively (2002). The development of relationships is critical to the school culture and climate. Elementary teachers often use a glow and grow technique with their parents and students to foster good relationships. For example, during a conference, a teacher would first share an area of strength that a student has and then an area of concern. Through this process, the teacher expresses his/her understanding of the student in totality and not simply the deficiencies or areas that are lacking. A principal utilizing this same technique when evaluating teachers would incorporate aspects of transformational leadership and emotional intelligence and foster a positive stable relationships with his/her teachers. In other words, a principal needs to be emotionally intelligent in order to successfully lead a school and its stakeholders.

Conclusion

Although emotional intelligence in leadership may not be seen, its impact is immense. A leader’s ability to lead is manifested in their ability to envision a better future and assimilate the necessary goods, services, practices and people to achieve their vision. Effective leadership must include vision, organization and management. A leader should also motivate, communicate, facilitate, collaborate, and innovate. Leaders must be able to manage, encourage, listen and nurture those whom they lead. It is essential for a successful leader to effectively identify and respond to challenges, and possess a high degree of emotional intelligence; perhaps their “most important attribute” for success. (Hyatt, Hyatt, and Hyatt, 2007, p. 2).
Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine the relation between elementary teachers’ perception of their principals’ emotional intelligence level and their level of job satisfaction. The guiding question in this study was, “What is the relation between elementary school teachers’ perception of their principals’ emotional intelligence level and their teacher job satisfaction?” This chapter includes information related to: how the study’s site was selected, the research design, the survey instruments, selection of the participants, data collection methods, and the methods of data analysis. The chapter closes with a description of how informed consent was gained from the participants and how Institutional Review Board approval was attained prior to the data collection process.

Research Question

What is the relation between elementary teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and the teachers’ level of job satisfaction?

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between elementary teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and the teachers’ level of job satisfaction.

I predicated that emotional intelligence variables: others emotional appraisal, use of emotion, and regulation of emotion will positively relate to teacher job satisfaction variables: supervision, contingent rewards, operating procedures, and communication.

If there is a positive relation between teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and the teacher’s level of job satisfaction, then this information may be used in designing curriculum for school leadership programs and professional development programs.

Research Design
The research design for this study was a non-experimental correlation; the variables were not manipulated and the participants were not randomly assigned. **Correlational research is a type** of non-experimental research in which the primary independent variable of interest is a quantitative variable (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). Correlational research is not used to determine causation but can be used to determine whether or not additional experimental research is warranted depending on the strength of variable relationships.

**Data Collection Instruments**

Teachers completed their respective surveys in an online format. The study consisted of two survey instruments, based upon the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS) and the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) developed by Paul Spencer. The researcher did not field test the instrument due to a threat of sample preservation. Additionally, the nature of the changes to the survey were minor and did not change the conceptualization of any of the constructs within the survey. Rather, the contextual nature of categories or questions were removed or reworded to provide specificity and clarity for participants.

**The WLEIS.** The instrument used to collect data on teacher’s perceptions of elementary principals’ EI levels was based upon the WLEIS. The WLEIS is one of the most popular self-report EI instruments and based on the four-branch ability EI model; Self-Emotional Appraisal, Others’ Emotional Appraisal, Use of Emotion, and Regulation of Emotion (Wong & Law, 2002). There are four questions in each of the ability areas for a total of sixteen questions. For example, one of the items reads, “**I always know my friends’ emotions from their behavior**”. The WEIS is a seven point Likert-type scale and there are four questions in each of the ability areas for a total of sixteen questions. Respondents’ rate each of the statements on a continuum from “strongly agree”
to “strongly disagree”. Statistical analysis suggests that the scale is a reliable and valid self-report index of the ability to monitor and manage emotions (Wong & Law, 2002).

**Modifications to the WLEIS.** For the purposes of this study, Self-Emotional Assessment was excluded because the instrument was not being utilized as a self-report survey. Additionally, statements within the instrument were rewritten to capture teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence level. Examples of changes to the wording of the EI scales: under the branch Others Emotional Appraisal “I am sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others.” was rewritten as “My principal is sensitive to the feelings and emotions of teachers.”; within Use of Emotion, “I always tell myself I am a competent person” was rewritten as “My principal tells teachers that they are competent.”; finally, in Regulation of Emotion, “I am able to control my own temper and handle difficulties rationally.” was reworded into two statements, “My principal is able to control his/her temper.” and “My principal handles difficulties rationally.” The resulting survey, Teacher’s Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence (TPPEI) was 13 items measured on a ten point increment slide scale that ranged from 0 = disagree to 100 = agree.

**The JSS.** The instrument used to collect data on teachers’ job satisfaction level was based upon the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). The JSS was developed by Paul E. Spector at the University of Central Florida for use in human service organization and has demonstrated both reliability and construct validity in previous studies (1997). The survey is a 36 item, nine facet scale which includes: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, and communication is used to assess employee attitudes about the job and aspects of the job. Items on the JSS are rated on a 6-point Likert scale and the respondents were asked to rate each
statement on a continuum from 1 = disagree very much to 6 = agree very much. Items on the survey are written in both directions so approximately half must be reverse scored.

