Change Fatigue and Leadership Influences

by

Samuel Deschenes

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Psychology

Middle Tennessee State University
August 2019

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Patrick McCarthy, Chair

Dr. Michael Hein

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, thank you to my family and friends for their continued support throughout this entire process. I especially would like to thank my fiancé Kendall for supporting and encouraging me while we have been apart for this journey. I also want to thank my parents Martin and Jennifer for always listening and encouraging me from beginning to the end.

Second, I wanted thank all the faculty that have helped me complete this thesis. Thank you Dr. McCarthy for guiding me throughout the entire process and especially for the time and effort you have given me here at the end. Dr. Hein and Dr. Van Hein, thank you for your constructive help in developing the thesis into the final product it is today. Lastly, thank you Dr. Frame for his encouragement towards the end in helping me finish when I did not think I would able to.

ABSTRACT

Change fatigue is a developing concept that addresses the response individuals have when they perceive that too much change is occurring. As organizational change becomes more prevalent, more organizations and researchers are interested in understanding the influential factors impacting change fatigue in order to limit the negative effects. The current study, sampled from Tennessee public school educators, sought to understand some of the influential factors that may either increase or decrease the likelihood of change fatigue occurring. First, the results found that individual characteristics, culture-types, and leadership influences have significant relationships with change fatigue. Second, the relationship between culture-types, leadership, and change fatigue was further analyzed with moderation analysis to understand their complex relationships. While moderation was not found in the relationships, the study contributes to the growing body of knowledge around change fatigue and offers new directions for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

v

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I: LITERATURE REVIEW

Culture is "a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group … as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel" (Schein, 2010, p. 18). Organizational culture has a significant influence on employees by relationship with the organization, peers, leaders, and the work itself (Beer & Walton, 1987; Goodman, Zammuto, & Gifford, 2001; Jex & Britt, 2014). This influence spreads across all the domains of an organization including change initiatives such that culture has been found to significantly influence the success and outcomes of change within organizations (Beer & Walton, 1987; Goodman et al., 2001; Leuschke, 2017; Perel, 2015).

Change has become a constant for many organizations as they seek to understand and implement the latest and greatest ideas. These changes are usually motivated by survival in competitive markets, improving poor performance, or organizational self-improvement (Jex & Britt, 2014). Change initiatives are generally implemented with good intentions for organizations and individuals, and success stories can be found throughout the media. Change does not come without a cost, and negative outcomes of change have become more apparent as change has become more frequent. Employees tasked with implementing change are frequently underprepared and overwhelmed with the change process (Austin, 1997), and researchers have begun to understanding how change initiatives are leading to significant outcomes such as burnout, cynicism, change resistance, and change fatigue. While these are all potential outcomes of change, the current study seeks to better understand and develop the concept of change fatigue.

This study builds upon the foundational work of Perel (2015) and Leuschke (2017) that looked into the relationship of culture and change fatigue. Perel (2015) found a

relationship between organizational culture and change fatigue that suggests that organizational culture influences the likelihood of experiencing change fatigue. Through the Competing Values Framework (Goodman et al., 2001), Perel (2015) identified that groups cultures focusing on support and empowerment tend to experience less change fatigue while rational cultures that promote competition, efficiency, and performance tend to experience more change fatigue. Leuschke (2017) continued to confirm these findings while revealing how person-organization fit partially mediates the relationship between culture and change fatigue.

Leuschke (2017) also studied change fatigue specifically within the field of education. While school culture had been hypothesized as a significant influence on educator outcomes such as school norms, colleague relationships, student learning, and professional satisfaction (Teasley, 2017), Leuschke (2017) studied how school culture may be related to change fatigue. Because educators are exposed to numerous sources of stress and change, they are highly vulnerable to experiencing the negative outcomes of strain (Klusmann, Richter, & Lüdtke, 2016).

Strain has led to outcomes such as the lack of stability and attrition within education. Within the 2011-2012 school year, 16% of public educators either moved positions or left the profession. (Goldring, Taie, & Riddles, 2014). Attrition in teaching is higher than nursing, engineering, and law (Ingersoll, Merrill, & Stuckey, 2014). With such high turnover, the educators who stay face more strain as they deal with the change. While coping with turnover issues, educators continually have to deal with change externally from the educational system. By the nature of school governance, schools may be influenced by the national, state, or local government (Zeehandelaar et al., 2015). Elected

officials often have an exaggerated belief about what educators can accomplish, and educational reform frequently changes from fad to fad (Good & Lavigne, 2015). This change is often compounded by principles' authority to implement change as they see fit within a school. Because of the lack of communication between these power sources, multiple change initiatives may overlap and add to existing stress of teaching (Stauffer & Mason, 2013). As a consequence of all the change, change fatigue has been identified in educators (Leuschke, 2017; Orlando, 2014). In continuation of Leuschke (2017), the current study seeks to look more deeply into the relationship of change fatigue in education.

Change Fatigue

   Definition and characteristics. Change fatigue is a still relatively new concept within the change literature and research is continuing to discover new facets about the topic. This recent development has created several different definitions for the concept (Bernerth, Walker, & Harris, 2011; Dilkes, Gray, & Cunningham, 2014; Elving, Hansma, & De Boer, 2011; McMillan & Perron, 2013; Stensaker, Meyer, Falkenberg, & Haueng, 2002). Some researchers have maintained a simple definition of the perception of too much change (Bernerth et al., 2011) while others have sought to focus their definitions on the outcomes of change fatigue (Dilkes et al., 2014; Elving et al., 2011; McMillan & Perron, 2013; Stensaker et al., 2002). Change fatigue is related to feelings of stress and burnout (McMillan & Perron, 2013), and the feelings may lead to adaptive failure during the change process and less enthusiasm in response to change efforts (Dilkes et al., 2014). Change leaves the individual feeling overwhelmed which can lead to organizational chaos if the feeling is widespread (Stensaker et al., 2002). For this study, change fatigue

will be defined as an individual's perception of too much change leading to a stressed, negative response to the change initiative.

This definition captures the key features of change fatigue that help differentiate change fatigue from other similar concepts such as change resistance, change cynicism, psychological uncertainty, and burnout. Change fatigue is different from change resistance because of the active response of change resistance (McMillan & Perron, 2013). Change fatigue tends to manifest through a passive response by accepting the organizational change that impacts the employee's daily work life (McMillan & Perron, 2013). While change fatigue may eventually lead to change resistance (Stensaker et al., 2002), they are different constructs.

Change fatigue is also conceptually different from change cynicism (Bernerth et al., 2011; Elving et al., 2011). While change cynicism tends to focus on the likelihood of success and blaming individuals for failure, change fatigue mainly focuses on the amount of change and the ensuring stress (Bernerth et al., 2011). Psychological uncertainty is different from change fatigue through the temporal focus of the change. Psychological uncertainty deals with the individual's ability to predict the future accurately while change fatigue focus on the present overload of change (Bernerth et al., 2011). Finally, change fatigue is related to burnout through antecedents and consequences. However, change fatigue is a possible antecedent to burnout, and burnout is a consequence of experiencing change fatigue (Bernerth et al., 2011). While change fatigue is related many of these constructs, change fatigue has developed into a unique construct with distinguishable antecedents, consequences, and characteristics.

Theoretical structure of change fatigue. Change fatigue has been purposed to operate within the Conservation of Resources Model (Bernerth et al., 2011). In the original model, an individual experiences psychological stress and uses resources to cope with the stress (Hobfoll, 1989). Psychological stress is a reaction to the environmental conditions which there is a real or perceived threat of losing resources. Resources are objects, characteristics, conditions, or energies that are valued by the individual (Hobfoll, 1989). Individuals continually strive for a net gain of resources, but some circumstance arise when individuals must use their resources without replenishing them. If this loss of resources continues, an individual will experience a depletion of resources and consequently exhaustion. In order to avoid this outcome, individuals try to conserve their resources to have a positive net outcomes or develop new resources.

Change fatigue integrates within the model because change can be a source of stress. The psychological stress comes from the possible outcomes of change and the threats these outcomes pose to resources (Hobfoll, 1989). Change outcomes may pose a threat to one's job, promotions, time, or status which are all considered resources (Hobfoll, 1989). Thus, perceiving change as a threat to these resources leads to psychological stress. When change occurs frequently and individuals chronically experience psychological stress, their resources become depleted if they are unable to conserve or gain resources. When this depletion is caused by the chronic change, change fatigue can occur.

Antecedents of change fatigue. Because change fatigue can be experienced when resources are depleted (Bernerth et al., 2011), understanding what depletes change coping resources will lead to identifying the antecedents. Researchers have most

frequently cited excessive change as an antecedent for change fatigue (Bernerth et al., 2011; Elving et al., 2011; McMillan & Perron, 2013; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006; Stensaker et al., 2002). Excessive change has been described as "situations where several, seemingly unrelated, and sometimes conflicting changes are undertaken simultaneously, and where new change are introduced before ongoing ones are completed (with) little of any time spent on reaping the benefits of change, or allowing routine to take over" (Johnson, Bareil, Giraud, & Autissier, 2016, p. 740-741). These situations would likely lead to a perception of too much change because of the resource depletion involved with maintaining performance and coping with the outcomes of the change. Factors influencing excessive change are the number, duration, uncertainty, magnitude, and importance of change (Bernerth et al., 2011; Glick, Huber, Miller, Doty, & Sutcliffe, 1990; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006). While excessive change can be a significant antecedent of change fatigue, emotional exhaustion has also been understood to influence change fatigue (Arens & Morin, 2016). Emotional exhaustion is a consequence of depleted coping resources. If an individual is experiencing emotional exhaustion, this state will limit an individual's ability to deal with change by limiting the coping resources available to deal with change. Emotional exhaustion effectively will lower the threshold of change necessary to experience change fatigue by acting as a moderator to the relationship. These two factors act as antecedents for change fatigue influencing change a stressor or the coping resources available to deal with the stressor.

