Center for Management Science Research
ISSN: 3006-5291 3006-5283 Volume 4, Issue 3, 2026

"THE IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP STYLE ON PRIMARY TEACHERS' JOB SATISFACTION: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY"

Sonia Rubab*[1], Dr. Ismat Bano[2], Shafeeq Ur Rehman[3]

*[*1]MPhil Scholar, Department of Arts & Humanities, Superior University, Lahore;*
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Arts & Humanities, Superior University, Lahore
[3]Lecturer, Department of Arts and Humanities Superior university

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23099702

Keywords
Leadership style, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, job satisfaction, primary teachers, correlational study, school management, teacher motivation.

Article History
Received: 30 January 2026
Accepted: 15 March 2026
Published: 31 March 2026

Copyright @Author
Corresponding Author: *
Sonia Rubab

Abstract
Primary school teachers' happiness with their jobs is closely chained to how their school leaders number and contend things. This study given questionnaires bayed MLQ and TJS to means how different leadership styles–like transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire–impress things. The results disport that transformational leadership significantly hefts teachers' happiness and motivation. Transactional leadership enjoys a slight positive link. On the other hand, a hands-off leadership style can glooms the happiness and loyalty of teachers and the overall team. The results disport that how leaders number enjoys a big effect on how happy primary teachers are with their jobs. Recommendations hint instruction school leaders how to cue in a way that buttresses teachers, aids them scent motivated, and amends their performance.

Institute for Excellence in Education & Research

INTRODUCTION:

Good school leadership is very important for raw material teachers happy, motivated, and able to charge their best work. This, in turn, enjoys a big effect on how well students master and the overall quality of the school (Bush, 2020; Leithwood et al., 2020). When teachers are happy, they lean to be more involved, creative, and dwell in their jobs longer. But if they are unhappy, they may scent exhausted and more likely to desert their positions (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2018). A leader's way of leading is a big factor in how satisfied people are. Studies disport that when leaders buck up, direct, and aid teachers cultivate, it directs to greater job satisfaction, loyalty, and erudition for teachers (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The results will mount important information to school leaders, government officials, and teachers. The aim is to aid leaders master better, backup school systems breed better, and breed environments that buttress teachers' happiness and amend the quality of education in primary schools.

Statement of the Problem

Teacher happiness is very important for a good primary education system, but many teachers scent unhappy because of too much work and bad leadership. How a leader behaves greatly impresses how motivated and happy teachers scent.

Transformational leadership brings well and transactional leadership can be useful, but laissez-faire leadership often forms teachers see unhappy about their job. There chances not enough understanding of how these styles specifically influence primary school teachers, especially in areas that live irregular, where there live often not enough resources available. This research gap forms it harder to bring good policies that can assist fete teachers and better their performance. This study communicates how different leadership styles influence the job satisfaction of primary school teachers, and it directs to furnish helpful information to better leadership programs and overall educational outcomes.

Research Objectives

- To examine the relationship between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction among primary school teachers.
- To investigate the relationship between transactional leadership style and job satisfaction among primary school teachers.
- To determine the relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction among primary school teachers

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The literature review incubates the stage by emphasizing the important link between different leadership styles and how satisfied teachers see about their jobs. In education, these two factors are really important because they directly influence how well schools grooms students, how much effort teachers dispose in, and how much energy students convert to knowledge (Leithwood et al., 2020). Good leadership contributes clear direction, aids teachers and students, and breeds a positive school environment that aids save good education (Bush, 2020). As schools get more complicated because of new rules and the need to disport results, commanding has made over from just contending to a more involved role that aids confect the school environment, impacts how teachers suppose and act, and amends overall success (Hallinger, 2018). So, wise how leadership actions impress how happy teachers are is really important for raw material schools better in the long run. This chapter breeds together around research about different leadership styles and how they impress teachers' job satisfaction, employing important theories and real studies to hatch the stage for the current research.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

This study is hung on two related theories: Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Theory (FRLT) and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction.

2.2.1 Full Range Leadership Theory (FRLT)

FRLT is a complete model that aids group and decide different leadership behaviors on a scale that comes from being not very involved to being very active.

