

Leading Culturally Diverse Teachers: Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction of Multinational Teachers

Malisa Komolthiti

Stamford International University
malisa.komolthiti@stamford.edu

Abstract

This literature review explores leadership theory over a five-period of time, teacher job satisfaction, cross-cultural leadership, and the relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The extensive review of research and theory reveals that leadership may influence teacher job satisfaction, and culture may play a role in leadership practices and teachers' perception about leaders. The review of existing research on the relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction shows that existing research has been centered around determining whether there is a relationship between leadership behavior and teacher job satisfaction and on identifying the type of leadership style that might influence satisfaction. Analysis of the literature indicates that existing research has been conducted in two main settings: research in one specific area or in cross-country research. A study of the relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction in a multicultural educational institution is suggested for future research in order to understand whether culture plays a role in this relationship.

Keywords: Correlation, cross-cultural leadership, teacher job satisfaction, leadership style, educational leadership

1. Statement of the Problem

Leadership styles affect teacher job satisfaction (Nguni, Slegers, & Denessen, 2006). A study shows that one leadership style, transformational leadership, had significant effects on organizational commitment, and satisfaction and had indirect effects on student academic performance (Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995). Leadership and job satisfaction are fundamental components of effective organizations (Kennerly, 1989). Workers with lower job satisfaction tend to have lower work performances (Pan, 1994; Wang, 1999). Teacher job satisfaction was reported as one of the intrinsic motivators significantly influencing retention while extrinsic motivators including salary and work overload had no effects (Perrachione, Rosser, & Petersen, 2008).

Previous studies focused on the relationship between leadership styles of school leaders and satisfaction of teachers in some parts of the country such as in New Jersey (Bliss et al., 1990), in northern Israel (Shechtman, Zou'bi, & Katz, 1994), in central midwestern state (Blase et al., 1986), in the northern part of Israel (Bogler, 2001), in Shanghai, China (Zhang & Wu, 2001), in the eastern educational zone of Tanzania (Nguni et al., 2006), in Ankara, Turkey (Korkmaz, 2007), and in Flanders, Belgium (Hulpia, Devos, Rosseel, & Vlerick, 2012); and some studies were conducted across country such as in Lebanon (Theodory, 1981), in Singapore (Koh et al., 1995), and in the United States (Higgins, 2010).

However, in the new millennium, globalization has stimulated a dynamic flow of immigrants worldwide (Suarez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004). There are increasing numbers of international schools and multinational educational institutions where students and leaders are from

different countries of origin and have varying national, linguistic, religious, and racial backgrounds. The relationship between cultural context and leadership was recognized in a cross-country study, the GLOBE project (Jepson, 2009). Leaders in multicultural organizations need to consider the national origin and cultures of their workers.

Significance of the Problem

A meta-analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance demonstrates a relationship between the two (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). Job satisfaction in organizational sciences is a vital research topic, and the measure of work attitudes, such as job satisfaction is one of the most useful information about organizations' employees (Whitman, Van Rooy, & Viswesvaran, 2010). Organizations need to ask how to increase job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which in turn help increase long-term worker productivity and performance (Westover, Westover, & Westover, 2010).

In the field of education, highly satisfied teachers are more likely to want to improve their teaching efforts and to engage in professional development. In addition, teacher job satisfaction has a direct correlation with student academic achievement (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013). Thus, educational organizations' leaders need to understand variables that increase teacher job satisfaction, and try to enhance the effects of those variables, which may lead to an increase of student academic achievement.

One of the variables influencing teacher job satisfaction is educational leaders' effectiveness. A study showed that teacher job satisfaction depends heavily on how educational leaders demonstrate feedback, reward, and provide support (Whaley, 1994). However, an extensive cross-cultural research demonstrated leadership has not only managerial but also cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 1980). Although leader prototypes applied to people from different national cultures are difficult to define, a study on differences in leadership perception provides a better understanding of cross-cultural leadership (Gerstner & Day, 1994).

2. Purpose of the review

The primary concept addressed in this literature review is to explore whether differences of cultural and national background of teachers and leaders play a role in leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. This article gives an overview of the literature on which the study is based. The primary concepts addressed in this literature review are leadership theory, cross-cultural leadership, job satisfaction, and the linkage between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. There have been considerable research and proposals for theoretical frameworks on the relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction (Blase, Dedrick, & Strathe, 1986; Higgins, 2010; Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni, Slegers, & Denessen, 2006; Theodory, 1981; Zhang & Wu, 2001).

The first section of this article presents a historical review of five main leadership theories: trait approach, style approach, contingency approach, transformational leadership, and distributed leadership during the following five time-periods, followed by the cross-cultural perspective of leadership in the globalization era. The concept of national cultures (Hofstede, 1980) is explored, as well as the GLOBE project, which is a major cross-cultural leadership research project. The review of this research project and criticisms of it (Ailon, 2008; Gerstner & Day, 1994; Graen, 2006) provide an awareness of the influences of culture on leadership perspective, how countries are divided into ten cultural clusters, and limitations that are useful for this research. The theory, research, and practices of teacher job satisfaction are presented in the third section.

Each variable that might influence teacher job satisfaction is explored. These variables are demographic variables, coworkers, professional competence, job-or-role-related characteristics, policy and bureaucracy, and pay. The last section is devoted to an investigation of the linkage between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The review examines the related literature and relevant research studies on the relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The contexts of these studies are also explored to find out which in context the study of the relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction has been conducted in an educational field. The last section provides conclusion of the review and a discussion for future research.