      Outcomes of change fatigue. Change fatigue has also be associated with several different outcomes that have impacts for both the organization and the individual. Related to organizations, change fatigue is associated with increases in turnover (Ead, 2015;

Stensaker et al., 2002) and turnover intention (Bernerth et al., 2011) while decreasing organizational commitment (Bernerth et al., 2011; Ead, 2015) and effectiveness (Stensaker et al., 2002). Change fatigue can limit or completely inhibit change reform (Dilkes et al., 2014).

For the individual, change fatigue has personal consequences such as increased strain, withdrawal, and exhaustion (Bernerth et al., 2011; Ead, 2015) while decreasing satisfaction and motivation (Stensaker et al., 2002). Experiencing a significant amount of psychological stress can increase an individual's risk of psychological and physical illness (Hart, 2009)

A particular worry of change fatigue is developing burnout. Change fatigue has been linked to increased likelihood of burnout (Bernerth et al., 2011), and the consequence related to burnout are also quite severe. While burnout has some similar consequences to change fatigue such as increased turnover (including intention) and decreased satisfaction (Arens & Morin, 2016; Maslach, 2017; Y. Wang et al., 2015), burnout also includes other unique outcomes. Burnout has been related to poor physical health outcomes and increased risk for mental illness such as depression and anxiety (Arens & Morin, 2016; Maslach, 2017; Y. Wang et al., 2015). Decreased productivity and performance have also been related to burnout (Klusmann et al., 2016; Maslach, 2017; Y. Wang et al., 2015). For educators, burnout has been shown to increase absenteeism and depersonalization while decreasing class preparation (Klusmann et al., 2016). Burnout is a broader concept compared to change fatigue, but burnout and change fatigue tend to operate in a similar manner. Consequently, a significant amount of change fatigue literature comes from developments within burnout literature.

Change fatigue has been showing to have significant impacts in organizations, and as organizations continue to adapt and change, understanding the impacts of change fatigue will be important to keep employees engaged, productive, and committed.

Influential Factors of Change Fatigue

While literature has been sparse on how to limit change fatigue, a few researchers have hypothesized ways to help limit the effects of excessive change (Stensaker et al., 2002). The primary way to reduce change fatigue would be to limit the number of changes that an organization implements. While this primary intervention would directly addresses the issue, limiting change is an unlikely solution given the current trends and benefits that adaptive and competitive changes can give an organization. Secondary interventions focusing on reducing the impact of change are the most common. Organizations tend to focus on how the change are introduced, communicated, and completed (Stensaker et al., 2002). Altering the change process with better planning may alleviate some of the issues associated with change fatigue such as uncertainty and duration. Tertiary interventions may seek to increase employee's capacity for change (Stensaker et al., 2002). Since the employees are affected by the change and change is unlikely to slow, organizations can try to prepare the recipients of change initiatives to decrease the likelihood of change fatigue while also increasing the likelihood of successful change implementation. Examples of tertiary interventions may be voluntary EAPs or other work-life balance initiatives. These secondary and tertiary interventions would allow for the change to continue at the current rate, and mitigate the negative effects of the change. While these are general approaches to influence change fatigue,

this study seeks to identify specific factors that may significantly influence change fatigue.

Leadership influence on change fatigue. Leadership has been credited for having significant influence within the change process (Beil-Hildebrand, 2005; Leithwood, 1994; McMillan & Perron, 2013; Smollan, 2017; Stordeur, D'hoore, & Vandenberghe, 2001) and influence on emotional exhaustion (Stordeur et al., 2001). Because leaders are the most salient individual in the work environment, they often represent the organization and influence subordinate behaviors (Stordeur et al., 2001). Few studies have researched the specific leadership behaviors that may influence change fatigue (McMillan & Perron, 2013).

Leaders can have a negative influence on subordinate outcomes (Stordeur et al., 2001) by becoming a source of stress for the subordinates (Boyas, Wind, & Kang, 2012). The stress of change plus the added stress from the leadership can increase the likelihood of emotional exhaustion for subordinates (Stordeur et al., 2001; Y. Wang et al., 2015) which is linked to change fatigue (Arens & Morin, 2016). Leaders may also develop poor relationships with subordinates leading to loneliness and exclusion among subordinates (Y. Wang et al., 2015). The social isolation may in turn increase employees stress because of a lack of social help.

While leaders could have a negative influence on subordinate outcomes, they have been found to have a positive influence on change (Stordeur et al., 2001). Subordinate participation and communication have been identified as ways that leaders can positively influence the change process. Leaders that can increase subordinate involvement in the change process can limit the negative effects of change (Boyas et al.,

2012; Bruckman, 2008; Elving et al., 2011; Frahm & Brown, 2007; Leithwood, 1994; Stauffer & Mason, 2013). Subordinates generally perceive change as coming from upper management, and the lack of participation in the change process has been found to have a strong effect on change fatigue (Elving et al., 2011). Involving subordinates in the change process can improve commitment to the change (Bruckman, 2008; Leithwood, 1994) and limit frustration (Frahm & Brown, 2007). Stauffer and Mason (2013) recommend using shared decision making process to limit the stress educators face. With subordinate influence, leaders can reduce subordinate job stress and increase trust (Boyas et al., 2012).

A key factor of the previous influence was communication, and communication has been credited with limiting the negative effects of change (Beer & Walton, 1987; Bruckman, 2008; Elving et al., 2011; Frahm & Brown, 2007; MacIntosh, Beech, McQueen, & Reid, 2007; Stauffer & Mason, 2013). When leaders stimulate quality communication with the subordinates, the subordinates are able to understand the plan, become involved in the process, and accept the goals (Elving et al., 2011). Communication is important for helping subordinates understand the reason for the change and the merits of the decision (MacIntosh et al., 2007). When the value of the change is communicated, subordinates are more likely to be inspired and committed to the change (Beer & Walton, 1987; Frahm & Brown, 2007). Without good communication, change fatigue is more like to be experienced because subordinates are unaware of the change implementation which creates disorientation and dysfunction among the subordinates (Elving et al., 2011). For this study the leadership influence will be isolated to understand the effects of the principal of a school as they are generally

considered the primary leader of a school and the supervisor of the teachers. These leadership behaviors have led to the following hypotheses for this study:

Hypothesis 1a. Perceived participation in change process will be negatively related to change fatigue.

Hypothesis 1b. Perceived principal communication will be negatively related to change fatigue.

While these behaviors have been found to have a significant influence, leaders may also limit change fatigue by the relationships they form with subordinates. Leaders that establish fairness, trust, and support with their subordinates can influence their subordinates' reactions to change. Promoting fairness within the organization can limit the stress and politics of change for subordinates (Boyas et al., 2012). This fairness is especially important when the change involves consolidating positions and termination (MacIntosh et al., 2007). Trust is also important for limiting the negative effects of change (Beer & Walton, 1987; Boyas et al., 2012; Bruckman, 2008; Frahm & Brown, 2007; Stensaker & Meyer, 2012; Stordeur et al., 2001). A lack of trust in the leadership can lead subordinates to be cynical and only focus on themselves during the change (Stensaker & Meyer, 2012). This trust can be developed by being reliable and meeting the goals of change (Beer & Walton, 1987). Leaders also can influence subordinates in the change process by giving support and recognition (Beer & Walton, 1987; Bruckman, 2008; Stauffer & Mason, 2013; Stordeur et al., 2001). When leaders acknowledge the stress of change, actively listen to subordinate concerns, and recognize good performance, they can limit the stress of subordinates (Stauffer & Mason, 2013). When subordinates have high emotional investment and are rarely recognized for their efforts, a

lack of support can be perceived as a source of stress (Stordeur et al., 2001). On the other side, leaders have the capability to meaningfully advocate for subordinate self-regard and self-efficacy to handle organizational change (Beer & Walton, 1987; Syrek, Apostel, & Antoni, 2013).

Leaders may have the most significant impact on employee reactions to the stress of change (Syrek et al., 2013). Leaders have the ability to influence how subordinates cope with stressors, and can enhance the conservation model of subordinate (Syrek et al., 2013). Given the current climate and trends, organizations are likely to not limit change so leaders could be a potential means to help limit the effects of these stressors (Syrek et al., 2013). With these considerations, studying the effect leaders have on change fatigue may prove to be a fruitful pursuit. Again, the current study will isolate leadership to the role of school principals. The literature on leadership relationships have led to the following hypotheses for this study:

Hypothesis 2a. Perceived principal fairness will be negatively related to change fatigue

Hypothesis 2b. Perceived trust in principal will be negatively related to change fatigue.

Hypothesis 2c. Perceived principal support will be negatively related to change fatigue.

Peer support influence on change fatigue. Peer support has been credited with a significant effect within the change process (Austin, 1997; Scheck & Kinicki, 2000; Smollan, 2017), but few studies have directly looked at the relationship of peer support's effect within change fatigue. Peer support has been defined as the "interpersonal

exchanges of affect, affirmation, and aid" (Smollan, 2017). Peer support has the ability to help change stressful situations, change the appraisal of the stressful situation, or mitigate the emotional effects (Smollan, 2017).

Occasionally, the peer support influences are not necessarily positive. An individual with poor relationships with their colleges is more likely to experience loneliness and exclusion, especially among teachers (Y. Wang et al., 2015). Peer support can also have a significant effect on an individual's health and well-being both positively and negatively (Y. Wang et al., 2015).

While peers can have a negative effect, generally having peers and friends to support stress at work have been associated with positive outcomes. Peers support can have positive effects when they become an outlet for frustrations (Austin, 1997). Peers can also can be a significant source of learning through sharing experiences (Austin, 1997). Peers can also be a source of information about current trends and changes (Austin, 1997) which in turn could alleviate some of the stress associated with change. Within the conservation of resources model, emotional support from peers has been linked to resupplying coping resources (Austin, 1997; Scheck & Kinicki, 2000), and cohesiveness has been correlated with the intensity of emotional exhaustion (Gaines & Jermier, 1983). Professional learning communities have been found to limit stress among teachers (Orlando, 2014).

Peer support should consequently have a significant influence on limiting the effects of change fatigue. Social support is able to change the nature of the stress, influence the appraisal process, and/ or impact the coping resources available to successfully handle the change. By influencing these factors, peer support should be able

to mitigate the negative side effects of constant change while still fully participating in the change process. These findings led to the following hypothesis for the study:

Hypothesis 3. Perceived peer support will be negatively related to change fatigue.