It hints that different leadership styles—like transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire can impress how followers scent, what them, and how well they achieve (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational leadership concerns bucking up and authorizing those who succeed. Its four dimensions are:

2.3.1 Leadership Styles in Education

Laissez-faire leadership is generally harmful, chained to lower teacher effectiveness and higher levels of burnout (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2018). Teacher happiness approaches from both inside and outside the job. Inside factors comprehend emotion proud of their work and hands control over their teaching. Outside factors comprehend the school environment and support from school leaders. It disports a key role in estate teachers around, cinching good teaching, and aiding students master well (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Teachers who are happy with their jobs are usually more committed, creative, and good at what they do. On the other hand, emotion unhappy is connected to lost work, mastering tired from work, and closing the job, which can glooms the quality of education (Hong, 2012). There betides strong evidence exhibition that how leaders bear enjoys a big impact on how satisfied teachers are

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research

with their jobs. Transformational leadership is closely connected to greater satisfaction because it grasps care of both the things that people and the basic needs that commemorate them from emotion dissatisfied. Transactional leadership enjoys a less consistent and usually not as strong positive connection. Laissez-faire leadership enjoys a clear negative effect, which glooms job satisfaction and team morale (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Avolio & Bass, 1995). Even though there has been a lot of research completed, there exist still major areas that exist not well decided, especially when it approaches to primary education settings. A lot of research allows at secondary or higher education, but primary school environments, where basic skills are first indoctrinated, are not calculated as much (Hallinger, 2018). This gap is especially clear in places where education is still evolving, as leaders there agreement with specific problems such as limited resources and strong pressures on the system. There isn't enough research hung in specific locations that betrays how the three FRLT styles are chained to how happy primary school teachers are with their jobs in those settings.

Methodology

This chapter silhouettes the research methodology. The study habituated a correlational approach to feel how different leadership styles of primary school principals—such as transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire—influence the level of job satisfaction among teachers. Standardized questionnaires, such as the MLQ and TJS, were used to a group of primary school teachers. The data was broke down exercising statistical methods to experimentation the hypotheses. The chapter construes how the samples were dispose together, the tools habituated to contain data, the methods habituated to break down the information, and briefly stands in the ethical issues deliberate to jackleg sure the study is accurate and reliable.

Research Design and Approach.

This study exercises a quantitative correlational research design. This method brings well for exposure how strong and in what direction the link is between natural situation factors, like different leadership styles—such as transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire—and teacher job satisfaction as the outcome. A quantitative approach assists mount these ideas clearly and fairly by exercising questionnaires that are the same way every time. The correlational design brings well in educational settings because it assists detect connections between different things without irregular any of the factors detailed. It helps ID key links between how leaders offer signals and how happy people are, reliable and useful information to mount wise decisions in school leadership.

Population & Sampling.

This study fastens on primary school teachers who bring in both public and private schools in a certain area. To jackleg sure the results are fair and accurate, around 150 to 200 teachers will be chosen at random from the group. This method of election samples assists bring data quickly while fettle the accuracy essential for solid correlation and retrogression analysis, stuff the results useful for the bigger group overall.

Data Analysis

4.2.1 Gender of Participants

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	60	40%
Female	90	60%
Total	150	100%

Out of the 150 teachers in the sample, 90 were female, which is 60%, and 60 were male, which is 40%. Most people in this group were between 30 and 39 years old, raw material up 40% of the total,

which is 60 people. The next largest group was those ancient 20 to 29, who fashioned up 30% of the total, which is 45 people. Teachers between the ages of 40 and 49 fashioned up 20% of the group, which is 30 teachers. The smallest group was teachers who were 50 years old or older, raw material up 10% of the group, which is 15 teachers. The sample is mostly fashioned up of women who are in the middle of their careers.

Teaching Experience

Teaching experience provides insight into whether professional tenure affects job satisfaction and perception of leadership.

Experience (Years)	Frequency	Percentage
0–5	30	20%
6–10	50	33%
11–15	40	27%
16+	30	20%
Total	150	100%

The sample's teaching experience was circulate out like this: 33% of them, which is 50 people, enjoyed between 6 and 10 years of experience, and 27%, which is 40 people, enjoyed between 11 and 15 years. Participants who enjoyed between 0 to 5 years of experience and those with 16 or more years each fashioned up 20% of the sample, with 30 people in each group.

IEER
Institute of Excellence in Education & Research

School Type

Examining school type helps comprehend differences in leadership practices between public and private primary schools.

School Type	Frequency	Percentage
Public	80	53%
Private	70	47%
Total	150	100%

Grade Level Taught

Grade Level	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
Grade 1	*25*	*17%*
Grade 2	*30*	*20%*
Grade 3	*25*	*17%*
Grade 4	*25*	*17%*
Grade 5	*25*	*17%*
Grade 6	*20*	*13%*
Total	*150*	*100%*

Teachers were disseminate out among the primary grade levels, with Grade 2 keeping the most teachers at 20%, which imports 30 teachers in total. Grades 1, 3, 4, and 5 each held the same percentage of 17%, with a total of 25 students. Grade 6 held the smallest number of students, stuff up 13% of the total, which is 20 students. This communicates that the sample is fairly balanced across most grade levels, but there live a bit more teachers from lower primary, specifically Grade 2, and a little fewer teachers from upper primary, which is Grade 6.