Leadership Theory

Leadership behavior is an extensive domain of research and numerous researchers have defined the main concepts of leadership (Bass, Bass & Stodgill, 1990). Leadership concepts are the least understood phenomenon (Rost, 1991). Leadership can be simply defined as “the behaviors, traits, interactions, influences, occupations and the relationships of the administrative position” (Yukl, 2010, p.2). Majority of the definitions of the leadership mainly reflect simple assumption which involves the intentional idea of the leaders who actually want to facilitate, guide and structure the organization as well as building relationships in an organization or among a group (Yukl, 2010, p.3).

The understanding about the concept of leadership actually developed over time with the start of the understanding of the traits and characteristics of the leaders which are known as personal traits. This has shifted the focus on the behavior of the leaders. With the passage of time, the situation aspect of the leadership got introduced and it was in 1980s when the concept of transformational leadership was introduced. The transformational leadership has the motivation of the leaders to influence the followers in making sacrifices and moving forward towards the organizational objectives and goals. From here the leadership concept moved on from the post heroic towards distributed or shared leadership (Pepper, 2010). Majority of the research on the leadership during the past century was conducted in Canada, United States and Western Europe. Due to the emerging globalization during the last decade, the researchers have major concern about the role of leadership in different cultures and thus the concept of culture was added to the study of the leadership (Yukl, 2010).

Numerous leadership frameworks and theories have been proposed. In this review, only four approaches have been focused namely post-heroic leadership, transactional leadership and transformational leadership, contingency leadership, style and trait approaches. Every approach has been presented with its time period. Trait approach was the first even approach introduced during 1940s, style approach during 1960s, contingency approach during late 1960s and early 1980s, transactional and transformational approach during 1980s. The latest approach is the post-heroic approach which is a form of distributed leadership.

Trait Approach. Traits mainly refers to the attributes an individual possesses including temperament, motives, needs and personality (Yukl, 2010). This approach is among the early approaches presented in the study of leadership. The initial traits studied mainly believed in the natural leaders and attempts were made to identify the personal and physical traits of the leaders. Numerous studies compared the traits of leaders with those of non-leaders and many also investigated the traits of good leaders. About 124 traits had been studied during 1904-1948 and among them Stogdill (1948) found that most common traits of a good leader is the capability to help groups to reach to the goals.

The sample traits investigated include self-confidence, responsibility, initiative, understanding the task and intelligence. But it is worth mentioning here that no particular trait was enough to guarantee the success of a leader in any situation.

Stogdill hence concluded that no single pattern of traits can guarantee success of a leader and personal traits of any leader need to be relevant to the goals and activities of the followers. He also reviewed the traits studied again in 1974 and again similar traits were found among the 163 traits studied during 1949-1970. He reached to the conclusion that no universal leadership trait and possession of a single trait doesn't guarantee effectiveness of the leader. But some other researchers are of the opinion that some of the traits like self-confidence (Bass, Bass & Stodgill, 1990), belief in making self-destiny (Rotter, 1966), self-control and emotional maturity (Bass, Bass & Stodgill, 1990) are more relevant to the managerial effectiveness. Despite of the disagreement among the researchers on the effectiveness of any single trait, the trait approach is still considered helpful in understanding the effectiveness of the managers (Yukl, 2010). Trait knowledge has been also effective in recruiting managers in organizations.

Style Approach. During 1960s, the focus of the researchers shifted from the traits towards the style of behavior of the leaders. Their focus mainly then became what the leaders do instead of the characteristics they possess. Though trait approach was helpful in recruiting leaders for the managerial positions, style approach on the other hand was helpful for the training (Parry & Bryman, 2006). Researchers in this domain tried to identify different types of the behaviors or the leadership styles which can influence performance and job satisfaction. The method used by them to identify the styles include the questionnaires, critical incidents and field experiments (Yukl, 2010). Majority of the studies conducted in this direction followed method first employed by the pioneer studies of the University of Michigan and Ohio State University. Questionnaire based investigation method was used by Ohio State University (Yukl, 2010).

The initial tasks of the researchers were to identify the relevant leadership styles/behaviors along with developing relevant questionnaires to examine how frequently leaders use those behaviors. From the analysis two basic behavior types were identified including initiating structure and consideration. Consideration behavior is mainly the employee centered approach that refers to leadership style where leaders are mostly concerned about the subordinates. While on the other hand the initiating structure behavior is mainly task based that refers to leadership style in which leaders are concerned about the accomplishment of tasks (Parry & Bryman, 2006).

Questionnaires developed during that time were Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ XII) and Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ) (Yukl, 2010).

The main focus of the Michigan researchers was to identify the relationship among the leaders' group performance, group process and behavior. They used a completely different approach than the Ohio State University researchers. They utilized structured interviews approach instead of questionnaires as well as the special managerial style/behavior questionnaire (Yukl, 2010). They identified three main types of leadership behaviors that differentiated the non-effective managers from the effective and that includes the participative leadership, relation-oriented behavior and task-oriented behavior. The task oriented behavior was similar to what was identified by the researchers of the Ohio State University as initiating structure and it included the task related functions of the leader having broader range of behavior showing this attitude.

The relation oriented behavior was similar to the consideration approach proposed by the researchers of the Ohio State University. The participative leadership was considered as a behavior that involved the capability to be responsible to take all important decisions during group tasks (Yukl, 2010).