Work locus of control influence on change fatigue. Generally, locus of control is the extent that an individual believes that their actions have a direct influence on the personal consequences. Consequently, having an internal locus of control means the individual feels they have direct influences over their personal rewards and consequences. An external locus of control would mean an individual feels outside influence on their rewards and consequences. Having a high internal locus of control has been associated with positive life outcomes such as increased life satisfaction, increased problem-focus coping, and decreased in strain (Q. Wang, Bowling, & Eschleman, 2010).

Extending beyond general locus of control, Spector (1988) developed a work locus of control scale that specifically measures locus of control within the setting of an individual's work. Thus, work locus of control is "the extent to which people attribute rewards at work to their own behavior" (Q. Wang et al., 2010). Work locus of control has been shown to influence several work related opinions and outcomes. When the ordinal scale was developed, it was shown to significantly influence job satisfaction, organizational commitment, autonomy, role stress and turnover intention (Spector, 1988).

Work locus of control has been an influential factor of numerous organizational and personal outcomes. Higher internal work locus of control is related to an increase in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, social support, and job performance (Ng, Sorensen, & Eby, 2006; Q. Wang et al., 2010). Internal work locus of control decreases tension, role stress, absenteeism, and turnover intention (Ng et al., 2006; Q. Wang et al.,

2010). Work locus of control has been shown to have a stronger relationship to these organizational outcomes comparatively to general locus of control (Q. Wang et al., 2010).

Most significantly to change fatigue, work locus of control has been shown to limit burnout (Bitsadze & Japaridze, 2016; Ng et al., 2006; Q. Wang et al., 2010). As explained earlier, burnout is a similar concept to change fatigue, and burnout is a consequence of change fatigue. If work locus of control is able to mitigate the effects of burnout, work locus of control may have a similar effect on the change process by mitigating change fatigue. By having a belief that one can control their outcomes of change, an employee may be more likely to not succumb to the relentless change process and experience change fatigue. These finding lead to the following hypothesis for the study.

Hypothesis 4. Internal work locus of control will be negatively related to change fatigue.

Perceived source of changed influences on change fatigue. Leuschke's (2017) study into change fatigue in education had a few surprising findings that will be further explored in this current study. Using the Competing Values Framework, Leuschke (2017) found support for group and developmental culture-type schools having a negative relationship with change fatigue. The study also found that a hierarchical culture-type had a negative relationship with change fatigue (Leuschke, 2017). The findings with hierarchical culture-types was surprising given Perel's (2015) findings which found that hierarchical culture-type lead to positive relationship with change fatigue. The difference in results was a topic of discussion for Leuschke's (2017) study. Some respondents of Leuschke's survey provided unsolicited feedback about the nature of the change

experienced at their school which provided possible insight into the difference. One respondent commented, "the change that we experience at my school is a direct result of the change occurring at the federal, state, and district level." Another said, "it's the people from the board who cause the stress, not peers or even the principal…" (Leuschke, 2017, p. 51). These comments have led to the foundation for the need to study Leuschke's (2017) differential findings.

Change may be perceived as coming from two different types of sources. Change can come internally from within the organization. For education, internal change may be related to change that originates from an individual working within the same school such as a principal. Change may also come externally of the organization. For education, change coming from the federal, state, or local governments, regional districts, and school boards may be perceived as external sources of change. Because the origin of the change comes from individuals outside of the basic educational organizational unit (a school), these changes are perceived as external to the individuals of the school. While all organizations may experience both internal and external change, education tends to experience a significant amount of perceived external change.

This insight may help explain Leuschke's findings. How the leader manages the change can be seen as either supportive or directive. When change is perceived internally, leaders may be viewed negatively because they are a direct change agent. In this case, a directive leader is more likely to cultivate negative change responses in line with the findings of Perel (2015) and hierarchical culture-type's positive influence on change fatigue. On the other hand, a supportive leader is more likely to cultivate a positive change response. This response is in line with both findings of Perel (2015) and Leuschke

(2017) when group and developmental culture-types tended to mitigate change fatigue. Supportive leadership is likely to have similar effects if change fatigue is perceived externally, continuing the effects found by both Perel (2015) and Leuschke (2017).

The purposed difference is when change is perceived externally, and the leader has a directive approach in managing the change. As discussed earlier, change leads to uncertainty and stress (Bernerth et al., 2011). A directive leader may limit the uncertainty of change and consequently stress by providing a source of stability for the employees. Because these leaders value control and power, they may be able to act as an ally in handling the change. Through directive planning, communication, and implementation, a directive leader may limit the uncertainty effects of change. This effect may consequently reduce change fatigue and explain Leuschke's (2017) findings while not mitigating Perel's (2015) findings. Directive leaders cultivate hierarchical culture-types, but this culture-type and leadership style may be helpful during times of excessive change. Thus, one of the factors I seek to address is whether "leadership support for change" can have an interaction with the effectiveness of a leader's behavior. Leadership support for change may be able to act as a buffer to the external change. These findings lead to the following hypothesis for the study.

> *Hypothesis 5a.* Leadership support for change will moderate the relationship between directive leadership and change fatigue such that when leadership support for change is high, directive leadership will be negatively related to change fatigue.
>
> *Hypothesis 5b.* Leadership support for change will not moderate the relationship between supportive leadership and change fatigue. Supportive leadership will be

negatively related to change fatigue when leadership support for change is high or

low.

CHAPTER II: METHOD

Participants

The final sample size consisted of 126 teachers and administrators from Tennessee public schools. A total of 194 individuals started the survey, but 68 responses were removed. Sixty-seven of those responses were removed due to insufficiently completing the survey. One (1) response was removed because 3 out of 3 inattentive items were answered incorrectly.

Demographics of the participants were taken to better understand the sample. Full-time teachers (in any grades from Kindergarten through 12th) were 88.1% of the final sample. Administrators and part-time teachers made up 4.0% and 0.8%, respectively. Specialists, pre-kindergarten, or other specialty positions made up 6.3% of the sample.

When looking at the grades taught, 2.4% taught pre-kindergarten or early childhood, 38.1% taught kindergarten to fifth grade, 23.0% taught sixth to eight grade, 32.5% taught ninth through twelfth grade, and 2.4% identified as teaching a combination of grade levels (e.g., fifth-eighth or eighth-ninth). See Table 1 for frequencies for all collected participant demographics.

Table 1
Frequencies of Demographics Variables

Variable		Frequency	%
Position	Full-time Teacher	111	88.1%
	Part-time Teacher	1	0.8%
	Administrator	5	4.0%
	Other	8	6.3%
Grades Taught	Pre-Kindergarten	3	2.4%
	Kindergarten – 5th	48	38.1%
	6th – 8th	29	23.0%
	9th – 12th	41	32.5%
	Other	3	2.4%
Age	18 – 24	5	4.0%
	25 – 34	30	23.8%
	35 – 44	34	27.0%
	45 – 54	33	26.2%
	55 or older	23	18.3%
Years at Current School	Under 2 years	14	11.1%
	2 – 4 years	40	31.7%
	5 – 9 years	21	16.7%
	10 – 15 years	19	15.1%
	15 or more years	30	23.8%
Years in Public Schools	Under 2 years	3	2.4%
	2 – 4 years	18	14.3%
	5 – 9 years	26	20.6%
	10 – 15 years	24	19.0%
	15 or more years	54	42.9%
% Free and Reduced Lunch Recipients at Current School	0 – 10%	2	1.6%
	10% - 25%	5	4.0%
	25% - 50%	24	19.0%
	50% - 75%	42	33.3%
	Greater than 75%	48	38.1%
	I Don't Know	5	4.0%

Measures Related to Hypothesis

     Change fatigue. I used a change fatigue measure developed by Berneth, Walker, and Harris (2011). The scale consists of six items, and the cited coefficient alpha is .85 (Bernerth et al., 2011). The continued use of the scale can provide for more evidence for the new construct and extend the work of Perel (2015) and Leuschke (2017), whom both used an adapted version of the measure. This study used Leuschke's (2017) adaptation that utilizes a five-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree) instead of the original seven-point Likert scale. Items were adapted to include participant relevant wording such as using "school" instead of the generic "organization." Thus, items read like "*We are asked to change too many things at my school.*" A full copy of the measure can be found in Appendix A.

     Perceived participation. Perceived participation was measured through a selected section of the Work Group Characteristics Measure developed by Campion, Medkser, and Higgs (1993). The Work Group Characteristics Measure is a battery of short tests that measure 19 different characteristics. While the entire survey covers characteristics ranging from teamwork to task importance, the three item participation measure used a five-point Likert type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree) (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993). The participation scale has been used independently before with a reported coefficient alpha of .83 (De Dreu & West, 2001). The items were modified for the survey's intended audience with modifications such as "*As a member of this school, I have a real say in how the school carries out its work.*" A full copy of the perceived participation scale can be found in Appendix B.

Perceived leadership communication. Perceived leadership communication were evaluated through the Perceived Leadership Communication Questionnaire (PLCQ) developed by Schneider, Maier, Lovrekovic, and Retzbach (2015). The six-item scale used a five-point Likert type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree) and has a reported coefficient alpha of .80 (Schneider, Maier, Lovrekovic, & Retzbach, 2015). The items were modified for the survey's intended audience with modifications such as *"I am content with the way my communication with my principal is going."* A full copy of the perceived leadership communication can be found in Appendix C.

Perceived leadership fairness. Perceived leadership fairness was measured through a seven-item procedural justice scale developed by Colquitt (2001). The scale was modified so the items address leadership procedural justice instead of overall organizational justice based off previous modifications (van Dijke, De Cremer, Mayer, & Van Quaquebeke, 2012). The measure has seven-items and a five-point Likert type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree). The original procedural justices scale has a coefficient alpha of .78 (Colquitt, 2001), and the modification had a coefficient alpha of .88 (van Dijke et al., 2012). The items were modified for the survey's intended audience with modifications such as "*The principal's decisions have been free of bias.*" A full copy of the modified perceived leader fairness can be found in Appendix D.