**Modifications to the JSS.** For the purposes of this study, pay, promotion, and fringe benefits were eliminated because they were beyond the realm of a principal’s control. Additionally, statements within the two areas of the instrument were rewritten to capture teachers’ job satisfaction levels. Examples of changes to the wording of the JSS: under supervision: “My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.” was rewritten as “My principal is quite competent in doing their job.” and within communication, “Communications seem good within this organization.” was rewritten as “Communications seem good within the school.”. There were no changes to the survey item wording in the areas of contingent rewards and operating procedures. The resulting survey, Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey (TJSS) consisted of 16 items measured on a ten point increment slide scale that ranged from 0 = disagree to 100 = agree.

In this study, the independent variable was the responses of teachers’ on the Teachers’ Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence and the dependent variable was the responses of teachers’ on the Teachers Job Satisfaction Survey.

**Site Selection**

Nine elementary schools within a small school district in the southeastern corner of a southern state were selected as the site for this research. This geographic area was chosen for the study based on its proximity to the researcher.

**Participant Selection**

The participants were state certified elementary teachers who currently hold a position teaching in a southeastern state. Teachers were required to have one year of teaching experience at their current school to participate in the study. Demographic data on participants was collected
including their gender, degree of education, age and years of experience. Elementary teachers in the system received the surveys via their school email accounts and all participants in this research study voluntarily consented to do so.

**Data Collection Procedure**

Both the Teachers’ Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence survey and the Teacher’s Job Satisfaction Survey were administered electronically through Qualtrix. Teachers received an email asking them to participate in the study, upon agreeing they received a follow-up email with links to the surveys embedded. If teachers did not respond to the initial email, a subsequent email was sent requesting their participation.

The present study explored the relation between teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ emotional intelligence levels and their perceived job satisfaction. During this study, data were collected from participants through on-line surveys and analyzed using exploratory factor analysis (EFA). EFA is used for “analyzing the structure of the interrelationships (correlations) among a large number of variables (e.g., test scores, test items, questionnaire responses) by defining sets of variables that may be highly interrelated,” (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010, p. 94).

**Data Analysis**

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data collected in this study. Since threats to the consistency or reliability of a test can also affect the validity, Coefficient H was used to examine the construct reliability and factor loadings to assess the construct validity of the research.

A factor analysis was conducted to identify possible relationships and the strength of the relationships between the responses on the Teachers’ Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional
Intelligence Survey and the Teacher’s Job Satisfaction Survey questionnaires. Factor analysis is often used for interpreting self-reporting questionnaires (Bryant, Yarnold, & Michelson, 1999). One reason that researchers use factor analysis is to decrease the number of variables into smaller groups which are called factors. Additionally, evidence of construct validity in self-reporting scales is provided by factor analysis (Thompson, 2004). The results of the factor analysis were then used to run a simple linear regression between high loading factors.

A simple regression analysis was used to identify the single independent variable that has the best prediction of the dependent measure. The best independent variable is based upon the correlation coefficient. The higher the correlation coefficient, the stronger the relationship and the better the predictive accuracy. (Hair, et. al., 2010) The strength of the relationship between the variables is indicated by a numerical value and its direction is indicated by a + (positive) or a – (negative) sign. If there is no relationship or the variables are unrelated then the correlation coefficient is zero. If the scores are perfectly related then the numerical value is either -1.0 or +1.0 (Mertler & Reinhart, 2016).

Informed Consent and Internal Review Board

Approval for the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of North Florida (UNF) and permission was obtained from the school district. After permission was obtained, elementary teachers who had served at least one year in the district were invited by email to participate in the study. The email contained an informed consent document and information on accessing and completing the surveys electronically. All participants were asked to sign an informed consent form and their participation in the study was totally voluntary. The informed consent form advised participants that the scores from this study would not be shared with anyone under any circumstances and that all responses were
anonymous. Participants’ responses to survey items remained confidential to ensure that there would be no negative repercussions or risk to their employment from their participation in the study.
Chapter 4

Results and Discussion

This study examined the possible relation between teachers’ perceived emotional intelligence level of their principals and their level of job satisfaction. This chapter reports the data and consequent analysis used to investigate the research question and hypotheses of the study.

The guiding research question for this study was: What is the relationship between elementary school teachers’ perceptions of their administrator’s emotional intelligence and their level of job satisfaction? The research hypothesis was that there will be a statistically significant (p= <.001) relation between the dependent variables and the predictor variables. The null hypothesis was there will be no significant relationship between elementary teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and the teachers’ level of job satisfaction. This study was a bivariate regression investigation of the impact of a principal’s perceived emotional intelligence level on teacher’s job satisfaction.