Contingency Approach. From 1940s to early 1960s, the behavior, style and personal traits were investigated and studied. In late 1960s, the situational aspects by large were determined in order to identify the appropriate roles of leaders, their styles and behaviors (Yukl, 2010). Some contingency theories are Normative Decision Theory, Cognitive Resource Theory, LPC Contingency Model, Multiple Linkage Model, Situational Leadership Theory and Path-Goal Theory (Yukl, 2010). The earliest theory presented in this domain was the Fiedler's LPC Contingency Model. Instrument used for the measurement of the effectiveness of the managers was known as Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale (Fiedler, 1964). This LPC score shows the motive hierarchy of leaders (Yukl, 2010). Scale showing high LPC reading shows that leader is highly motivated to keep strong interpersonal relations with the subordinates and people. Leaders show supportive attitude in improving and fostering the relationships. While the low LPC score shows that a leader is motivated to complete the tasks.

Relationship among the leadership effectiveness and LPC score mainly depends on the situational variables also known as situational favorability. The situational favorability mainly was categorized in 3 categories; 1) leader-member relations: which means to what extent the subordinates are cooperative and loyal, 2) position power: which means to what extent a leader has the authority and 3) task structure: means to what extent the operating processes are in place to the accomplish tasks. With the passage of time, the contingency approach became less popular due to the inconsistent results in generated (Parry & Bryman, 2006). But the major contribution of this approach is that it has been successful in attracting the attention of the researchers towards the situational factors (Yukl, 2010).

Transformational Leadership. Parry & Bryman (2006) identified different terms which could be used to mainly describe new leadership types. Some of these types include charismatic leadership, transformational leadership and transactional leadership. The transactional leadership mainly refers to the exchange process that involves what the leader and the subordinates want and expect from each other (Bass, 1985). While the transformational leadership focuses on the motivating and encouraging the employees to accomplish the tasks. Transactional and transformational behavior both are though distinct but are not mutually exclusive (Yukl, 2010). In short, the transformational behavior includes the individualized consideration, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation. While the transactional behavior includes passive management, active management by exception and contingent reward (Yukl, 2010).

Majority of the researchers use the term charismatic and transformational interchangeably (Yukl, 2010). Both these concepts though are similar but has some distinctions. The charismatic leaders mainly arouse the commitment and enthusiasm among the followers through the compelling vision while the transformational leaders motivate and transform the followers by bringing awareness among them about the importance of the outcomes of the tasks and the organizational or group interests.

Distributed Leadership. The individual focused heroic leadership has been shifted towards the post-heroic model which not only focuses on single leader but also on the collaborative efforts of all the stakeholders (Oduro, 2004). Heroics concept is problematic due to main two reasons (J. P. Spillane, 2005); 1) the main center in the heroic model is the school

of principals or administrators but the leaders normally require more than simply individual efforts. Distributed leadership show that the leadership routine is a mix of different leaders (J. P. Spillane, 2005). Number of the leaders normally depend on the routine as well as the subject area. The routine such as evaluating and monitoring the teaching practices generally require the principal and the assistant principal. While the routines such as development of teachers within literacy involves the lead teacher, curricular specialist and the principal.

The research also identifies that the number of the leaders who are involved in some leadership routine mainly depends on the school subjects such as in the case of the Adams Elementary, the literacy instructions which are involve more participants for the execution of the leadership routines than the mathematics instructions (J. Spillane & Diamond, 2003). 2) heroic model mainly focuses on What instead of how. It mainly focuses on what the leadership structures, roles, routines and functions are there instead of how the leadership is being exercised.

The leadership practices should not only focus on what the leader do but also on why and how they do it. The distributed leadership actually is the antidote to the heroic leadership (Spillane, 2005). The term distributed leadership has been interchangeably used with the shared leadership, democratic leadership, and team leadership. The democratic leadership can be defined in 2 ways; 1) it can be used as an expansion to the authority or the leadership to the teachers, 2) it can be used as an expansion to the leadership work (Firestone & Martinez, 2007). The main focus of the distributed leadership is on exploration of spreading of the leadership among teachers and the leaders. The elements of distribution are 1) dispersed: which means leadership is to be taken as an activity which can easily be located in different segments of the organization, 2) collaborative: which means leadership through networking, partnership or alliance, 3) democratic: means leadership which is antithetical to the delegation and hierarchy, 4) shared: which means leadership which gets emerged from the social process and not from the leaders (Oduro, 2004).

Cross-Cultural Leadership

In recent years, globalization has generated public interest in social sciences, humanities, public policy, and educational fields (Suarez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004). Educational leaders have been working with increasingly diverse groups of students and teachers. In this globalization era, many organizations are challenged to maintain global leadership competence and to manage increasing diversity (Manning, 2003). Leadership has not only managerial dimensions, but also cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 1980). It is important to develop effective cross-cultural leaders (Manning, 2003). Effective leaders need to be aware of cultural differences and work in unfamiliar situations and cultures in which the leadership skills that they have within their own culture are no longer enough (Frost & Walker, 2007).

In 1980, Hofstede introduced four dimensions of national cultures. National culture was defined as the values that distinguish countries from each other. National cultures were grouped into four groups: Power Distance (PDI), Individualism versus Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity versus Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI). According to Hofstede (1980), power distance is the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power is distributed unequally. Individualism is a loose social framework where people take care only of themselves and family, while collectivism is a tight social framework where people look after and loyal to their groups or social network.