Perceived trust in leadership. Perceived trust in leadership was measured through an eight-item trust scale developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003). The original scale includes 26-items related to trust in faculty, principals, and parents, but only the items related to the principal subscale will be used. The scale has been modified from a six-point Likert type scale to a five-point Likert type scale (1=Strongly Disagree,

5=Strongly Agree). Coefficient alpha for the subscale is .98 (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015). The items were modified for the survey's intended audience with modifications such as "*The principal's decisions have been free of bias.*" A full copy of the modified perceived trust in leaders can be found in Appendix E.

Perceived Leadership Support. Perceived leadership support was measured using a modified shortened form of a perceived organizational support measure developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986). The original scale has 36 items and a coefficient alpha of .97 (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Original items include "*The organization take pride in my accomplishments at work*" and "*Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.*" For this study, the recommended short version will be used which includes 16 items with a five-point Likert type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree) (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The items were modified to substitute "principal" for "organization" such that items read "*My principal takes pride in my accomplishments at work*" and "*Help is available from my principal when I have a problem*." A similar modification using the term supervisor instead of principal has been used in previous research with a coefficient alpha of .89 (Bohle & Alonso, 2017). A full copy of the modified perceived leader support can be found in Appendix F.

Perceived social support. Perceived social support was measured using a scale developed by Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, and Farley (1988). The original Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support includes twelve items that address perceived support from family, friends, and significant others on a seven-point Likert scale. Cronbach's alpha for the scale was a reported .88 (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988). For the

current study, the scale was modified to include "coworkers" instead of friends or family items like "*My coworkers really try to help me*" and "*I have coworkers with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.*" Significant others items will not be used. A five-item Likert scale was also used instead of the original seven (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree). A full copy of the modified perceived social support can be found in Appendix G.

Work locus of control. For work locus of control, I used a measure developed by Spector (1988). The original scale consists of 16 items with a coefficient alpha reports between .75 and .85 (Spector, 1988). The scale was modified from the original six-point Likert scale to a five-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree). The scale includes items such as "*Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck.*" A full copy of the modified Work Locus of Control Scale can be found in Appendix H.

Supportive and directive leadership. For identifying support and directive leadership, I used the Competing Values Framework. Developmental and group cultures will be used to identify supportive leadership culture while rational and hierarchical cultures will be used to identify directive leadership. I used the same scale as Leuscke (2017), which include modifications from the original scale. The original scale was developed by Kalliath, Bluedorn, and Gillespie (1999), who reported Cronbach's alphas between .80 through .90 for all subscales. Lueschke's (2017) study found similar reliabilities for the modified subscales ranging from .82 through .89. The scale uses a five-point Likert type scale (1 = Not Valued at All, 5 = Extremely Valued). A copy of this scale can be found in Appendix I.

Leadership support for change. Because no other research has adequately addressed this issue in the past, questions were developed to specifically meet the needs of this survey. The three-item, five-point Likert type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree) was developed to address whether the leader can act as a buffer or an ally during the change. An example items from the scale is "*My principal is an ally during times of change.*" A copy of these items can be found in Appendix J.

Other Supporting Measures

External source of change scale. The External Source of Change Scale was uniquely developed for the current study. While not specifically addressing the hypothesis, this scale provides supplemental information that may prove useful in post-hoc analyses. The intention of the scale is to assess the degree to which educators perceive changes in the school as coming from external sources. The four-item, five-point Likert type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree) includes items such as *"Government laws and regulations require my school to implement changes."* A copy of these items can be found in Appendix K.

Internal source of change scale. This Internal Source of Change was uniquely developed for the current study. While not specifically addressing the hypothesis, this scale provides supplemental information that may provide useful in post-hoc analysis. The intention of the scale is to assess the degree to which educators perceive changes in the school as coming from internal sources. The three-item, five-point Likert type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree) includes items such as *"My principal unnecessarily implements change."* A copy of these items can be found in Appendix L.

Demographics. Demographic questions were included in the survey to understand the sample. Specifically, this study intends to collect a representative sample similar to Leuschke's (2017) to clearly expand on her results. Included at the end of the survey are 6 demographic questions related to current school position, grade currently taught, age, current years at the school, current years in public education, and percent of student on free and reduced lunch. Grade currently taught, age, current years at the school, and current years in public education will have group responses. Current school position were broken down by full-time, part-time, and administration. Percent free and reduced lunch was included to potentially control for socio-economic influences. A copy of these demographic variables can be found in Appendix M.

Procedure

The survey measures were combined into one cohesive online questionnaire using the Qualtrics online survey platform. The current survey included 97 questions, including 3 attentiveness check questions, 5 demographic questions, and 89 hypothesis related questions. For a copy of the attentiveness check questions, see Appendix N. The questionnaire began with an informed consent page that includes a description of the study and assurance that the information will remain anonymous. See Appendix O for a copy of the informed consent. After consenting to take the survey, the respondent began the main section of the survey which includes all the measures related to the hypothesis. These measures are ordered in a manner to reduce the likelihood of priming effects based on advice from the committee. The demographic questions follow the hypothesis related measures, and a final debriefing statement is included.

In order to obtain a representative sample for K-12 educators in Tennessee, email addresses of current teachers were obtained by canvasing publicly available information on school websites. These emails were collected into an excel file for distribution of the survey. Schools selected for participation were chosen to represent the diversity of Tennessee K-12 public educators. Consideration was given to location and size of the schools to ensure all areas of Tennessee are appropriately represented. Emails were not be taken from private schools or schools that explicitly have a no solicitation clause.

The survey was distributed initially via email using the researcher's personal university account and a dedicated Gmail account. When emailing, emails were sent using the BCC feature to help promote the idea of anonymity. Emails were sent in batches of 40 to 60 emails over three days to help reduce the likelihood of being flagged as spam on the recipients' end. Individuals were given roughly 10 days to complete the survey. A common link was used to ensure anonymity of the responses by guaranteeing that the provide link cannot be tracked back to a specific email. A copy of the initial email sent to educators can be found in Appendix P.

After a slow start during the 10 days opening, an addendum to the IRB allowed a second email to be sent to the educators as a reminder to take the survey. The same process was used from the initial survey. A copy of the reminder email sent to educators can be found in Appendix Q.

To promote participation in the survey, an incentive was offered to the educators. Two $100 Amazon gift cards were offered as potential compensation for participating in the survey. At the end of the main survey, individuals were given an opportunity to copy and paste a link to a separate survey. The second survey explained the parameters of the

incentive and offered the ability to submit their preferred email to participate in the

random drawing. The incentive was collected in a separate survey to ensure the

information provided in the survey cannot be linked to the main survey. This

disconnection maintained the anonymity of the responses while allowing participation in

the incentive. The incentive survey closed as the same time as the main survey. To ensure

the randomization for selecting the incentive winners, the randomization function in excel

was used. Individual winners were contacted, and the incentives were delivered. For a

copy of the wording used at the end of the survey to redirect participants to the incentive

survey, see Appendix R. For a copy of the wording used within the incentive survey, see

Appendix S.

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis

Descriptive statistics were conducted on all variables for the survey. See Table 2 for a summary of all descriptive statistics. Internal reliability analysis were conducted on all scales using Cronbach's Alpha. Reliabilities for the scales sufficiently range from .82 to .97, except for External Source of Change. External Source of Change Scale had a Cronbach's Alpha of .61 which indicates a questionable reliability. While the scale is questionably reliable, its purpose is supplementary to the primary focus of the current study. See Table 3 for the reliability analysis for all scales. Intercorrelation analyses were run for all the scales after the reliability analyses. See Table 4 for intercorrelation analyses.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics

Variable	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Organizational Culture Type					
Group	126	3.60	0.93	1.00	5.00
Developmental	126	3.49	0.83	1.00	5.00
Hierarchical	126	3.68	0.94	1.00	5.00
Rational	126	4.15	0.83	1.00	5.00
Directive Leadership[1]	126	3.92	0.83	1.00	5.00
Supportive Leadership[2]	126	3.54	0.82	1.25	5.00
Change Fatigue	126	3.35	1.20	1.00	5.00
Perceived Participation	126	2.72	1.10	1.00	5.00
Perceived Principal Communication	126	3.59	1.17	1.00	5.00
Perceived Principal Fairness	126	3.29	1.02	1.00	5.00
Perceived Trust in Principal	126	3.74	1.04	1.00	5.00
Perceived Principal Support	126	3.76	0.98	1.00	5.00
Perceived Peer Support	126	4.20	0.74	1.86	5.00
Internal Work Locus of Control	126	3.74	0.47	2.31	4.94
Leadership Support for Change	126	3.60	1.10	1.00	5.00
External Source of Change	126	3.73	0.62	2.00	5.00
Internal Source of Change	126	2.48	1.12	1.00	5.00

[1]Directive Leadership was created through averaging Hierarchical and Rational Culture Types
[2]Supportive Leadership was created through averaging Group and Development Culture Types

Table 3
Scale Reliabilities

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
Organizational Culture Type		
Group	0.89	4
Developmental	0.86	4
Hierarchical	0.89	4
Rational	0.89	4
Directive Leadership[1]	0.93	8
Supportive Leadership[2]	0.92	8
Change Fatigue	0.97	6
Perceived Participation	0.91	3
Perceived Principal Communication	0.96	6
Perceived Principal Fairness	0.94	7
Perceived Trust in Principal	0.95	8
Perceived Principal Support	0.97	16
Perceived Peer Support	0.94	7
Internal Work Locus of Control	0.82	16
Leadership Support for Change	0.93	3
External Source of Change	0.61	4
Internal Source of Change	0.90	3

[1]Directive Leadership was created through averaging Hierarchical and Rational Culture Types

[2]Supportive Leadership was created through averaging Group and Development Culture Types