Educational Qualifications

Educational educations indicate the qualified preparation of participants, which may effect their expectations from school leadership.

Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
B.Ed	70	47%
M.Ed	60	40%
Other	20	13%
Total	150	100%

Most of the people who rejoined enjoyed official teaching certificates: 47% (which is 70 people) enjoyed a B.Ed degree, and 40% (which is 60 people) enjoyed an M.Ed. The dwelling 13%, or 20 people, were in an "Other" group, which could comprehend special degrees or diplomas akin to specific subjects. This betrays that the sample is highly qualified, as 87% enjoy a estimable teaching certification, and about 40% enjoy bypast on to reverie at the graduate level.

Transformational Leadership

It presents the mean scores and standard deviations for items measuring transformational leadership.

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
My school leader inspires teachers to achieve high standards.	4.32	0.61
My school leader encourages innovative teaching methods.	4.21	0.68
My school leader provides individual support to teachers.	4.15	0.72
My school leader communicates a clear and motivating vision for the school.	4.28	0.65
My school leader fosters teamwork and collaboration among staff.	4.20	0.69

Teachers offered their leaders the highest scores for bucking up them to keep up high standards, with an average of 4.32 and a standard deviation of 0.61, and for clearly clearing the direction the school should succeed, with an average of 4.23 and a standard deviation of 0.64. Encouraging innovation (M=4.21, SD=0.68) and forwarding teamwork (M=4.20, SD=0.69) were also earned very well. The lowest average score was for feeding individual support, with a mean of 4.15 and a standard deviation of 0.72. All the standard deviations were under 1, exhibition a strong agreement. Overall, leaders are caught as most effective when they hatch inspiring goals and direct the way, but individuals is an area where they could amend.

Transactional Leadership

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
My school leader provides clear rules and guidelines for teachers.	3.95	0.74
My school leader rewards teachers for meeting performance expectations.	3.88	0.77
My school leader monitors teacher performance and provides corrective feedback when necessary.	3.90	0.71
My school leader ensures tasks are completed according to set standards.	3.92	0.69
My school leader addresses issues only when problems arise.	3.80	0.81

Teachers enjoy a somewhat positive view of their leaders' transactional behaviors. Clear rules and being clung accountable for consummating tasks were earned the highest (M=3.95 and 3.92). Performance monitoring and rewards were also celebrated, with scores of 3.90 and 3.88. The least well-earned part was dickering with problems only when they circumstance (M=3.80), which also enjoyed the biggest difference in opinions (SD=0.81), exhibition that some teachers experience leadership as replying to issues after they befall instead of brutal to forestallment them beforehand.

4.3.3 Laissez-Faire Leadership

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
My school leader avoids making important decisions.	2.15	0.82
My school leader provides little guidance or support to teachers.	2.08	0.85
My school leader is often absent or uninvolved in school matters.	2.12	0.79

My school leader does not intervene when problems occur.	2.05	0.88
Teachers are largely left to manage their work without leadership direction.	2.10	0.80

Teachers suppose their school leader is really complicated and beseems a good job. The most highly celebrated behaviors were transformational, like atmosphere high standards and participating a clear vision, exhibition strong support through inspiration. Transactional behaviors, like atmosphere clear rules and agreeing on performance, were also there but not as strong, exhibition a mix of structure and responsibility. Laissez-faire behaviors mastered very low scores, exhibition that the leader isn't caught as passive or not complicated. The overall style alloys transformational and transactional methods.

4.3.4 Teacher Job Satisfaction

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
I feel recognized and appreciated for my contributions as a teacher.	4.10	0.68
I have good relationships with my colleagues.	4.25	0.64
I am satisfied with professional development opportunities.	3.88	0.71
I feel supported by my school leader in my teaching practice.	4.12	0.66
I have autonomy in making instructional decisions in my classroom.	3.95	0.70
My workload is manageable and reasonable.	3.82	0.73
My teaching environment allows me to perform effectively.	3.96	0.68
I am satisfied with the compensation and benefits I receive.	3.70	0.75
I feel motivated and engaged in my teaching role.	4.05	0.67

Using Pearson correlation for inferential analysis disported that there exist important connections between leadership styles and how satisfied teachers exist with their jobs. There betides a strong positive link between transformational leadership and satisfaction, exhibition that this leadership style significantly amends teachers' well-being. Transactional leadership disported a moderate positive correlation. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership was institute to enjoy a strong negative link with job satisfaction, exhibition that it enjoys a harmful effect. All the connections disported a significant statistical result with a p-value less than 0.05. These results disport that the way leaders act enjoys a big effect on how happy and motivated teachers scent.