Masculinity includes values like assertiveness, the acquisition of money and materials, and not caring for others, while feminine encompasses values that are opposite from masculinity. Lastly, uncertainty avoidance is the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations.

In 1991, a major cross-cultural leadership research project, conceived by Robert J. House, was conducted. The first purpose was to conduct an international research project on leadership, but, later, the study expanded into other aspects of national and organizational cultures (Hofstede, 2006). The relationship between cultural context and leadership was recognized in a cross-country study, the GLOBE project (Jepson, 2009).

The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness project or the GLOBE Project was a quantitative-based research effort conducted across 62 cultures in 170 countries and initiated in the 1990s by Wharton School of Management at the University of Pennsylvania (Frost & Walker, 2007). The study aimed to investigate organizational culture and cross-cultural leadership. The research questions were whether societal culture is reflected in organizational culture and whether particular kinds of leadership, especially transformational and charismatic leadership, have universal value (Peterson, 2004).

The GLOBE researchers categorized countries into ten cultural clusters based upon cultural similarities due to shared geography and climate conditions, which were believed to influence on people's perceptions and behaviors. These cultural groups are as follows:

- (a) Anglo Cultures: England, South Africa (white), Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Ireland, United States
- (b) Arab Cultures: Bahrain, Algeria, Qatar, Morocco, Kuwait, Tunisia, Lebanon, Syria, Yemen, Jordan, Iraq, UAE, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Oman
- (c) Confucian Asia: Taiwan, Hong Kong, South Korea, Singapore, China, Japan, Vietnam
- (d) Eastern Europe: Hungary, Romania, Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Slovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Serbia, Greece, Slovenia, Albania, Russia
- (e) Germanic Europe: Dutch-speaking (Netherlands, Belgium and Dutch speaking France) German-speaking (Austria, German-speaking Switzerland, Germany, South Tyrol, Liechtenstein)
- (f) Latin America: Costa Rica, Venezuela, Ecuador, Mexico, El Salvador, Colombia, Guatemala, Bolivia, Brazil, Argentina
- (g) Latin Europe: Italy, Portugal, Spain, France, Switzerland (French and Italian speaking)
- (h) Nordic Europe: Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway
- (i) Southern Asia: India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Iran, Philippines, Turkey
- (j) Sub-Sahara Africa: Zambia, Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa (Black), Nigeria

In the GLOBE project, leadership attributes were analyzed to see which leadership attributes are universal positive or negative, and which may be interpreted differently in different culture (Frost & Walker, 2007). The results showed that good leadership attributes in any culture are honesty, trustworthiness, decisiveness, intelligence, positivity, and being a good communicator; bad leadership attributes in any culture are ruthlessness, irritability, egocentricity, and a dictatorial approach; and attributes, which may be misinterpreted in different cultures are ambition, logic, enthusiasm, individuality, sensitivity, and willingness to take risks (Frost & Walker, 2007).

The GLOBE project contributed a quantitative-based approach in the field of cross-cultural research into leadership and acknowledged the differences of leadership across cultures (Jepson, 2009). It is one of the well-known cross-cultural leadership research projects. Nevertheless, it has some limitations. Not all researchers agree the results. The project was criticized for over-simplifying culture (Ailon, 2008). In a critical analysis of the GLOBE project, Jepson (2009) pointed out the methodological limitations of the project. He indicated that the standardized questionnaire tended to “treat both culture and leadership in a too minimalist, static, and overly objectivist way, limiting our understanding of the complex, fluid and fragmented nature of cultural contexts” (Jepson, 2009, p.76). The GLOBE project was also criticized for claiming too much cross-cultural, ecological validity; for over-generalizing its findings, and for inappropriately making broad interpretations based on empirical findings (Graen, 2006). Graen (2006) stated that the GLOBE research is “the results of a large number of one-shot, self-reported, culturally biased survey studies” (Graen, 2006, p. 100).

In 1994, a prototype-based approach was used in a cross-cultural leadership study (Gerstner & Day, 1994). A leader prototype is a collection of traits or attributes stored in followers’ memory, which are used in identifying leaders. The prototype is an abstract perception one has about a leader. A perceived individual will be seen as a leader when he or she fits the prototype stored in the follower’s memory. However, Gerstner & Day (1994) stated that, in a cross-cultural context, the perception about leadership did not involve only physiological function, but also cultural background. They conducted a cross-cultural leadership research effort to compare leadership prototypes of students from eight countries: American, China, France, Germany, Honduras, India, Japan, and Taiwan. The students were enrolled in graduate programs at a large southeastern university. Their average age was 26.6 years, and the average time living in the United States was 2.5 years. The results showed that characteristics of business leaders varied by culture. The findings also showed an unexpected result that the U.S. business leader prototype maybe more similar to the Japanese than to the Honduran prototype. They concluded that leader prototypes applied to people from different national cultures are difficult to define. However, a study on differences in leadership perception is significant as it provides a better understanding of cross-cultural leadership.

Teacher Job Satisfaction

In the study of organizational behavior, job satisfaction is the most frequently examined variable (Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction and motivation are tightly linked to each other and to work effectiveness and productivity (Westover, Westover, & Westover, 2010). There are several attempts in defining job satisfaction (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013). A study on various definitions of job satisfaction concluded that job satisfaction is a reaction to one’s job (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). It can also be simply defined as the feelings people have about their jobs (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013).