Table 4

Intercorrelations for Survey Scales

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Group Culture	--													
2. Developmental Culture	.74**	--												
3. Hierarchical Culture	.75**	.69**	--											
4. Rational Culture	.66**	.67**	.76**	--										
5. Change Fatigue	**-.53****	**-.44****	**-.40****	**-.31****	--									
6. Perceived Participation	.71**	.64**	.55**	.44**	**-.42****	--								
7. Perceived Principal Communication	.71**	.51**	.59**	.40**	**-.40****	.65**	--							
8. Perceived Principal Fairness	.69**	.59**	.66**	.49**	**-.45****	.74**	.87**	--						
9. Perceived Trust in Principal	.72**	.52**	.62**	.48**	**-.50****	.59**	.87**	.81**	--					
10. Perceived Principal Support	.69**	.51**	.57**	.47**	**-.48****	.65**	.91**	.82**	.83**	--				
11. Perceived Peer Support	.13	.30**	.06	.17	**.04**	.13	.01	.05	-.03	.05	--			
12. Internal Work Locus of Control	.45**	.37**	.39**	.40**	**-.41****	.37**	.32**	.38**	-.37**	.42**	.29**	--		
13. Leadership Support for Change	.72**	.55**	.59**	.45**	**-.47****	.65**	.88**	.82**	.82**	.88**	.01	.36**	--	
14. External Source of Change	-.06	-.06	.02	-.04	**.37****	-.01	.05	.06	-.05	.00	.08	.01	-.03	--
15. Internal Source of Change	-.64**	-.40**	-.55**	-.41**	**.56****	-.48**	-.67**	-.66**	-.69**	-.70**	.05	-.40**	-.70**	-.70**

*Note: n=126 for all scales. **p<.001. Primary dependent variable is bolded.*

Primary Analyses

Hypothesis 1a predicted that perceived participation in the change process would be negatively related to change fatigue. Pearson's correlations ($\alpha = .05$) were conducted to determine the relationship between perceived participation and change fatigue. The results indicate support of the hypothesis ($r = -.42$, $p < .001$). Hypothesis 1b predicted that perceived principal communication would be negatively related to change fatigue. Pearson's correlations ($\alpha = .05$) indicated support for this hypothesis ($r = -.40$, $p < .001$).

Hypothesis 2a predicted that perceived principal fairness would be negatively related to change fatigue. Pearson's correlations ($\alpha = .05$) indicated support for this hypothesis ($r = -.45$, $p < .001$). Hypothesis 2b predicted that principal support would be negatively related to change fatigue. Pearson's correlations ($\alpha = .05$) indicated support for this hypothesis ($r = -.48$, $p < .001$).

Hypothesis 3 predicted that perceived peer support would be negatively related to change fatigue. Pearson's correlations ($\alpha = .05$) did not indicated support for this hypothesis ($r = .04$, $p = .65$). Hypothesis 4 predicted that internal work locus of control would be negatively related to change fatigue. Pearson's correlations ($\alpha = .05$) indicated support for this hypothesis ($r = -.41$, $p < .001$).

Hypothesis 5a predicted that leadership support for change will moderate the relationship between directive leadership and change fatigue such that when leadership support for change is high, directive leadership will be negatively related to change fatigue. To test hypothesis 5a, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted. First,

directive leadership and leadership support for change significantly predicted change fatigue, $R^2 = .23$, $F(2, 123) = 19.49$, $p < .001$. Next, the interaction term was added to the regression model, which did not significantly predict change fatigue, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F(3, 122) = .06$, $\Delta p = .82$. The results do not support the hypothesis that leadership support for change moderates the relationship between directive leadership and change fatigue. Similar analyses were completed separately with each of the two subcomponents of directive leadership rational culture-type and hierarchical culture-type. However, neither of these two subcomponents of directive leadership revealed a moderated relationship with change fatigue. Thus, the results did not detect differences when using the combined directive leadership factor versus the separate subcomponent cultures.

Hypothesis 5b predicted that leadership support for change will not moderate the relationship between supportive leadership and change fatigue, and supportive leadership will be negatively related to change fatigue when leadership support for change is high or low. To test hypothesis 5b, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted. First, supportive leadership and leadership support for change significantly predicted change fatigue, $R^2 = .30$, $F(2, 123) = 26.18$, $p < .001$. Next, the interaction term was added to the regression model, which did not significantly predict change fatigue, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F(3, 122) = .03$, $\Delta p = .87$. These results support the hypothesis that leadership support for change would not moderate the relationship between supportive leadership and change fatigue. Similar analyses were completed separately with each of the two subcomponents of supportive leadership group culture-type and developmental culture-type. However,

neither of these two subcomponents of supportive leadership revealed a moderated

relationship with change fatigue. Thus, the results did not detect differences when using

the combined supportive leadership factor versus the separate subcomponent cultures.

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

This study has helped to identify some of the factors that influence change fatigue

for Tennessee's public school educators. Change fatigue is still a relatively new concept,

and the antecedents and consequences are still being better understood. While previous

studies have examined the consequences of change fatigue (Bernerth et al., 2011;

Leuschke, 2017; Perel, 2015), little research has been done on the potential influential

factors that may limit change fatigue. The current study sought to more clearly

understand the impact of leadership on an individual's experience with change fatigue.

When examining the results of the study, change fatigue was influenced by several

leadership factors such as, participation, leadership communication, fairness, trust, and

support. This discussion begins with a look at these factors individually.

Leadership Behaviors and Relationships

While previous literature has examined the positive impact of participation on

change outcomes (Bruckman, 2008; Frahm & Brown, 2007; Stauffer & Mason, 2013), no

studies have examined the relationship between participation and change fatigue. This

study examined the relationship by asking educators about their perceived participation in

the change. The results showed that when educators felt more involved, they tended to

experience less change fatigue. Practically, schools should consider how to involve

educators more during the change process because doing so will likely limit the negative

impacts of change fatigue. This finding makes sense if we consider that involvement will

generally lead to greater understanding and investment with the change initiative which

can lead to more positive change outcomes. This finding is consistent with literature on support for change more generally (Bruckman, 2008; Frahm & Brown, 2007; Stauffer & Mason, 2013).

While previous literature has suggested that leadership communication would negatively impact change fatigue (Elving et al., 2011), no studies have empirically analyzed the relationship between leadership communication and change fatigue. This study was able to examine the relationship by asking current educators about the communication habits of their direct leaders, principals. This study found that quality leadership communication with subordinates had a negative relationship with change fatigue. This results means that if quality communication is achieved between a leader and a subordinate, then the subordinates are less likely to experience change fatigue. Because schools tend to experience consistent change, principals, as the primary leader of a school, should establish quality communication with the teachers to limit the potential for change fatigue. Similar to the finding about change involvement, quality communication can lead to a better understanding of the change which would limit some of the uncertainty that contributes to change fatigue. This finding is consistent with literature on communication during change (Beer & Walton, 1987; Bruckman, 2008; Elving et al., 2011; Frahm & Brown, 2007; MacIntosh et al., 2007; Stauffer & Mason, 2013).

Leadership fairness was also found to have a negative relationship with change fatigue. This result means that when leaders are seen as unfair, their subordinate are more

likely to experience change fatigue. In the case of school educators, changes can often mean position changes within the school. When changes deal with terminations and promotions, principals need to be as objective as possible. Being objective and honest during position changes will help educators believe in the fairness of the process. Promotions and terminations can lead to stress during the change process, and principals can limit the uncertainty and stress by remaining objective throughout the process. When principals are seen as unbiased, this may alleviate some of the stress and uncertainty for the educators dealing with the primary issues of the change.

Like fairness, trust is another important aspect of limiting change fatigue. The study found that when subordinates tended to trust their leaders more, change fatigue tended to be limited. While previous research has shown a positive relationship between leadership trust and change success (Beer & Walton, 1987; Boyas et al., 2012; Bruckman, 2008; Frahm & Brown, 2007; Stensaker & Meyer, 2012; Stordeur et al., 2001), this study was the first to look more specifically at the impact with change fatigue. Along with fairness, leaders should consider fostering trust among subordinate to limit change fatigue.

Finally, leadership support was found to be negatively related to change fatigue. In education, the more principals are able to support and help the educators during times of change, the less likely educators are to experience change fatigue. Support is a general term that can include aspects of helping, recognizing, and listening to the concerns of the

educators. Supporting an educator would likely limit the stress associated with coping with the change, which would lead to limiting change fatigue.

Together these factors have shown how leadership behaviors and relationships can have a significant impact in limiting change fatigue. These finding contribute to the greater understanding of change fatigue and highlight the potential for a leader to influence subordinates' experience with change fatigue. Previous literature has tangentially supported leadership's impact on change fatigue, but this study provides a preliminary, empirical understand of how leadership influence change fatigue. These strength of the results suggest that looking further into the relationship of change fatigue and leadership may lead to new meaningful insights.

For practioners, these results support anecdotal experiences with change fatigue. This clearly supports the need to continually invest in leadership development from selection to continued training and development. When looking specifically in education, a high proportion of educators are continually leaving the profession (Goldring et al., 2014; Ingersoll et al., 2014), and principals can potential play a significant role in retaining educators in the future by limiting their experience with change fatigue.

Peer Influences

While previous literature supported leadership's influence on change fatigue, little research suggested ways that individual differences and peer support may influence change fatigue. Peer support had been found in previous research to limit stress and increase coping resources (Austin, 1997; Orlando, 2014; Scheck & Kinicki, 2000), but no

study had directly studied change fatigue and peer support. In this study, peer support was found to have no relationship with change fatigue. This result was contrary to the hypothesis and raises other questions about the nature of change fatigue.

Peer support may not influence change fatigue because peers cannot necessarily alter change in the way that a leader may. An individual would still have to deal with the overabundance of change whether or not peer support is available. Educators have to work in individual classrooms. While peer support may be available, educators' work is still largely independent. This idea may be especially true if peer support is available, but the support tends to dwell on and complain about the change to cope. In this case, peer support would be available, but it may not be peer support that would limit change fatigue.

Statistically, the results may also be influenced by the limited variance of peer support scores. Peer support had the least variability among the different factors. The limited variability can impact the ability to detect a relationship among other factors. Even with this consideration, peer support did not approach significance with any other factors. This issue should be noted for further research using peer support.