In order to answer this question, data were collected using two surveys adapted by the researcher as discussed in Chapter 3. One survey related to teacher’s perceptions of their principal’s level of emotional intelligence and one which measured their job satisfaction level and then analyzed. The first survey, Teacher’s Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence (TPPEI), was based on Wong’s and Law’s research, Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS). This survey was related to teacher’s perceptions of their principal’s level of emotional intelligence and composed of 14 items. The second survey, Teacher Job Satisfaction (TJS), was based on Paul Spencer’s research, Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). This survey was related to teacher’s job satisfaction level, was composed of 16 items.
Data received on the dependent and independent variable were intended to answer this study’s question of a relation between teacher’s perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence level and their job satisfaction. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to examine the factor structure of items related to teacher’s perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and their level of job satisfaction. A simple linear regression was conducted to determine the strength of the relationship between teacher’s perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and their job satisfaction level.

**Demographics of Participants**

There were a total of 39 participants in the current study, 38 female and one male. The ethnicity of the participants was 32 white or Caucasian, 4 African American, 1 Hispanic, 1 Japanese, and 1 participant did not disclose their ethnicity. Participants ranged in age from 26 to 61 years of age. The highest degrees earned by participants were 9 undergraduate, 18 masters, 9 specialists and 4 doctoral degrees. Participants’ years of experience ranged from three to 38 and the number of years with their current principal ranged from 1 to 15 years.

**Data Related to Teachers’ Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence**

On the Teachers’ Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence survey, there were a total of 14 items measured on a visual analog scale. As previously discussed, those items were categorized into three subsets. The first subset included 4 items related to Other’s Emotional Appraisal which is defined by Wong and Law as the ability to perceive and understand the emotions of others around them. The second subset included four items related to the Use of Emotion which is defined by Wong and Law as the ability of individuals to make and use of their emotions by directing them towards constructive activities and personal performance. The third subset included 5 items related to Regulation of Emotion which is
defined by Wong and Law as peoples’ ability to regulate their emotions which will enable a more rapid recovery from psychological distress.

As the initial goal of this research was to identify how teacher perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence impact their level of job satisfaction, it was most important to conduct an analysis to examine the survey items that specifically dealt with job satisfaction. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to possibly reduce the larger set of variables into a smaller set variables. These latent construct or constructs subsuming these items are referred to as principal components and explain most of the variance in the original variables (44.23 %). The exploratory factor analysis for the Teachers’ Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence resulted in one component being extracted as evidenced by the eigenvalues and scree plot. Coefficient H was used to determine latent construct reliability with Coefficient H values above .70 being described as satisfactory. (Hancock & Mueller, 2001). The Teachers’ Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence survey had a Coefficient H value of .97 indicating the instrument had excellent internal latent reliability.

Table 1

*Component Matrix for Teacher’s Perceptions of Their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence Level.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>TPPEI Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My principal always knows teachers’ emotions from their behavior.</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal has good control of his/her own emotions.</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal is able to control his/her temper.</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal encourages teachers to set their own goals.</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal is a good observer of teachers’ emotions.</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal tell teachers that they are competent.</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal handles difficulties rationally.</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal is sensitive to the feelings and emotions of teachers.</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My principal encourages teachers to be self-motivated.  
My principal is capable of controlling his/her own emotions.
My principal has a good understanding of the emotions of teachers in our school.
My principal always encourages teachers to try their best.
My principal is quite competent in doing his/her job.

In the initial extraction, factor scores were calculated for each individual for EI and were calculated as Z-scores. One of the items on the questionnaire was deleted, “My principal can always calm down quickly when he/she is very angry”, because it had a loading of <.30. After running the exploratory factor analysis, the Eigenvalue for Factor 1 was 9.06 and explained 69.69% of the total item variance. This indicated that a one factor solution was adequate in capturing most of the variability across the 13 items. The researcher defined and referred to that component as Principal’s Perceived Emotional Intelligence (PPEI).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>9.060</td>
<td>69.691</td>
<td>69.691</td>
<td>9.060</td>
<td>69.691</td>
<td>69.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>9.950</td>
<td>79.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>6.846</td>
<td>86.487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>3.708</td>
<td>90.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>2.355</td>
<td>92.550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>1.744</td>
<td>94.294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data related to the Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey

On the Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey, there were a total of 16 items measured on a slide scale. As previously discussed, those items were categorized into four subsets. The first subset included 4 items related to supervision. The second subset included four items related to contingent rewards. The third subset included 4 items related to operating procedures. The fourth and final subset included 4 items related to communication.

Teachers job satisfaction mean scores ranged from 13.23 to 88.31 with an overall mean score of 58.14 and a median score of 63.86. The standard deviation ranged from 24.44 to 37.57 with a mean score of 28.97 and a median score of 33.18.

An exploratory factor analysis was also conducted on the TJSS to possibly reduce the larger set of variables into a smaller set of variables. The analysis resulted one component being extracted with a principal component value of (69.69%). Coefficient H was used to determine measurement reliability with Coefficient H values above .70 being satisfactory. (Hancock &Mueller, 2001). The Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey had a Coefficient H value of .91 indicating the instrument has satisfactory internal reliability.

Table 3
**Component Matrix for Teachers’ Job Satisfaction Level.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>TJSS Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
<td>-.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications seem good within the school.</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal is unfair to me.</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal shows too little interest in the feelings of teachers.</td>
<td>-.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are few rewards for those who work here.</td>
<td>-.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have too much to do at work.</td>
<td>-.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals of the school are not clear to me.</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like my principal</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained.</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the initial extraction, factor scores were calculated on the survey as sample dependent Z scores. Four of the items on the questionnaire were deleted because they had a loadings of <.30:

“My principal can always calm down quickly when he/she is very angry.”
My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.
I have too much paperwork.