A meta-analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance reported a relationship between the two (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). Some researchers believe that job satisfaction causes an increase in work performance (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). Some believe that positive behaviors are the cause of job satisfaction, and some believe that job satisfaction is a side effect of behaviors (Balzer, et al., 2000). However, some researchers do not believe that job satisfaction leads to better work performance (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955).

In the field of education, teacher job satisfaction is significant as a study showed that teachers who have job stress or lack of job satisfaction tend to have a weak relationship with students and thus have a classroom management problem (Burke, Greenglass, & Schwarzer, 1996). Furthermore, teacher job satisfaction was reported as one of the intrinsic motivators significantly influencing retention, while extrinsic motivators including salary and work overload had no effects (Perrachione, Rosser, & Petersen, 2008). Teacher job satisfaction is also critical to teacher retention and commitment, which will lead to school effectiveness (Shann, 1998).

Nevertheless, the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity appears to be inconclusive. While some researchers claim that job satisfaction has an impact on performance and productivity (Judge et al., 2001; Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013; Whitman, Van Rooy, & Viswesvaran, 2010), some argue that the relationship between satisfaction and productivity is not that straightforward (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013), and some state that there is no correlation between job satisfaction and performance (Barbash, 1979).

Variables that Influence Teacher Job Satisfaction

Some research on variables that influence teacher job satisfaction has been conducted (Chapman & Lowther, 1982; Ma & MacMillan, 1999; Perrachione et al., 2008). There are many variables that influence teacher job satisfaction, including demographic variables (Bogler, 2002; Green-Reese, Johnson, & Campbell Jr., 1991; Ma & MacMillan, 1999); coworkers (Garner, 1995; LaRocco, House, & French, 1980; Maslow, 1954; Sergiovanni, 1967); professional competence (Ma & MacMillan, 1999); job-or-role-related characteristics (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013); policy and bureaucracy (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013); and pay (Maslow, 1954).

Job satisfaction can be influenced by intrinsic and extrinsic motivators (Herzberg, 1966). Intrinsic factors involve job content or work roles, and extrinsic factors are work environment or workplace conditions. According to Herzberg (1996), intrinsic factors contribute to job satisfaction. In contrast, extrinsic factors do not lead to job satisfaction but rather to job dissatisfaction. In the following sections each type of variable is explored.

Demographic Variables. Some studies have investigated the relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and their demographic characteristics (Bogler, 2002). Findings show inconsistent results. Some research shows that job satisfaction has been positively related to age, gender, marital status, and level of education. The findings of Ma & MacMillan's study (1999) show that the older and the more experienced teachers are, the less satisfied they are with their careers, and male teachers tends to be less satisfied than female teachers. However, Green-Reese et al. (1991) show a different result.

Their study of job satisfaction of 229 secondary school physical education teachers in 85 urban schools in North Florida and South Georgia shows that the age of teachers and years of teaching experiences are not significant factors in job satisfaction or job stress. As for teachers' marital status, other research shows that married female teachers are more satisfied than unmarried teachers are (Goodlad, 1984). In term of teachers' educational level, teachers with higher educational level tend to be more satisfied than those with lower educational level (Meek, 1998).

Coworkers. Colleagues can cause job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013). Coworkers provide friendships, social support, and the continued learning that help enhance performance (LaRocco, House, & French, 1980). Teamwork creates a greater sense of professionalism and higher job satisfaction (Garner, 1995). Teachers also gain confidence through collaboration. Teachers tend to stay in the profession when they have positive relationships with colleagues (Maslow, 1954). Although working with professional teams can create a positive working environment (LaRocco, House, & French, 1980; Garner, 1995; Maslow, 1954), one study shows that interpersonal relationship with peers cause teacher job dissatisfaction (Sergiovanni, 1967). Teachers' preferences on interaction with coworkers are different (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013). Teachers have different emotional needs and backgrounds. Some teachers prefer a higher degree of interaction with other teachers, while some need little interaction.

Professional Competence. Teaching competence is viewed as one of key contributors to teacher job satisfaction (Albert & Levine, 1988). A positive feeling about what the teachers know and a feeling that their teaching is effective lead to their satisfaction (Ma & MacMillan, 1999). In contrast, the lack of this professional competence will lead to an uneasy feeling resulting in teaching dissatisfaction. Teaching competence can be described as (a) the content knowledge and skills needed for the particular course, (b) the teachers' belief that they have or have access to effective and up-to-date teaching strategies, and (c) the teachers' ability to use their knowledge along with instructional techniques to help students meet the educational standards (Ma & MacMillan, 1999).

Job- or Role-Related Characteristics. Research shows that a job itself or teachers' daily tasks can be a satisfier, a dissatisfier, and a predictor of job satisfaction (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013). Variation of job tasks, creativity in performing tasks, and ownership of assignments can create higher job satisfaction than the salary does. Teachers tend to have lower job satisfaction when performing routine or repetitive tasks. Teachers who believe that their tasks are important and meaningful tend to have a higher level of job satisfaction.

Policy and Bureaucracy. Policy and bureaucracy have been reported as annoyances that cause lower job satisfaction (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013). Teachers often view regulations, paperwork, and meetings as unnecessary bureaucracy and hindrances that disrupt them from their work. Thus, teachers who perceive a high level of bureaucracy in their workplace have low job satisfaction.