This finding creates a need for more research to better understand the relationship between peers and change fatigue, especially within an educational setting. Research on the effects of peers on change initiatives and change fatigue is limited but could potentially finding unique results that better inform our understanding of change influences.

For practioners, this means that we me need to invest more beyond informal general peer support as a way to help professionals deal with change. If organizations rely on those relationships, they may not be as successful at helping prevent change fatigue as other more formal initiatives. Instead, they should consider more deliberate efforts to limit change fatigue as suggested by Orlando (2014). Orlando (2014) found that professional learning communities limit stress. This insight may mean that practioners should consider creating organized, focused peer support groups to better influence change fatigue.

Culture-Type and Change Fatigue

While not a specific hypothesis within the study, this study added to the understanding of how culture-type can influence change fatigue. Similar to Perel (2015) and Leuschke (2017), this study found that group and developmental culture types had a negative relationship with change fatigue. This study was able to replicate and support the previous results of these two studies.

This study also supported Leuschke's finding that hierarchical culture-type can have a negative relationship with change fatigue. This result is in contrast to Perel's (2015) findings that hierarchical culture-type had a positive relationships with change fatigue. Unique for this study, the results found that rational culture-type had a negative relationship with change fatigue. Originally Perel (2015) found a positive relationship, and Leuschke (2017) found no relationship.

Leuschke (2017) suggested that her different results may have come from a difference in the sample compared to Perel (2015). Leuschke's (2017) sample focus specifically on Tennessee public educators, and Perel's (2015) sample was of general United States workers. Leuschke (2017) suggested that the educators' work environment may have led to some of the differing results. Due to the external sources of change, independence of their work, and leadership influences, she proposed that an educator's work environment may be impacting the relationship. In particular, she suggested that educators may view change as primarily originating from sources external to the school. Thus, due to these work environment factors, she had suggested that the leader (generally a principal) may have a unique ability to limit the change fatigue by acting as a buffer some of the changes that occurred. This buffering ability was suggested as a reason why more directive leadership styles like hierarchical and rational culture-types may have a different relationship with change fatigue compared to Perel's (2015) findings.

Moderation of Leadership Support for Change and Leadership Type

This study tested a main suggestion of Leuschke (2017) that leaders may be acting as a buffer to change fatigue. To test the idea, this study attempted first to replicate Leuschke's findings with culture-types and change fatigue within the Tennessee public education setting. Then using a newly created leadership support for change scale, this study sought to capture the buffering nature a leader may provide. This scale would be used as a moderator to the relationship between directive leadership styles and change fatigue to test Leuschke's idea.

Results from this study found some similar results to Leuschke's (2017) study. Group and development culture-types continued to have negative relationships with change fatigue, and hierarchical culture-type continued to have a negative relationship with change fatigue. Unique for this study when compared to both Perel (2015) and Leuschke (2017), rational culture-type was found to have a negative relationship with change fatigue.

When analyzing to find if leadership support for change acted as a moderator, this study found no evidence of a relationship. When analyzing to see if leadership support for change would moderate, directive leadership, supportive leadership, and their respective culture-types relationships with change fatigue no evidence was found. Leadership support for change was not a moderator.

These results were able to replicate some of Leuschke's (2017) findings, and this study was the first to find a negative relationship between rational culture-type and change fatigue. However, the current moderation analyses were not able to offer any clarification to understanding how directive culture types may limit change fatigue based on Leuschke's (2017) suggestion. Leadership's ability to act a buffer to the change impacting the school was not found. This relationship may be impacted by the other work factors in a more complex way than originally hypothesized. The independence of the work and the sources of change may more heavily influence the relationship more than previously thought. How school culture types, leadership, and change fatigue interact continues to yield complex results.

Future Research and Limitations

Future research should continue to looking into change fatigue and the relationship with other factors. Specifically, future research could continue to analyze and understand the relationship culture-types, leadership, and change fatigue. Leuschke (2017) and Perel (2015) found differential results when understanding directive leadership and change fatigue. The differences lead to this study attempting to clarify the differences, but no definitive answer was discovered. First, future research may seek to use other measures besides the competing values framework to identify culture and leadership styles to find if other types of factors have similar results with change fatigue. Second, the moderation of leadership support for change may be further explored with the work environment factors. Because the leadership support for change scale was newly developed for this study, the results may not completely isolate and understand the relationship. Third, other measures identifying the amount of internal and external change were taken for this study but were not used due to considerations of time and scope of the current study. Future analysis using these results may continue to clarify the relationship by separating results into different groups. Potentially individuals that experience a high degree of external change may have a stronger potential for finding moderation effects of leadership support for change. Internal change seemed to have a relationship with several factors, and this relationships could be more deeply explored.

Fourth, the leadership factors of trust, fairness, participation, support, and communication within the study were exploratory. Because no other research had looked

specifically into these, this study sought to understand if relationships existed. Now that relationships have been found, future research may try to better understand how the leadership factors influence change fatigue through path analysis. This study looked at two task behaviors and two relational behaviors, but all of the factors were intercorrelated suggesting a more complex relationship between the factors. Studying these in the future may help clarifying leadership's impact on change fatigue.

This study was not without limitations. First, the study had a sample size of 126. While the measured demographics provide support for the representativeness of the sample compared to Leuschke (2017), some demographics were left out to preserve anonymity, such as which school system the educators worked for. This study is not able to know if the sample is overly representative of a school system. The sample is enough to be contain within one school system which may bias the results to specific conditions. While indications are that this is not occurring according to the demographics and data analyses, the study should recognized the potential for this limitation.

Second, the leadership support for change scale was developed for this study. This scale contributes to the literature as a way to further explore the relationships between culture, leadership, and change fatigue. While the initial reliability analysis provided positive results with an alpha greater than .90, this scale is still new and should be continue to be assess whenever used to ensure that the scale is reliable and valid. Similarly the internal and external sources of change scales were developed for the study.

While they contribute to understanding the relationships, future analysis of the data would have to consider this limitation.

REFERENCES

Arens, A. K., & Morin, A. J. S. (2016). Relations between teachers" emotional exhaustion and students" educational outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *108*(6), 800–813.

Austin, M. J. (1997). The peer support group needed to guide organizational change processes. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *98*, 57–66.

Beer, M., & Walton, A. E. (1987). Organization change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.38.020187.002011

Beil-Hildebrand, M. B. (2005). Instilling and distilling a reputation for institutional excellence: A critial reflection on organising practice. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, *19*(6), 440–465. https://doi.org/10.1108/14777260510629643

Bernerth, J. B., Walker, H. J., & Harris, S. G. (2011). Change fatigue: Development and initial validation of a new measure. *Work & Stress*, *25*(4), 321–337. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2011.634280

Bitsadze, M., & Japaridze, M. (2016). Locus of control in Georgian teachers and its relation to teacher burnout. *Problems of Management in the 21st Century*, *11*(1), 8–15.

Bohle, S. A. L., & Alonso, A. R. M. (2017). The effect of procedural fairness and supervisor support in the relationship between job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior. *Review of Business Management*, *19*(65), 337–357.

https://doi.org/10.7819/rbgn.v0i0.3023

Boyas, J., Wind, L. H., & Kang, S. (2012). Exploring the relationship between

employment-based social capital, job stress, burnout, and intent to leave among

child protection workers: An age-based path analysis model. *Children and Youth*

Services Review, *34*(1), 50–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.08.033

Bruckman, J. C. (2008). Overcoming resistance to change: Causal factors, interventions,

and critical values. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, *11*(2), 211–219.

https://doi.org/10.1080/10887150802371708

Campion, M. A., Medsker, G. J., & Higgs, A. C. (1993). Relations between work group

characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups.

Personnel Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb01571.x

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct

validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 386–400.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386

Dilkes, J., Gray, J., & Cunningham, C. (2014). The new Australian curriculum, teachers,

and change fatigue. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(11), 45–64.

https://doi.org/10.14221/afte.2014v39n11.4

Ead, H. (2015). Change fatigue in health care professionals-an issue of workload or

human factors engineering? *Journal of Perianesthesia Nursing*, *30*(6), 504–515.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jopan.2014.02.007

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived

organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.1.51

Elving, W. J. L., Hansma, L. D., & De Boer, M. G. (2011). BOHICA: Bend over, here it comes again. . . *Teorija in Praksa*, *48*(6), 1628–1647.

Frahm, J., & Brown, K. (2007). First steps: Linking change communication to change receptivity. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *20*(3), 370–387. https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810710740191

Gaines, J., & Jermier, J. M. (1983). Emotional exhaustion in a high stress organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*(4), 567–586. https://doi.org/10.2307/255907

Glick, W. H., Huber, G. P., Miller, C. C., Doty, D. H., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (1990). Studying changes in organizational design and effectiveness: Retrospective event histories and periodic assessments. *Organizational Science*, *1*(3), 293–312.

Goldring, R., Taie, S., & Riddles, M. (2014). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results fom the 2012-2013 teacher follow-up survey*. *National Center for Education Statistics*. Washington, D. C. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2

Good, T. L., & Lavigne, A. L. (2015). Issues of teacher performance stability are not new: Limitations and possibilities. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *23*(2). https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.1916

Goodman, E. A., Zammuto, R. F., & Gifford, B. D. (2001). The competing values framework: Understanding the impact of organizational culture on the wuality of work life. *Organizational Development Journal*, *19*(3), 58–68.

Hart, J. (2009). Stress management and chronic disease. *Alternative and Complementary Therapies*, *15*(3), 109–112. https://doi.org/10.1089/act.2009.15302

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*(3), 513–524.

Ingersoll, R. M., Merrill, L., & Stuckey, D. (2014). *Seven trends: The transformation of the teaching force. Consortium for Policy Research in Education*. Philidephia. https://doi.org/10.12698/cpre.2014.rr80

Jex, S. M., & Britt, T. W. (2014). *Organizational Psychology: a Scientist-Practitioner Approach* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Johnson, K. J., Bareil, C., Giraud, L., & Autissier, D. (2016). Excessive change and coping in the working population. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *31*(3), 739–755. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-12-2014-0352

Klusmann, U., Richter, D., & Lüdtke, O. (2016). Teachers' emotional exhaustion is negatively related to students' achievement: Evidence from a large-scale assessment study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *108*(8), 1193–1203. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000125

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership in school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *30*(4), 498–518.