After running the exploratory factor analysis, the Eigenvalue for factor 1 was 5.04 and explained 44.27% of the total variance. This indicated that a one factor solution was adequate in capturing most of the variability across the 12 items. The researcher determined that although a three factor solution could have been run, a one factor solution was sufficient to explain the data. The researcher defined and referred to that component as Teachers’ Job Satisfaction Level (TJSL).

Table 4

*Factor Loadings for the Total Variance Explained Teacher Job Satisfaction Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Results

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on both the Teachers’ Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey results of the analysis indicated that a one factor solution was appropriate for both. On the Teachers’ Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence, the first factor explained 69.69% of the variance and on the Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey, the first factor explained 44.27% of the variance indicated one independent variable and one dependent variable.

Data Relation between Principal’s Perceived Emotional Intelligence Level and Teachers Level of Job Satisfaction

Since a one factor solution was sufficient to explain the data, as a simple regression was used in this study to examine the relation between the independent and dependent variables, EI
and TJS. The regression analysis was conducted to test the null hypothesis, there is no significant relationship between elementary teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and the teachers’ level of job satisfaction. Assumptions of linearity, independence of errors and homoscedasticity of errors, and normality of error distributions were evaluated. Analysis of the data indicated by the teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence and the teachers’ level of job satisfaction rejects the Null. A strong positive relation was found, B = .80 and indicated that teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence was associated with teachers’ level of job satisfaction.

Assumptions needed to be met on the variables for the results of this test to be reliable. First, variables were checked for normal distribution by visual examination of the normality histogram for the regression and through skewness and kurtosis examination. Values of skewness and kurtosis of zero indicate a normal distribution with an acceptable range between -2 and +2 for skewness and -7 and +7 for kurtosis. All skewness and kurtosis were within acceptable ranges. A t-test was conducted to ensure that the assumption of normal distribution was met and paired samples were normally distributed. The t-test score of the histogram of EI and TLJS are shown in Figure 1 and a normal P-Plot of the regression is shown in Figure 2.

*Figure 1*
The second and third assumptions for regression, linearity between the independent and dependent variables and homoscedasticity, were evaluated. These assumptions were visually examined through a scatterplot and found to be acceptable. Homoscedasticity was determined by the data being evenly dispersed around the line of best fit for the bivariate relationship. There were no major outliers which indicated a normality of error distribution. A normal P-Plot of the bivariate regression indicated a linear relation between the variables and a regression analysis was appropriate.

Figure 2

Linear Relationship Between EI and TLJS
The data met the assumptions of bivariate linear regression. The correlation between EI and TJS was positive. As teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence level increased, their level of job satisfaction increased. As teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence level decreased, their level of job satisfaction decreased. Pearson’s r was run to determine the effect size or strength of the relation between EI and TJS. A correlation of -1 to 1 scale is used, -1 being a strong negative correlation and 1 being a strong positive correlation. Educational researchers are satisfied with a moderate negative correlation of -.35 to -.50 and a moderate positive correlation of .35 to .50 (Hair et al., 2010). The Beta for the regression model was .80, which indicates a strong positive relationship between EI and TLJS. The standardized regression weight also indicates a strong relation between the two variables ($R^2 = .80$). This means on average, a .8 standard deviation increase in job satisfaction for every one standard deviation increase in participants’ perceptions of their principal’s EI.

The t-score for the data were examined to determine if either a Type I or Type II error had occurred. A Type I error occurs when the data indicate a false positive and the researcher rejects a null hypothesis when it is actually true. A Type II error occurs when the data indicate a
false negative and the researcher does not reject the null hypothesis and fails to accept an alternate hypothesis. Type I errors are reported as the p-value and are usually set at .05 or .01, the current study had a p-value of less than .01, so a Type I error is unlikely. Type II errors are reported as Beta scores and are usually set at 0 – 1, the current study had a Beta score of .80 so a Type II error is unlikely.

A significance of (p= <.001) indicates that there is likely a generalizable difference in the population that is represented by the sample. The significance for the current study was less than .01, indicating that the results are likely generalizable.
Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The United States public education is an ever evolving entity. Through the course of the last 20+ years, the increased emphasis on improved student achievement has placed an increasingly high demand upon teachers for accountability with regard to student achievement. As a result, substantial research has been conducted job satisfaction levels, presumably to improve this area with the teaching profession. However, teacher job satisfaction has continued to decrease; dropping 23 percent from 2008 to 2011 and another five percent from 2011 to 2012 (MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, 2012). Factors which can improve teacher job satisfaction, once identified, should be implemented and should impact the areas of recruitment and retention as well. The purpose of the present study was to identify a possible relation between teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s EI and their level of job satisfaction. The researcher adapted the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS) into a survey instrument to measure teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s EI level, the Teacher’s Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence Survey (TPPEIS). The researcher adapted Paul Spencer’s Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) into a survey instrument to measure teachers’ level of job satisfaction. The instruments were designed to ascertain data would either support or negate a relation between perceived principal’s EI and teacher’s level of job satisfaction.