Pay. Pay or income and financial recognition for accomplishment can be used as a tool to promote job satisfaction and self-esteem (Maslow, 1954). Teachers need to feel that they are financially stable, and teachers who have financial problems are likely to behave negatively (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013). Some researchers have indicated that pay can be used as a tool to improve an employee's job satisfaction, since knowing that one can make more income increases the level of job satisfaction (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013).

However, not all researchers agree that money can increase the level of satisfaction. Some believe that it might cause an adverse effect if administered improperly (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013). Using pay incentives like merit pay plans have been reported as an unsuccessful strategy in increasing motivation (Sylvia & Hutchinson, 1985).

The Relationship between Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction

Some research indicates that leadership style is related to teacher job satisfaction (Blase et al., 1986; Nguni et al., 2006; Whaley, 1994). Leaders or principals may have a direct or indirect effect on the satisfaction of teachers (Hulpia, Devos, & Rosseel, 2009). However, the research on leadership type or leadership behavior that directly or indirectly influences teacher job satisfaction is still inconclusive.

Bliss, Konet, & Tarter, 1990 conducted a study by utilizing Fiedler's LPC contingency model. They examined leadership style and effectiveness in 60 secondary school social studies departments. Department chairpersons were divided into two groups: task-oriented and relations-oriented based on their LPC scores.

Teachers were randomly selected from each department to provide information about satisfaction in their career. The findings indicate that task-oriented leadership promotes a higher level of teacher job satisfaction in high-control situations.

As for leadership styles, transformational leadership or transactional leadership has been reported as correlated to teacher job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006; Pepper, 2010). Transformational leadership behaviors have been viewed as a factor that contributes to a higher level of satisfaction. Bogler (2001) examined the effects of transformational or transactional leadership style of school principals on teacher job satisfaction of 745 teachers from Israeli schools, and the findings indicate that principals' transformational leadership affect teachers' satisfaction both directly and indirectly.

Nguni et al. (2006) investigated the perception of 700 Tanzanian teachers about transformational and transactional leadership styles of school principals and the teachers' own job satisfaction. The results indicate that both transformational and transactional leadership influence teacher job satisfaction, as well as other variables in the study.

In a study of the effects of leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction on organizational health, (Korkmaz, 2007) surveyed of 635 teachers' perception of transformational and transactional leadership styles of their principals and their job satisfaction. Their results demonstrates that the perception of transformational leadership type is an indicator of teacher job satisfaction. The more transformational leadership type teachers perceived, the more satisfied they are. In contrast, the less transactional leadership behaviors they perceived, the more satisfied they are.

However, not all researchers agree that transactional leadership negatively affects satisfaction. From a review and analysis of literature on leadership and leadership styles, especially transformational and transactional leadership type, (Pepper, 2010) concluded transformational leadership is not the only type that creates a healthy school environment. A proper balance of these two leadership types helps establish a positive school environment (Pepper, 2010), which in turn leads to teacher satisfaction (Moore, 2012).

In addition, leadership behaviors such as consideration behaviors (Blase et al., 1986), styles of decision making (Bogler, 2001), communication style (Kottkamp & Others, 1987), and how leaders provide support (Hulpia et al., 2009) and feedback (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013) influence teacher satisfaction. A survey of 168 full-time elementary, junior high, and senior high school teachers from many regions of a central midwestern state about their perceived impact of the

principal's behavior on teachers' classroom performance, and their work stress showed an association between teacher satisfaction and frequency of the principal's initiation of structure and consideration behaviors (Blase et al., 1986).

From a review of literature, Bogler (2001) found that it was hypothesized that leaders' decision-making style that allow greater teacher involvement in decision-making processes leads to a higher level teacher job satisfaction than autocratic decision-making style where leaders solely make decision without consulting team members .

In the study of school climate of 78 high schools in New Jersey, (Kottkamp & Others, 1987) found that teachers seem to be more satisfied in schools where principals were perceived as using an open communication style compared to schools where principals use an authoritative style. Leader supportive behaviors were reported as positively influencing teacher job satisfaction (Hulpia et al., 2009).

The findings of a study on the relation between distributed leadership, organizational commitment and job satisfaction of teachers involving teachers from 46 secondary schools, on the other hand, indicated that leadership support indirectly influences job satisfaction (Hulpia et al., 2009).

Feedback studies have looked at the depth, quantity, appropriateness, and timing of the feedback given by leaders (Knox & Anfara Jr., 2013). These studies indicate that appropriate feedback provided by leaders creates a feeling of importance for teachers as such feedback made them feel they had been given the necessary support for success.

The Context of the Studies on Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction

Several research studies have been conducted to determine the relationship between leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction (Blase et al., 1986; Higgins, 2010; Knoop, 1981; Nguni et al., 2006; Robinson, 1995; Weissman, 2009). This review of literature reveals that leadership style is one of the factors that influence teacher job satisfaction both directly and indirectly. The review demonstrates that although some research studies have investigated the relationship between leadership style and teacher satisfaction (Bogler, 2001), there is a lack of research on multicultural perspectives.

A study of this relationship in the setting of a multicultural educational institution is absent. Research on leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction pays very little attention to the context of multicultural organizations. There is no attempt at investigating the relationship of leadership style and teacher satisfaction involving leaders and teachers who have diverse backgrounds.

The focus of existing research has been on determining whether there is a relationship between leadership behavior and teacher job satisfaction and which type of leadership style or behavior influences or promotes teacher job satisfaction (Blase, Dedrick, & Strathe, 1986; Bliss et al., 1990; Bogler, 2001; Hulpia, Devos, & Rosseel, 2009; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006; Pepper, 2010).