Leuschke, E. E. (2017). *School culture and teacher change fatigue in Tennessee* (Master's Thesis). Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN.

MacIntosh, R., Beech, N., McQueen, J., & Reid, I. (2007). Overcoming change fatigue:

Lessons from Glasgow's National Health Service. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *28*(6), 18–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/02756660710835879

Maslach, C. (2017). Finding solutions to the problem of burnout. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *69*(2), 143–152. https://doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000090

McMillan, K., & Perron, A. (2013). Nurses amidst change: The concept of change fatigue offers an alternative perspective on organizational change. *Policy, Politics, and Nursing Practice*, *14*(1), 26–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527154413481811

Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Eby, L. T. (2006). Locus of control at work: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*(8), 1057–1087. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.416

Orlando, J. (2014). Veteran teachers and technology: Change fatigue and knowledge insecurity influence practice. *Teachers and Teaching*, *20*(4), 427–439. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2014.881644

Perel, C. (2015). *Examining the relationship between organizational culture and change fatigue* (Master's Thesis). Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN.

Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2006). Perceptions of organizational change: A stress and coping perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(5), 1154–1162. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1154

Scheck, C. L., & Kinicki, A. J. (2000). Identifying the antecendents of coping with an organizational acquistion: A structureal assessment. *Journal of Organizational*

Behavior, *21*(6), 627–648.

Schein, E. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, F. M., Maier, M., Lovrekovic, S., & Retzbach, A. (2015). The Perceived Leadership Communication Questionnaire (PLCQ): Development and validation. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, *149*(2), 175–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2013.864251

Smollan, R. K. (2017). Supporting staff through stressful organizational change. *Human Resource Development International*, *20*(4), 282–304. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2017.1288028

Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of the work locus of control scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *61*(4), 335–340. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1988.tb00470.x

Stauffer, S. D., & Mason, E. C. M. (2013). Addressing elementary school teachers' professional stressors: Practical suggestions for schools and administrators. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *49*(5), 809–837. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13482578

Stensaker, I. G., & Meyer, C. B. (2012). Change experience and employee reactions: Developing capabilities for change. *Personnel Review*, *41*(1), 106–124. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481211189974

Stensaker, I. G., Meyer, C. B., Falkenberg, J., & Haueng, A. C. (2002). Excessive

change: Coping mechanisms and consequences. *Organizational Dynamics*, *31*(3), 296–312. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(02)00115-8

Stordeur, S., D'hoore, W., & Vandenberghe, C. (2001). Leadership, organizational stress, and emotional exhaustion among hospital nursing staff. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *35*(4), 533–542. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2001.01885.x

Syrek, C. J., Apostel, E., & Antoni, C. H. (2013). Stress in highly demanding IT jobs: Transformational leadership moderates the impact of time pressure on exhaustion and work-life balance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *18*(3), 252–261. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033085

Teasley, M. L. (2017). Organizational culture and schools: A call for leadership and collaboration. *Children and Schools*, *39*(1), 3–5. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdw048

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2015). Faculty trust in the principal: An essential ingredient in high-performing schools. *Journal of Education Administration*, *53*(1), 66–92. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2014-0024

van Dijke, M., De Cremer, D., Mayer, D. M., & Van Quaquebeke, N. (2012). When does procedural fairness promote organizational citizenship behavior? Integrating empowering leadership types in relational justice models. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *117*(2), 235–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.10.006

Wang, Q., Bowling, N. A., & Eschleman, K. J. (2010). A meta-analytic examination of work and general locus of control. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(4), 761–768.

https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017707

Wang, Y., Ramos, A., Wu, H., Liu, L., Yang, X., Wang, J., & Wang, L. (2015).

Relationship between occupational stress and burnout among Chinese teachers: A

cross-sectional survey in Liaoning, China. *International Archives of Occupational*

and Environmental Health, *88*(5), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-014-

0987-9

Zeehandelaar, D., Griffith, D., Smith, J., Thier, M., Anderson, R., Pitts, C., & Gasparian,

H. (2015). Schools of thought: A taxonomy of American education governance,

(August), 1–71. Retrieved from http://edexcellence.net/publications/schools-of-

thought-a-taxonomy-of-american-education-governance

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The

multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality*

Assessment, *52*(1), 30–41.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Change Fatigue Scale

Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below using the following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly Agree

1. Too many change initiatives are introduced at my school

2. I am tired of all the changes in this school.

3. The amount of change that takes place at my school is overwhelming.

4. We are asked to change too many things at my school.

5. It feels like we are always being asking to change something around here.

6. I would like to see a period of stability before we change anything else in this school.

APPENDIX B

Perceived Participation Scale

Instructions: Please indicate the extent that you agree or disagree with each of the

statements about your school using the following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly

Agree

1. As a member of this school, I have a real say in how the school carries out its work.

2. Most teachers in this school get a chance to participate in decision making.

3. My school is designed to let everyone participate in decision making.

APPENDIX C

Perceived Leadership Communication Scale

Instructions: Please indicate the extent that you agree or disagree with each of the statements about your school using the following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly Agree

1. My principal is sensitive to the needs of others.

2. My principal seems to like devoting his/her time to me.

3. I am content with the way my communication with my principal is going.

4. My principal and I share an understanding of how we would like to achieve our goals.

5. My principal and I can speak openly with each other.

6. Especially when problems arise, my principal and I talk to each other even more intensively in order to solve the problems.

APPENDIX D

Perceived Leadership Fairness Scale

Instructions: Indicate the extent to which each of the following items describe the procedures your supervisor uses to arrive at decisions regarding your job using the following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly Agree

1. I have been able to express my views and feelings during the principal's decisions.

2. I have had influence over the outcome arrived at by the principal's decisions.

3. The principal's decisions have been applied consistently.

4. The principal's decisions have been free of bias.

5. The principal's decisions have been based on accurate information.

6. I have been able to appeal the outcome arrived at by the principal's decisions.

7. The principal's decisions have upheld ethical and moral standards.

APPENDIX E

Perceived Trust in Leadership Scale

Instructions: Please indicate the extent that you agree or disagree with each of the statements about your school using the following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly Agree

1. Teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.

2. The principal in this school typically acts in the best interests of the teachers.

3. Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.

4. Teachers in this school trust the principal.

5. The principal doesn't tell teachers what is really going on.

6. The principal of this school does not show concern for teachers.

7. The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal's actions.

8. The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.

APPENDIX F

Perceived Leadership Support Scale

Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below using the following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly Agree

1. My principal values my contribution to the schools well-being.

2. If my principal could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary, they would do so.*

3. My principal fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.*

4. My principal strongly considers my goals and values.

5. My principal would ignore any complaint for me.*

6. My principal disregards my best interests when he/she makes decisions that affect me*

7. Help is available from my principal when I have a problem.

8. My principal really cares about my well-being.

9. Even if I did the best job possible, my principal would fail to notice.*

10. My principal is willing to help me when I need a special favor.

11. My principal cares about my general satisfaction at work.

12. If given the opportunity, my principal would take advantage of me.*

13. My principal shows very little concern for me.*

14. My principal cares about my opinions.

15. My principal takes pride in my accomplishments at work

16. My principal tries to make my job as interesting as possible.

* Reversed Scored

APPENDIX G

Perceived Social Support Scale

Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below using the following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly Agree

1. My coworkers really try to help me.

2. I get the emotional help and support I need from my coworkers.

3. I can count on my coworkers when things go wrong.

4. I can talk about my problems with my coworkers.

5. I have coworkers with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.

6. My coworkers are willing to help me make decisions.

7. I can talk about my problems with my coworkers.

APPENDIX H

Work Locus of Control Scale

Instructions: The following statements are about your opinion of *jobs in general* (i.e., not only jobs in education or jobs at your school). Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below using the following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly Agree

1. A job is what you make of it.

2. On most jobs, people can pretty much accomplish whatever they set out to accomplish.

3. If you know what you want out of a job, you can find a job that gives it to you.

4. If employees are unhappy with a decision made by their boss, they should do something about it.

5. Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck. *

6. Making money is primarily a matter of good fortune. *

7. Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort.

8. In order to get a really good job you need to have family members or friends in high places. *

9. Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune. *

10. When it comes to landing a really good job, who you know is more important than what you know. *

11. Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job.

12. To make a lot of money you have to know the right people. *

13. It takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding employee on most jobs. *

14. People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded for it.

15. Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do.

16. The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make

a little money is luck. *

* Reversed Scored

APPENDIX I

Supportive and Direct Leadership Scale

Instructions: Please indicate the extent that these are things that might be valued by your

school **as a whole** using the following scale:

A. Not Valued at All. B. Of Little Value. C. Moderately Valued. D. Very Valued. E.

Extremely Valued

Group Culture

1. Participation and open discussion

2. Employee concerns and ideas

3. Teamwork and cohesion

4. Morale

Developmental Culture

5. Innovation and change

6. Creative problem solving

7. Decentralization

8. New ideas

Hierarchical Culture

9. Predictable outcomes

10. Stability and continuity

11. Order

12. Dependability and reliability

Rational Culture

13. Outcome excellence and quality

14. Getting the job done

15. Goal Achievement

16. Doing one's best

APPENDIX J

Leadership Support for Change Scale

Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below using the following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly Agree

1. My principal is an ally during times of change.

2. My principal helps limit the impact of change coming from outside the school.

3. My principal supports me during change.

APPENDIX K

External Source of Change Scale

Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below using the following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly Agree

1. Government laws and regulations require my school to implement changes.

2. The district superintendent initiatives many of the changes at my school

3. Community pressures drive many of the changes at my school.

4. Change comes from external sources of the school.

APPENDIX L

Internal Source of Change Scale

Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below using the

following scale:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly

Agree

1. My principal unnecessarily implements change.

2. My principal is excessive with the number of changes.

3. My principal frequently initiates makes changes to the school.

APPENDIX M

Demographic Questions

How do you classify your position at your current school?