This final chapter reviewed the methodology and summarized and discussed the findings related to prior research and the theoretical framework upon which this study was based. The researcher drew conclusions and made recommendations for future research based upon the findings of the current study. The contributions this study makes to the field of education with respect to teacher job satisfaction as it is specifically related to teachers’ perceptions of their
principal’s EI and strategies for increasing teacher job satisfaction by improving leadership skills of principals could be quite significant.

**Review of the Methodology**

Nine elementary schools were selected within a small school district in the southeastern corner of a southern state as the site for this research. The participants were state certified elementary teachers who currently held a teaching position within the district and who had worked at their current school for at least one year. Each of the participants received the surveys via their school email accounts and all voluntarily consented. The actual number of people who participated was 39. Although the number of surveys that were completed did not provide a desirably large sample size, it adequately represented the small district. Based on the level of anonymity provided while using Qualtrex for survey distribution, no informed consent was needed. All participants completed the survey online in April, 2016.

The dependent variable was the level of job satisfaction measured by elementary teachers’ responses to the TJS survey instrument. The independent variable was teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s perceived level of emotional intelligence as measured by their responses to the TPPEI survey. Data analysis consisted of an exploratory factor analysis to legitimize the independent variable, bivariate correlations to test for a relationship between the independent and dependent variables, and a regression analysis to determine what level of significance the relationship had.

**Summary of Results**

The findings indicated that teachers’ level of job satisfaction was related to their perception of their principal’s perceived emotional intelligence level. The exploratory factor analysis for each survey indicated that a one factor solution was adequate in capturing most of
the variability for the respective surveys. The bivariate regression indicated a strong positive correlation between elementary teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence level and their level of job satisfaction with an $r^2$ value of .638. This suggests that teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence is associated with teachers’ level of job satisfaction, a significant finding.

**Discussion of Results**

The findings of the present study in relation to previous research studies and within the theoretical constructs upon which this study was based are discussed in this section.

**Relationship of the Present Study to Previous Research**

As formerly noted, there is an abundance of research on both school leadership and teacher job satisfaction. This study was driven by research which indicates a leader with emotional intelligence has a significant impact on an organization’s culture and success (Assanova & McGuire, 2009; Curry, Goleman, 1995; Fullan, 2002; Goleman et al., 2002; Stephens & Hermon, 2010). Prior research indicates that principal’s leadership abilities can improve school culture and climate which in turn lead to improved levels of teacher job satisfaction (Egley & Jones, 2005).

The present study tested the relation of teachers’ perceptions of principals’ emotional intelligence to their level of job satisfaction. The outcome of this study supports previous research indicating that leaders levels of emotional intelligence has an impact on levels of job satisfaction. There is consistency between results of this current study and prior studies regarding the emotional intelligence levels of leaders and levels of job satisfaction.

**Interpretation of the Results within the Theoretical Framework**
The theoretical framework for this study was based upon transformational leadership. This leadership style is grounded in the leadership theory of Burns and asserts that effective leaders are continually supporting the development of leaders within the organization which enables transformational leaders to effectively implement change (Burns, 1978). Due to the immense amount of change that the United States public education system is constantly undergoing, authentic transformational leadership is necessary within our schools to guide and empower principals and teachers to implement successful change.

Previous studies indicate that many of the characteristics of a transformational leader are also qualities of emotional intelligence. According to Lunenburg & Ornstein, motivation, empathy, integrity and intuitive abilities are qualities of a leader shared by transformational leadership and emotional intelligence (2004). Examining the interrelatedness of transformational leadership style and emotional intelligence as related to teacher job satisfaction was the objective of this research.

In the present study, teachers’ perceptions of principals’ emotional intelligence levels and their level of job satisfaction was examined through two surveys. The first survey measured teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence level, and the second survey measured the teachers’ level of job satisfaction. Based upon the data from the surveys, there is significant positive relation between these two constructs which supports the premise that authentic transformational leadership style and emotional intelligence are indeed related to job satisfaction.

**Limitations**

The focus of the current study was the relation between teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence level and their level of job satisfaction. Survey instruments
were utilized to obtain the quantitative measurements for teachers’ perceptions of principal’s levels of emotional intelligence and their level of job satisfaction. The researcher adapted previously constructed survey instruments to obtain the specific data for the research. The use of a slide scale for the survey instruments create limitations in the reliability and validity of answers provided by the participants. The researcher assumed participants would answer the instruments honestly without bias and interpret the survey questions accurately. Utilizing different instruments may lead to different data outcome.

A second limitation of this study was the relatively small sample size. The purpose of quantitative research is to produce rich data which is made possible by having large sample sizes. However, obtaining a large sample size when conducting research of this nature can be difficult. Teachers can be hesitant to participate due to the sensitive nature of investigating principals and job satisfaction.