The studies generally investigated leadership behavior and satisfaction of teachers and leaders who share the same ethnical and racial background. The studies were mainly conducted in two main settings: research in one specific area or in cross-country research.

- (a) Research in one specific area:
 - 60 secondary school social studies departments in New Jersey (Bliss et al., 1990)
 - 20 schools in northern Israel (Shechtman, Zou'bi, & Katz, 1994)

- elementary, junior high, and senior high schools from many regions of a central midwestern state (Blase et al., 1986)
 - 98 schools in the northern part of Israel (Bogler, 2001)
 - primary schools in Shanghai, China (Zhang & Wu, 2001)
 - 70 schools in the eastern educational zone of Tanzania (Nguni et al., 2006)
 - 46 high schools in Ankara, Turkey (Korkmaz, 2007)
 - 46 secondary schools in Flanders, Belgium (Hulpia, Devos, Rosseel, & Vlerick, 2012)
- (b) a-cross country research:
- 14 secondary schools in Lebanon (Theodory, 1981)
 - 100 secondary schools in Singapore (Koh et al., 1995)
 - the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education or CCNE-accredited colleges and universities in the United States (Higgins, 2010)

6. Conclusion and recommendation for future research

In the literature review on the topic of the relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction in a multicultural perspective, considerable research was discovered explaining how leaders may influence teacher job satisfaction, how cultural attachments that leaders have may affect their behaviors, and how culture may affect followers' perspectives of leaders. The review of existing research has revealed that a multicultural perspective is missing from the study of the relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction in educational settings. The impact of globalization has forced not only business sectors, but also educational sectors to deal with the increasing diversity.

Effective leaders need to be aware of cultural differences (Frost & Walker, 2007); thus, educational leaders, especially the ones in a multinational educational institution or international school, need to develop their cross-cultural skills in order to work with increasing diverse numbers of students, staff, and teachers.

Future research should be conducted to examine leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction at multicultural educational institutions, researchers can better understand the complexity of leadership styles in a multicultural context. Such study will add multicultural perspectives to the body of research. The results of the study can be used to plan leadership-training programs that integrate cultural perspectives in professional development programs in international organizations. In addition, the research on leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction can be an initiative for finding the best environments for teaching and learning.

A study on the relationship between leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction at a multicultural educational institution is significant for many reasons. A study of a relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction of multinational teachers can be an initiative in educational context. The finding can clarify which leadership styles produce higher teacher job satisfaction at multicultural institution. The information about these styles helps provide guidance for improved professional development programs such as leadership training for chairpersons within the institution. An understanding of the relationship between leadership styles of multicultural instructors and their job satisfaction helps create effective leadership policies and practices, which in turn create an increase of teacher job satisfaction, and a better working environment. Satisfied teachers will, then, have more teaching efforts, high work performance and high teaching quality, which will lead to high academic performance students.

References

- Ailon, G. (2008). Mirror, mirror on the wall: Culture's consequences in a value test of its own design. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 885-904.
- Albert, D., & Levine, D. (1988). Teacher satisfaction. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 65(3), 47-58.
- Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C., . . . Parra, L. F. (2000). Users' manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI;1997 version) and the Job in General scales. In J. M. Stanton and C. D. Crossley. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- Barbash, J. (1979). Job satisfaction attitude surveys. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stodgill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research & managerial applications* (3 ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Blase, J. J., Dedrick, C., & Strathe, M. (1986). Leadership behavior of school principals in relation to teacher stress, satisfaction, and performance. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development*, 24(4), 159-171.
- Bliss, J. R., Konet, R. J., & Tarter, C. J. (1990). Leadership style and effectiveness in secondary school departments. *The High School Journal*, 74(1), 38-46.
- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662.
- Bogler, R. (2002). Two profiles of schoolteachers: A discriminant analysis of job satisfaction. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 18(6), 665.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 396-424.
- Burke, R. J., Greenglass, E. R., & Schwarzer, R. (1996). Predicting teacher burnout over time: Effects of work stress, social support, and self-doubts on burnout and its consequence. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 9(3), 261-275.
- Chapman, D. W., & Lowther, M. A. (1982). Teachers' satisfaction with teaching. *Journal of Educational Research*, 75(4), 241-47.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: how people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York, NY: Lexington Press.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 72(2), 149-190.
- Firestone, W. A., & Martinez, M. C. (2007). Districts, teacher leaders, and distributed leadership: Changing instructional practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(1), 3-35.
- Frost, J., & Walker, M. (2007). Cross cultural leadership. *Engineering Management*, 17(3), 27-29. doi:10.1049/em:20070303
- Garner, H. (1995). *Teamwork models and experience in education*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(2), 121-134. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(94)90024-8
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Graen, G. B. (2006). In the eye of the beholder: Cross-cultural lesson in leadership from project GLOBE: A response viewed from the third culture bonding (TCB) model of cross-cultural leadership
- Green-Reese, S., Johnson, D. J., & Campbell Jr., W. A. (1991). Teacher job satisfaction and teacher job stress: School size, age and teaching experience. *Education*, 112(2), 247.
- Herzberg, A. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World Publishing.