A. Regular full-time teacher (in any of grades Kindergarten-12 or comparable

ungraded levels)

B. Regular part-time teacher (in any of grades Kindergarten-12 or comparable

ungraded levels)

C. Administrator (e.g., principal, assistant principal, director, school head)

D. Other_____

In what grades do you spend most of your teaching time during the school year?

A. Pre-K or Early Childhood

B. Kindergarten-5th grade

C. 6th-8th grade

D. 9-12th grade

E. Other_____

How old are you?

A. 18-24

B. 25-34

C. 35-44

D. 45-54

E. 55 years old or older

How many school years have you worked (as a teacher, administrator, or staff) at

your CURRENT school?

A. Under two years

B. 2-4 years

C. 5-9 years

D. 10-15 years

E. 15 or more years

How many school years have you worked (as a teacher, administrator, or staff) IN

PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

A. Under two years

B. 2-4 years

C. 5-9 years

D. 10-15 years

E. 15 or more years

What percentage of students in your school receive free or reduced-price lunches?

If you aren't sure of the percentage of students receive free and reduced-price lunches at your school, click here to visit www.greatschools.org and look up your school.

1) Once on the site, enter your school name in the search bar under "Find a Great School."

2) When you find your school, click on the school name.

3) Within the Equity Section, click on "Low-income students."

4) In the break down, the % of low-income student should be with the rating.

A. 0-10%

B. 10-25%

C. 25-50

D. 50-75%

E. Greater than 75%

F. Do Not Know

APPENDIX N

Validity Check Items:

A. Strongly Disagree B. Disagree C. Neither agree nor disagree D. Agree E. Strongly

Agree

1. Select "Neutral" for this item only.

2. Select "Strongly Agree" for this item only.

3. Select "Strongly Disagree" for this item only.

APPENDIX O

Informed Consent

<u>Change Fatigue and Leadership Influences</u>
Principal Investigator: Samuel Deschenes

Welcome! I appreciate you taking the time to complete this survey. First, I have a few items to cover. Please read over the following information before continuing.

The purpose of the study is investigate how change impacts educators throughout Tennessee. The study attempts to understand the different factors that help and hinder successful change. By understanding these factors, the study hopes to provide recommendations on how to limit the negative consequences of change.

Requirements for taking the survey
1.   You are 18 years or older
2.   You are currently a public school teacher or administrator

Types of questions asked
1.   Characteristics of your current school
2.   Questions related to your experiences with workplace change
3.   Questions related to your work relationships
4.   Limited personal information (Grade level, number of years teaching, etc.)

The following survey will ask you a series of questions about yourself and your experience in schools. Participation in the survey is completely voluntary. You may stop your participation at any time for any reason without consequence. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes. You will have an opportunity at the end of the survey to enter a random drawing for one of two $100 Amazon Gift Cards as compensation for your time. There are no foreseeable risks for taking this survey beyond what you would experience in a typical day. All answers will remain anonymous.

Should you have any questions, please email Samuel Deschenes at smd5f@mtmail.mtsu.edu.

APPENDIX P

Initial Distribution Email

Hello Educators!

I am Samuel Deschenes, an Industrial/Organizational Psychology graduate student at Middle Tennessee State University. I am conducting research on **how public school educators are affected by the various change initiatives that are continually put upon them**. You are among the educators throughout Tennessee invited to participate.

Your participation in an anonymous survey will help complete my Master's thesis research and will give you a voice about the impact these issues have on Tennessee educators. This study also explores various factors that may help or hinder the success of change efforts and hopes to identify recommendations for how to limit the negative consequences of change.

Below is a link to a **voluntary, anonymous survey**. The survey should take only **20 minutes**, and will ask questions about your experiences at school with change, your work relationships, and limited information about you and your school.

After completing the survey, you will have the opportunity to participate in a random drawing for one of two **$100 Amazon Gift Cards**.

Please click the link below to continue to the survey:
https://mtsupsychology.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_2rwPp5sKqOvltEp

The survey will close on **May 10th**, but please take a moment to respond more immediately if possible. Your participation is valued and appreciated.

If you have any other questions or concerns, please email Samuel Deschenes at smd5f@mtmail.mtsu.edu

Thank you,
Samuel Deschenes
Industrial Organizational Psychology Master's Program (2019)
Middle Tennessee State University
smd5f@mtmail.mtsu.edu

APPENDIX Q

Reminder Email

Dear Educators,

Please don't miss this opportunity to make your voice heard about the many demands placed upon teachers. My commitment to the impact on you led to this research for my master's thesis. Your participation in the survey will help me complete my degree, while raising the public profile of Tennessee teachers' needs.

If you already responded to last week's email inviting you to participate in our survey, then thank you! If you have not yet participated, we encourage you to do so now. We value your input and have extended the deadline to **May 17th**.

As a reminder, this is a **voluntary, anonymous survey** about your experiences with change initiatives affecting you and your school, as well as related aspects of your work relationships. The survey should take only **20 minutes**.

After completing the survey, you will have the opportunity to participate in a random drawing for one of two $100 Amazon Gift Cards.

Please click the link below to continue into the survey:
https://mtsupsychology.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_2rwPp5sKqOvltEp

If you have any other questions or concerns, please email Samuel Deschenes at smd5f@mtmail.mtsu.edu

Best,
Samuel Deschenes
Industrial Organizational Psychology Master's Program (2019)
Middle Tennessee State University
smd5f@mtmail.mtsu.edu

APPENDIX R

Incentive Survey Prompt

Thank you for completing the survey.
If you wish to participate in the incentive drawing for one of two $100 Amazon Gift
Cards, please copy and paste the following link to access a separate survey:

https://mtsupsychology.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8uXaDwRm6kkwFRb

If you do not wish to participate, please click the arrow below to finish the survey.

APPENDIX S

Incentive Survey

Thank you for participating in the survey.

If you would like to participate in potentially receiving one of two **$100 Amazon Gift Cards**, please read and then enter your preferred email address below.

Once the survey has officially closed, two people at random will be selected and contacted to receive the gift cards. Emails from this survey will not be attached to the previous survey information, and will only be used for the purposes of the incentives.

If you have any questions, you can contact **Samuel Deschenes at smd5f@mtmail.mtsu.edu**.

If you do not wish to participate in the incentive drawing, you may decline at this time by closing out of the survey.

If you would like to participate in the incentive drawing, you may enter your email below at this time.

APPENDIX T

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

IRB
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd
Murfreesboro, TN 37129

MIDDLE TENNESSEE
STATE UNIVERSITY

IRBN007 – EXEMPTION DETERMINATION NOTICE

Friday, May 10, 2019

Principal Investigator	**Samuel Deschenes** (Student)
Faculty Advisor	Patrick McCarthy
Co-Investigators	NONE
Investigator Email(s)	*smd5f@mtmail.mtsu.edu; patrick.mccarthy@mtsu.edu*
Department	Psychology
Protocol Title	*Change fatigue and leadership influence*
Protocol ID	**19-1228**

Dear Investigator(s),

The above identified research proposal has been reviewed by the MTSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) through the **EXEMPT** review mechanism under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) within the research category *(2) Educational Tests* A summary of the IRB action and other particulars in regard to this protocol application is tabulated as shown below:

IRB Action	EXEMPT from furhter IRB review***	Date	**4/22/19**
Date of Expiration	NOT APPLICABLE		
Sample Size	3,000 (THREE THOUSAND)		
Participant Pool	Healthy Adults (18 or older) - Public School Teachers and Adminstrators		
Exceptions	Online consent and online data collection using Qualtrics is permitted		
Mandatory Restrictions	1. Participants must be 18 years or older 2. Informed consent must be obtained from the participants 3. Identifying information must not be collected		
Restrictions	**1. All restrictions for exemption apply.** **2. Mandatory disclosure of the exclusion criteria.** **3. Mandatory informed consent and age verfication as approved in the original Qualtrics link described in the exempt application..**		
Comments	NONE		

***This exemption determination only allows above defined protocol from further IRB review such as continuing review. However, the following post-approval requirements still apply:
- Addition/removal of subject population should not be implemented without IRB approval
- Change in investigators must be notified and approved
- Modifications to procedures must be clearly articulated in an addendum request and the proposed changes must not be incorporated without an approval
- Be advised that the proposed change must comply within the requirements for exemption
- Changes to the research location must be approved – appropriate permission letter(s) from external institutions must accompany the addendum request form
- Changes to funding source must be notified via email (irb_submissions@mtsu.edu)

- The exemption does not expire as long as the protocol is in good standing
- Project completion must be reported via email (irb_submissions@mtsu.edu)
- Research-related injuries to the participants and other events must be reported within 48 hours of such events to compliance@mtsu.edu

Post-approval Protocol Amendments:

The current MTSU IRB policies allow the investigators to make the following types of changes to this protocol without the need to report to the Office of Compliance, as long as the proposed changes do not result in the cancellation of the protocols eligibility for exemption:

- Editorial and minor administrative revisions to the consent form or other study documents
- Increasing/decreasing the participant size

Only THREE procedural amendment requests will be entertained per year. This amendment restriction does not apply to minor changes such as language usage and addition/removal of research personnel.

Date	Amendment(s)	IRB Comments
05/09/2019	Approved to use an updated email to remind participants..	IRBA2019-011

The investigator(s) indicated in this notification should read and abide by all applicable post-approval conditions imposed with this approval. Refer to the post-approval guidelines posted in the MTSU IRB's website. Any unanticipated harms to participants or adverse events must be reported to the Office of Compliance at (615) 494-8918 within 48 hours of the incident.

All of the research-related records, which include signed consent forms, current & past investigator information, training certificates, survey instruments and other documents related to the study, must be retained by the PI or the faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) at the sacure location mentioned in the protocol application. The data storage must be maintained for at least three (3) years after study completion. Subsequently, the researcher may destroy the data in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity. IRB reserves the right to modify, change or cancel the terms of this letter without prior notice. Be advised that IRB also reserves the right to inspect or audit your records if needed.

Sincerely,

Institutional Review Board
Middle Tennessee State University

Quick Links:
Click here for a detailed list of the post-approval responsibilities.
More information on exmpt procedures can be found here.