A third limitation of the study is that many of the convenience sample 39 participants may have had an existing relationship with the researcher. The study was limited to elementary schools within a small district in southeast Georgia. This is the same district in which the researcher has worked for many years and may have worked with some of the participants.

Many variables aside from those investigated can affect school’s culture and student achievement, which is another limitation of the study. Factors such as socioeconomics (Cuthrell et al., 2010; Gustafson, 2002), parental involvement (Boon, 2008, Lee & Shute, 2010), students with disabilities, school management practices and structure (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001), teacher experience and quality, teacher dedication and effort (May & Supovitz, 2011; Nettles & Herrington, 2007), student motivation (Harde, et al., 2006), and a myriad of others often impact schools and students.
Additionally, the structure of a small rural school system may be a limitation with regard to the turnover of elementary teachers change schools and role of administrators within the school building. Due to the rural location, it is difficult for a teacher to leave a school because of the limited number of schools within the county and the distance to travel for a position in another county. In a large urban area, it would be much easier for a teacher to change schools within a county and to change the county in which they teach. Additionally, the size of the district may impact the numbers and duties of administrators within a building; factors that may or may not impact larger urban school districts.

A final limitation to this study is the generalization to a wider population. The study was limited to a small district in southeast Georgia and may not be generalizable to other types of schools or regions not included in this study due to limits in cultural and ethnic diversity, population density, and size of schools and districts.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The findings from the current study support previous research in the business and education fields that indicated leaders with emotional intelligence guides a leader’s decision making abilities, their response to stimuli, relationships, behavior and their ability to inspire and motivate others for success (Curry, 2003, Moore; 2009; Stephens & Hermond, 2010). The results of this study lead to conclusions and recommendations which are applicable to the field of education (and educators), as well as to those desiring to conduct further research on authentic transformational leadership, the perceived emotional intelligence level of leaders, and the impact these two areas have on teacher job satisfaction within elementary schools.

The results of the present study indicate that there is a strong positive relation between teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence level and job satisfaction. The
correlation value of this study was .638 and a positive correlation for education studies typically has a value of .35 to .50 (Hair et al., 2010). This data indicates that teachers who perceive their principal’s as having higher emotional intelligence levels also have a higher level of job satisfaction.

Considering the outcome of the present study, the researcher has several recommendations to advance the significance of this study. First, the researcher recommends that the survey instruments be used in additional studies to validate its construct, content, and reliability. The researcher also suggests a larger school district and sample size be tested in different regions of the United States to add greater generalizability to the findings of the current study. Finally, the researcher suggests adding turnover rate or number of schools/districts taught in to the demographic information obtained from participants. This information may provide a greater understanding of teacher attrition in rural versus urban areas.

**Contributions of the Study**

As explained in Chapter 1, the purpose of the present study was to examine the possible relation between teacher’s perception of the emotional intelligence level of their principals and their level of job satisfaction. The findings of the study indicate that there is a strong positive relation between these two constructs. However, the impact of the current study and its findings has broader implications.

First is the potential impact on leadership recruitment and training process for principals. Since supporters of the Theory of Emotional Intelligence agree that emotional intelligence can be learned, emotional intelligence should be incorporated into educational leadership programs, school district leadership programs, and ongoing staff development programs. Schools are highly emotional places and the ability to lead in an emotionally intelligent manner is critical to the
success of a school leader and as such the success of a school. Training principals with the skills necessary to assess, understand and act with emotional self-awareness is essential. Additionally, since emotional intelligence can be learned, it might be of value to refer to emotional intelligence as a “mindset”. The construct of intelligence implies a “fixed” value with regard to intelligence quotient (IQ) and renaming emotional intelligence or Emotional Quotient (EQ) would be beneficial.

Retraining the brain is not a new concept nor one that is limited to leadership or emotional intelligence. Both The Growth Mindset and the Science of Happiness are based on the brain’s ability to change and control our behaviors. (Anchor, 2010; Dweck, 2015). Equipping principals with the skills necessary to understand how their behaviors are perceived by others would strengthen their ability to lead. Teaching future principals to strengthen their emotional constructs and channel them in a more positive manner would produce more effective and successful school leaders.

A second area of potential impact for this research is increased teacher job satisfaction levels on teacher retention rates. Based upon the current research, there is a strong relation between principal’s perceived emotional intelligence level by teachers and their job satisfaction levels. If training principal’s to be more emotionally aware could increase teacher’s level of job satisfaction and decrease teacher attrition, then the financial and instructional impact on schools could be quite positive.

The relatively recent interest in emotional intelligence in business as well as education gives reason to reflect. Why was emotional intelligence unimportant until now? Were we more emotionally intelligent in the past? Do we need to be more emotionally intelligent? Perhaps it is the gradual move away from face-to-face interactions. People communicate through email and
text messages more and more with less direct interaction with one another. The interpersonal skills so interlinked with direct interaction and emotional intelligence have been less and less in demand. Possibly, people’s ability to relate to one another thru empathy and compassion and to develop genuine relationships, their emotional intelligence, has suffered due to the personalization of communication.