Pearson Correlation Analysis

Leadership Style	Teacher Job Satisfaction (r)	Significance (p)
Transformational	0.68	0.001
Transactional	0.52	0.001
Laissez-Faire	-0.34	0.002

How a leader behaves enjoys a big impact on how happy teachers scent about their jobs. Transformational leadership is strongly connected to positive outcomes, with a correlation of r=0.68 and a p-value less than 0.001. Transactional leadership is somewhat connected to positive outcomes, with a correlation of 0.52 that is statistically significant. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership is connected to lower satisfaction, with a correlation of r = -0.34 and a p-value less than 0.01. Good leadership that really breeds aids amend teachers' happiness and fashions the work environment better.

ANOVA for Regression Model

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	34.28	3	11.43	67.78	0.001
Residual	33.98	146	0.23		
Total	68.26	149			

Interpretation:
The regression model is statistically significant ($F(3,146) = 67.78$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the combined effect of leadership styles reliably predicts teacher job satisfaction.

Summary of Multiple Regression Findings

Transformational leadership is the most important factor, then transactional leadership, but laissez-faire leadership lowers satisfaction. These results exhibit that keeping leaders who are detailed, encouraging, and inspiring can really assist better teachers' happiness, involvement, and satisfaction with their jobs.

Discussion, Conclusion and Future Recommendations

This part breeds together the results to disport how different leadership styles are chained to how satisfied primary school teachers are with their jobs, hung on Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Theory and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. The study betrays that transformational leadership is closely connected to higher job satisfaction. Teachers who experience their leaders as inspiring, supportive, and encouraging scent more motivated, cultivate more in their jobs, and enjoy better overall happiness, which fellows what earlier studies enjoy institute (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transactional leadership disported a moderate positive correlation. Clear rules, estate track of performance, and nurturing rewards when certain conditions are chanced help people scent satisfied by sacrifice a structured and accountable environment, which with Herzberg's hygiene factors that stop people from emotion dissatisfied. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership was strongly connected to lower job satisfaction. When leaders don't feed clear direction, enough support, or get complicated, teachers get frustrated and their spirits broke off, exhibition how harmful it is when leaders are not active or bespoke.

Discussion of Findings.

This study's findings clearly mount the key link between how school leaders hack their schools and how satisfied primary teachers are with their jobs, which with existent theories and earlier research. The analysis exhibited a strong positive connection ($r = 0.68$, $p < 0.001$) between transformational leadership and satisfaction, with raw materials being the biggest factor that influences satisfaction. This result reverses up Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Theory, exhibition that leaders who hatch high standards, participate a clear vision, cultivate learning and growth, and mount personal support can greatly heft teachers' internal motivation and job satisfaction, which fellows Herzberg's ideas about what people. Along with this, transactional leadership enjoyed a moderate positive link ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.001$), exhibition that atmosphere clear expectations, estate track of performance, and nurturing rewards hung on results aid add satisfaction. This is because these actions breed a clear structure and sense of responsibility, which are calculated hygiene factors by Herzberg. These factors don't backup people happy, but they aid duck unhappiness. In sharp contrast, laissez-faire leadership enjoyed a strong negative link ($r = -0.34$, $p < 0.01$) with job satisfaction. This quiet, ducking way of acting, which doesn't proposal any help or direction, doesn't mount teachers anything that them or fashions their job easier. This imports teachers are not fully skilled, are not very happy with their jobs, and don't really understand what they're evident to be expensive. This communicates how poor this style really is, since both theory models emphasize that. These results assist chalk up the main goals of the study by exposure how each type of leadership is compounded to teacher satisfaction and by emphasizing how important it is to hold leaders who are complex and proactive. The real point is this: to bring a good place for teachers where they see championed, hang around longer, and better student results, school leaders hypodermic needle to capital on buoying leadership. They should intentionally bring on fair and their teams while fettle the basic systems rolling smoothly. They also hypodermic needle to elude careless or uninterested attitudes. This chow knowledge furnishes a clear method to mount leaders and assist bring better policies that can better the quality of primary education.

Recommendations.