- Higgins, B. C. (2010). An evaluation of the relationship of nursing school administrators' leadership frame orientation to faculty perceptions of job satisfaction and leadership effectiveness. ProQuest Information & Learning). Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 70(9-). (2010-99050-199).
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership, and organization - do american theories apply abroad. *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(1), 42-63.
- Hofstede, G. (2006). What Did GLOBE Really Measure? Researchers' Minds versus Respondents' Minds. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(6), 882-896.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(2), 286-316.
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). The relationship between the perception of distributed leadership in secondary schools and teachers' and teacher leaders' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement*, 20(3), 291-317. doi:10.1080/09243450902909840
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., Rosseel, Y., & Vlerick, P. (2012). Dimensions of Distributed Leadership and the Impact on Teachers' Organizational Commitment: A Study in Secondary Education. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(7), 1745-1784.
- Jepson, D. (2009). Studying leadership at cross-country level: A critical analysis. 5(1), 61-80.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376
- Kennerly, S. M. (1989). Leadership behavior and organizational characteristic: Implications for faculty satisfaction. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 28(5), 198-202.
- Knoop, R. (1981). Leadership styles of principals and teachers' job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, and participation in decision making. ().
- Knox, J. A., & Anfara Jr., V. A. (2013). Understanding job satisfaction and its relationship to student academic performance. *Middle School Journal*, 44(3), 58-64.
- Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M., & Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformation leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(4), 319-333. doi:10.1002/job.4030160404
- Korkmaz, M. (2007). The effects of leadership styles on organizational health. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 23-55.
- Kottkamp, R. B., & Others, A. (1987). Secondary school climate: A revision of the OCDQ. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 23(3), 31-48.
- LaRocco, J. M., House, J. S., & French, J. R. (1980). Social support, occupational stress, and health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 2, 202-218.
- Ma, X., & MacMillan, R. B. (1999). Influences of workplace conditions on teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Research*, 93(1), 39-47.
- Manning, T. T. (2003). Leadership across cultures: Attachment style influences. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(3), 20-30. doi:10.1177/107179190300900304
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Meek, A. (1998). America's teachers: Much to celebrate. *Educational Leadership*, 55, 12-17.
- Moore, C. M. (2012). The Role of School Environment in Teacher Dissatisfaction Among U.S. Public School Teachers. *SAGE Open*, 2(1), 1-16. doi:10.1177/2158244012438888
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 145-177.

- Oduro, G. K. T. (2004). Distributed leadership in schools. *Education Journal*, (80), 23-25.
- Parry, K. W., & Bryman, A. (2006). Leadership in Organizations. In *The SAGE Handbook of Organization Studies* (2 ed., pp. 446-469). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Pepper, K. (2010). Effective principals skillfully balance leadership styles to facilitate student success: A focus for the reauthorization of ESEA. *Planning and Changing*, 41(1-2), 42-56.
- Perrachione, B. A., Rosser, V. J., & Petersen, G. J. (2008). Why do they stay? elementary teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention. *Professional Educator*, 32(2)
- Peterson, M. F. (2004). Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49(4), 641-647.
- Randers-Pehrson, M. (2000). Largest Foreign Language Program in the World Continues to Broaden Horizons, Dazzle Linguists. *American Council On The Teaching of Foreign Language*, 33(6), 657-678.
- Robinson, G. H. (1995). A study of the relationship of leadership styles of principals and teacher job satisfaction. ProQuest Information & Learning). *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 55(8-). (1995-95004-103).
- Rost, J. E. (1991). *Leadership for the 21st century*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80(609).
- Sergiovanni, T. (1967). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 5(1), 66-82.
- Shann, M. H. (1998). Professional commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 92(2), 67.
- Shechtman, Z., Zou'bi, M., & Katz, M. (1994). Principal leadership style and teacher feelings and behavior: Arab schools in israel. *The School Community Journal*, 4(2), 53-66.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Spillane, J., & Diamond, J. (2003). Leading instruction: The distribution of leadership for instruction. *JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM STUDIES*, 35(5), 533-543.
- Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *Educational Forum*, 69(2), 143-150.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 35-71.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature*. New York: Free Press.
- Suarez-Orozco, M. M., & Qin-Hilliard, D. B. (2004). *Globalization, culture and education in the new millennium*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Sylvia, R. D., & Hutchinson, T. (1985). What makes Ms. Johnson teach? A study of teacher motivation. *Human Relations*, 13, 693-713.
- Theodory, G. C. (1981). Principal's experience and teachers' satisfaction in lebanese secondary schools. *Journal of Psychology*, 108(1), 7-10.
- Weissman, N. L. (2009). The relationship between leadership styles of directors of accredited higher education respiratory care programs and faculty satisfaction, willingness to exert extra effort, perceived director effectiveness, and program outcomes. ProQuest Information & Learning). *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 69(7-). (2009-99010-239).
- Westover, J. H., Westover, A. R., & Westover, L. A. (2010). Enhancing long-term worker productivity and performance: The connection of key work domains to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 59(4), 372-387. doi:10.1108/17410401011038919

- Whaley, K. W. (1994). Leadership and teacher job satisfaction. *NASSP Bulletin*, 78(564), 46-50.
- Whitman, D. S., Van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2010). Satisfaction, citizenship behaviors, and performance in work units: A meta-analysis of collective construct relations Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01162.x
- Zhang, Z., & Wu, Z. (2001). The relationship between principal leadership behaviors and teachers' job satisfaction. *Psychological Science (China)*, 24(1), 120-121.
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7 ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.