The education of a child is an emotional process. Parents are concerned not just about their child’s academic abilities but also the impact the school environment has upon them emotionally. Teachers are charged with creating a safe learning environment in their classrooms and struggle to meet the needs of each of their students on a daily basis. Principals must oversee the school building as a whole and are responsible for the entire learning community. Often times, it is not what is said or done, but the manner in which it is said and done that impacts those around us. Empowering principals to be more emotionally aware when dealing with all stakeholders within the school community would be beneficial not only in the area of their leadership, but in their lives as well.

The multifaceted nature of the educational profession relate well with the relation between transformational leadership, emotional intelligence of elementary principals, and teacher job satisfaction.
Appendix A

Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS)

Self-emotion appraisal (SEA)
I have a good sense of why I have certain feelings most of the time.
I have good understanding of my own emotions.
I really understand what I feel.
I always know whether or not I am happy.

Others’ emotion appraisal (OEA)
I always know my friends’ emotions from their behavior.
I am a good observer of others’ emotions.
I am sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others.
I have good understanding of the emotions of people around me.

Use of emotion (UOE)
I always set goals for myself and then try my best to achieve them.
I always tell myself I am a competent person.
I am a self-motivated person.
I would always encourage myself to try my best.

Regulation of emotion (ROE)
I am able to control my temper and handle difficulties rationally.
I am quite capable of controlling my own emotions.
I can always calm down quickly when I am very angry.
I have good control of my own emotions.
Appendix B

Teachers’ Perceptions of their Principal’s Emotional Intelligence (TPPEI)
Adapted from the WLEIS

Other’s Emotional Appraisal (OEA)
- My principal always knows teachers’ emotions from their behaviors.
- My principal is a good observer of teacher’s emotions.
- My principal is sensitive to the feelings and emotions of teachers.
- My principal has a good understanding of the emotions of teachers in our school

Use of Emotion (UOE)
- My principal encourages teachers to set their own goals.
- My principal tells teachers that they are competent.
- My principal encourages teachers to be self-motivated.
- My principal always encourages teachers to try their best.

Regulation of Emotion (ROE)
- My principal is able to control his/her temper.
- My principal handles difficulties rationally.
- My principal is capable of controlling his/her own emotions.
- My principal can always calm down quickly when he/she is very angry.
- My principal has good control of his/her own emotions.
Appendix C

Paul Spencer’s Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.
There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.
I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.
When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.
Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.
I like the people I work with.
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.
Communications seem good within this organization.
Raises are too few and far between.
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.
My supervisor is unfair to me.
The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.
My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.
I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.
I like doing the things I do at work.
The goals of this organization are not clear to me. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.
People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.
My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.
The benefit package we have is equitable.
There are few rewards for those who work here.
I have too much to do at work.
I enjoy my coworkers.
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.
There are benefits we do not have which we should have.
I like my supervisor.
I have too much paperwork.
I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.
There is too much bickering and fighting at work.
My job is enjoyable.
Work assignments are not fully explained.
Appendix D
Teachers Job Satisfaction Survey (TJSS)
Adapted from the JSS

Supervision
My principal is quite competent in doing his/her job.
My principal is unfair to me.
My principal shows too little interest in the feelings of teachers.
I like my supervisor.

Contingent Rewards
When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.
There are few rewards for those who work here.
I don’t feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.

Operating Procedures
Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.
My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.
I have too much to do at work.
I have too much paperwork.

Communication
The goals of the school are not clear to me.
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.
Work assignments are not fully explained.
Appendix E
April 15, 2016

Dr. Will Hardin, Superintendent
Camden County Schools
311 South East Street

Dear Dr. Hardin,

I am currently a doctoral student at the University of North Florida and will soon be completing the research proposal for my dissertation topic: *The Perceived Emotional Intelligence of Leaders and their Teachers’ Job Satisfaction: How do they relate?* I have been an employee of the school system for thirteen years and have seen firsthand the dedication and work ethic of the leaders, teachers, support staff, and stake holders of this county to provide the best possible education for the student of Camden County. I would like to request your permission to use Camden County School System elementary teachers as the participants within my study.

Research on leadership to date frequently indicates that leaders impact their subordinate’s performance and attitudes through their leadership behaviors and attitudes. My study will investigate the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s emotional intelligence level and their job satisfaction level. If a high correlation exists, then efforts can be made to increase the emotional intelligence level of school-based administrators through staff development opportunities or through university leadership programs.

Increasing teacher job satisfaction would be a significant step in improving school climate which impacts teacher retention rates and student achievement. Determining the relationship between school administrators’ emotional intelligence level and the perceived job satisfaction level of teachers should enhance the understanding of what is needed for effective leadership within today’s schools to support best teacher performance and thus, ultimately improve student achievement.

The research would be conducted through two on-line surveys, the Emotional Quotient -360 (based on the research of Bar-On) and the Job Satisfaction Survey (based on the research of Spector). The identity of the teachers and which schools they work in will be unknown to the researcher and the coding of scores will be kept confidential.