This study proffers helpful ideas for school leaders, government workers, and researchers to

better the happiness of primary school teachers by irregular how leadership is concluded. School leaders should capital on transformational methods by a participated vision, fair smart learning, and victim special support custom-made to each student. At the same time, they should deduce things like clear rules and ongoing feedback to jackleg sure everyone grips responsibility and brings towards their goals. It's really important that they don't deathly bad things episode because they're not gripping an active role in first. They exercise hypodermic methods to corroborate up clear choices and regularly memorialize expatiating with everyone detailed, which can be complex. Policymakers should assist school leaders deduce how to frolic a role in training that assists them grooms for major changes and bring rewards that mount and forward good teaching. They should also deposit in place ways to tab how well school leaders are action their jobs. For the research community, future studies should employ bigger and more varied groups of people from different areas and types of schools, like public versus private. To backup the results more general and applicable, it's better to employ private data. Also, employing long-term studies aids decide how leadership actions impress teachers' well-being over time. To breed a supportive and bright school environment, leaders hypodermic to difference their approach and get more involved and inspiring. They should dislocate away from uninterested or distant styles of leadership to aid teachers scent motivated and amend overall education results in a lasting way.

Conclusion.

This study appeared at how different leadership styles impress how satisfied primary school teachers are with their jobs, hung on data from 150 teachers. The study given Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Theory along with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory to grill the data, bearing Pearson correlation and multiple regression methods. The study disported that transformational leadership is closely connected to higher teacher satisfaction, exhibition how it aids chance important personal goals such as being estimable and hands opportunities to cultivate. Transactional leadership enjoyed a moderate positive connection, sacrifice critical structure but not much in terms of motivation. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership disported a strong negative connection, exhibition how not being complicated or active as a leader can pain how happy and motivated teachers scent. The study brings out that hands a leader who is energetic and motivating is very important. School leaders hypodermic to cultivate bucking up behaviors while estate strict and clear systems in place, and they must carefully duck being too hands-off or not complicated. Policymakers should base on feeding training to cultivate leadership skills and breed systems that proposal support and encouragement. These recommendations are hung on chow evidence and are expressed to breed better school environments, support teachers' health and happiness, and eventually cue to better quality primary education.

REFERENCES

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 6*(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90035-7

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2016). *Research in education* (12th ed.). Pearson.

Bush, T. (2020). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52*(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863

Dinham, S., & Scott, C. (1998). A three-domain model of teacher and school executive career satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration, 36*(4), 362–378. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239810226787

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46*(1), 5–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217731110

Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley & Sons.

Hong, J. Y. (2012). Why do some beginning teachers leave the school, and others stay? *Educational Review, 64*(2), 103–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2011.580949

Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(2), 201–233. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311403323

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755–768. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management, 40*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077

Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Schumacker, R. (2020). How school leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 56*(4), 606–642. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20944690

Nguni, S., Sleegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 145–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565732

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2018). Job satisfaction and teacher motivation: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*, 152–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.09.007

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 199-218.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

Bush, T. (2020). Theories of educational leadership and management. *SAGE Publications Ltd*.

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research

Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221-258.

Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(3), 333-356.

Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5-24.

Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley & Sons.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Sage publications.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5-22.

Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 387-423.

Nguni, S., Sleegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 145-177.

Odeo, I. (2019). Leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction in public primary schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 11(2), 12-22.

Owens, R. G., & Valesky, T. C. (2015). *Organizational behavior in education: Leadership and school reform* (11th ed.). Pearson.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(6), 1029-1038.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological Reports*, 114(1), 68-77.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2018). Job demands and job resources as predictors of teacher motivation and well-being. *Social Psychology of Education*, 21(5), 1251-1275.

Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(1), 80–92

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.

IEER Institute for Excellence in Education & Research

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.

Klassen, R. M., Bong, M., Usher, E. L., Chong, W. H., Huan, V. S., Wong, I. Y., & Georgiou, T. (2009). Exploring the validity of a teachers' self-efficacy scale in five countries. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 34(1), 67-76.

Leithwood, K., & Beatty, B. (2008). *Leading with teacher emotions in mind*. Corwin Press.

Madigan, D. J., & Kim, L. E. (2021). Does teacher burnout affect students? A systematic review of its association with academic achievement and student-reported outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 105, 101714.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 103-111.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.

Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29(1), 38-54.

Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). School leadership and student achievement: The mediating effects of teacher beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(3), 798-822.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Dimensions of teacher burnout: Relations with potential stressors at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 20(4), 775-790.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

Thoonen, E. E., Sleegers, P. J., Oort, F. J., Peetsma, T. T., & Geijsel, F. P. (2011). How to improve teaching practices: The role of teacher motivation, organizational factors, and leadership practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(3), 496-536

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research