The benefits of participating in this study is that we will have an opportunity to gain insight into the levels of emotional intelligence and leadership performance as well as an opportunity to identify our strengths and how we can build upon them.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Charis Lee Swift, EdS
MLCES
Ms. Swift,
I am happy to approve your research to be conducted in Camden County Schools and wish you the best of luck. If there is anything else you need please do not hesitate to contact me.

Will Hardin
Superintendent of Schools
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MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2016

TO: Ms. Charis Lee Swift, BS, Med, EdS

VIA: Dr. Daniel Dinsmore
    Foundations & Secondary Education

FROM: Dr. Jennifer Wesely, Chairperson
      On behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board

RE: Declaration of Exempt Status for IRB#879887-1:
    “The Relationship between teacher's perceptions of their principal's: emotional appraisal of
    others, their use of emotion and their regulation of emotion; as related to the teacher's job
    satisfaction levels”

Your project, “The Relationship between teacher's perceptions of their principal's: emotional appraisal of
others, their use of emotion and their regulation of emotion; as related to the teacher's job satisfaction
levels” was reviewed on behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board and declared “Exempt” category 2.
Based on the recently revised Standard Operating Procedures regarding exempt projects, the UNF IRB no
longer reviews and approves exempt research according to the 45 CFR 46 regulations. Projects declared exempt
review are only reviewed to the extent necessary to confirm exempt status.

The IRB understands that the facility will consist of a small rural school system in the southeastern corner of the
state of Georgia. The school system is comprised of a high school, 9th grade center, two middle schools, and
nine elementary schools. The research will be conducted in the elementary schools.

Once data collection under the exempt status begins, the researchers agree to abide by these requirements:

- All investigators and co-investigators, or those who obtain informed consent, collect data, or have access
to identifiable data are trained in the ethical principles and federal, state, and institutional policies
governing human subjects research (please see the FAQs on UNF IRB CITI Training for more
information).

- An informed consent process will be used, when necessary, to ensure that participants voluntarily
consent to participate in the research and are provided with pertinent information such as identification
of the activity as research; a description of the procedures, right to withdraw at any time, risks, and
benefits; and contact information for the PI and IRB chair.
- Human subjects will be selected equitably so that the risks and benefits of research are justly distributed.
- The IRB will be informed as soon as practicable but no later than 3 business days from receipt of any complaints from participants regarding risks and benefits of the research.
- The IRB will be informed as soon as practicable but no later than 3 business days from receipt of the complaint of any information and unexpected or adverse events that would increase the risk to the participants and cause the level of review to change. Please use the Event Report Form to submit information about such events.
- The confidentiality and privacy of the participants and the research data will be maintained appropriately.

While the exempt status is effective for the life of the study, if it is modified, all substantive changes must be submitted to the IRB for prospective review. In some circumstances, changes to the protocol may disqualify the project from exempt status. Revisions in procedures or documents that would change the review level from exempt to expedited or full board review include, but are not limited to, the following:

- New knowledge that increases the risk level;
- Use of methods that do not meet the exempt criteria;
- Surveying or interview children or participating in the activities being observed;
- Change in the way identifiers are recorded so that participants can be identified;
- Addition of an instrument, survey questions, or other change in instrumentation that could pose more than minimal risk;
- Addition of prisoners as research participants;
- Addition of other vulnerable populations;
- Under certain circumstances, addition of a funding source

To submit an amendment, please complete an Amendment Request Document and submit it along with any updated documents affected by the changes via a new package in IRBNet. If investigators are unsure of whether an amendment needs to be submitted or if they have questions about the amendment review process, they should contact the IRB staff for clarification.

Your study was declared exempt effective 05/24/2016. Please submit an Exempt Status Report by 05/24/2019 if this project is still active at the end of three years. However, if the project is complete and you would like to close the project, please submit a Closing Report Form. This will remove the project from the group of projects subject to an audit. An investigator must close a project when the research no longer meets the definition of human subject research (e.g., data collection is complete and data are deidentified so the researcher does not have the ability to match data to participants) or data collection and analysis are complete. If the IRB has not received correspondence at the three-year anniversary, you will be reminded to submit an Exempt Status Report. If no Exempt Status Report is received from the Principal Investigator within 90 days of the status report due date listed above, then the IRB will close the research file. The closing report or exempt status report will need to be submitted as a new package in IRBNet.

All principal investigators, co-investigators, those who obtain informed consent, collect data, or have access to identifiable data must be CITI certified in the protection of human subjects. As you may know, CITI Course Completion Reports are valid for 3 years. Your completion report is valid through 03/06/2019, Dr. Dinsmore’s completion report is valid through 09/10/2017, and Dr. Gupton’s completion report is valid through 12/18/2016. The CITI training for renewal will become available 90 days before your CITI training expires. Please renew your CITI training when necessary and ensure that all key personnel maintain current CITI training. Individuals can access CITI by following this link: http://www.citiprogram.org/. Should you have questions regarding your project or any other IRB issues, please contact the research integrity unit of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs by emailing IRB@unf.edu or calling (904) 620-2455.
This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within UNF’s records. All records shall be accessible for inspection and copying by authorized representatives of the department or agency at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner. A copy of this memo may also be sent to the dean and/or chair of your department.
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