AN EVALUATION TOWARDS HEAD TEACHERS' GENDER BASED LEADERSHIP STYLES WITH TEACHERS' JOB SATISFACTION

MARIA AZWAN BINTI MARIYTEBI

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

AN EVALUATION TOWARDS HEAD TEACHERS' GENDER BASED
LEADERSHIP STYLES WITH TEACHERS' JOB SATISFACTION

MARIA AZWAN BINTI MARIYTEBI

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Education (Management & Administration)**

**Faculty of Education
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia**

AUGUST 2013

DEDICATION

To my beloved husband,
Abdul Latiff Bin Abu Hasim

For my dearest children,
Armand Qaliph Yusoff Bin Abdul Latiff and Miqael Aydin Yusoff Bin Abdul Latiff

To my loving parents who were no longer around,
Mariytebi @ Mohd. Yusof Bin Mohd. Som and Ramlah Binti Mohd. Sa'at

Special gratitude for my supervisor,
Dr. Lokman Bin Mohd. Tahir

An appreciation for all the lecturers, my siblings and friends.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my appreciation to my husband, Abdul Latiff Bin Abu Hasim for allowing me to continue with my studies and even sacrificing his times to look after our children while I was away. You offered me support, love and encouragement throughout. This goes to my children too; Armand Qaliph Yusoff Bin Abdul Latiff and Miqael Aydin Yusoff Bin Abdul Latiff. Mummy loves both of you dearly.

I would like thank both of my parents even though they were no longer around. The love and support they gave me when they were around was no boundaries. My gratitude goes to my siblings too.

My special thanks and acknowledgement goes to Dr. Lokman Bin Mohd. Tahir; my supervisor for this study. He has helped me a lot throughout this process and guided me for my thesis writings. His kindness and patience has given me confidence in completing this study. This is not an easy task to complete but I have learned valuable lesson that I gained from this.

My heartfelt thanks go to my colleagues in Sekolah Kebangsaan Bukit Rahmat, Ledang and friends that are together with me in this course and gave me moral support. They also motivated me greatly to move on as I was much pressured throughout the long road of this research study. To the head teachers that gave me support and teachers that cooperated in completing the surveys. They have been supportive and genuinely interested in my study. Without their co-operation, this study would never be a success.

Finally, I would like to thank all. There was a lot of valuable experience that deeply inspired me.

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study is to evaluate the style of leadership among the head teachers based on their gender. It also aims to explore behavioural differences between male and female head teachers in the way they managing the schools. The study involved teachers from various schools around Muar and Ledang. The quantitative survey questionnaires were distributed to ten schools around Muar and Ledang. The questionnaires consisted of 42 questions related to head teachers' leadership styles and approaches as well as the teachers' job satisfaction. The primer data was gathered through a modified questionnaires based from the *Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)* to evaluate the leadership styles and the approaches and consideration of head teachers. To evaluate the teachers' job satisfaction, *Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)* was used. The validity and reliability of the instrument was tested using Alpha Cronbach scale towards 12 teachers in the District of Muar and Ledang. The pilot study showed a high reliability of 0.853 for the items tested. The data was the analyzed using *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) version 20 to get the mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, Spearman correlation and regression. Based on the findings from the study has shown that there are only slight differences between both genders leadership styles based on teachers' evaluation. Head teachers gender based leadership does not carry much weight on teachers' job satisfaction align with the previous study by other researchers. The researcher recommends head teachers to prepare themselves with appropriate knowledge and skills of leadership. The researcher also suggests that further studies could be carried out either in similar or different in context to assure the effectiveness of head teacher's leadership styles and teacher's job satisfaction.

ABSTRAK

Tujuan utama kajian ini adalah untuk menilai gaya kepimpinan di kalangan guru besar dan pengetua sekolah berdasarkan jantina. Ia juga bertujuan untuk mengenalpasti perbezaan sikap di antara guru besar dan pengetua lelaki dan wanita dalam menguruskan sekolah. Kajian ini melibatkan sejumlah guru-guru di sekitar daerah Muar dan Ledang. Satu soal selidik berbentuk kuantitatif telah diedarkan di sepuluh buah sekolah di dua daerah tersebut. Soal selidik tersebut mengandungi 42 soalan yang berkaitan dengan gaya kepimpinan pengetua dan guru besar juga pendekatan yang mereka amalkan terhadap guru-guru dan pengaruhnya tehadap tahap kepuasan kerja guru. Pengukuran data yang digunakan adalah berdasarkan pengubahsuaian dari *Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)* untuk mengenalpasti gaya kepimpinan guru besar dan pengetua serta pendekatan yang digunakan oleh mereka terhadap guru- guru. Bagi mengukur tahap kepuasan kerja guru pula, pengukuran data dari pengubahsuaian kepada *Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)* dilakukan. Instrumen kajian telah diuji untuk menentukan kebolehpercayaan berdasarkan Alpha Cronbach di kalangan 12 orang guru di Daerah Muar dan Ledang. Hasil kajian rintis menunjukkan kebolehpercayaan yang tinggi (0.853) bagi ketiga-tiga item. Data kajian diproses menggunakan program *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)* bagi mendapatkan min, sisihan piawai, ujian ANOVA, korelasi *Spearman* dan regressi. Berdasarkan kepada dapatan kajian ini, hanya terdapat sedikit perbezaan sahaja diantara gaya kepimpinan guru besar dan pengetua lelaki juga wanita. Jantina pengetua juga tidak banyak mempengaruhi tahap kepuasan kerja dikalangan guru. Ini selari dengan dapatan dari pengkaji-pengkaji sebelum ini. Pengkaji mencadangkan agar guru besar dan pengetua bersiap siaga dengan ilmu dan kemahiran kepimpinan yang sewajarnya. Pengkaji juga mencadangkan agar kajian lanjutan dilakukan sama ada didalam konteks yang sama mahupun tidak untuk memastikan keberkesanan gaya kepimpinan seseorang pengetua atau guru besar dengan tahap kepuasan kerja guru-guru.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4   **CHAPTER 4 : DATA ANALYSIS**

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF SYMBOLS

f   -   Frequency

%   -   Percentage

β   -   Beta

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The Malaysian education system has undergone tremendous changes since more than fifty years ago. It has started to change when Malaysia has her independence in 1957. The changes have always been in line with the national aspiration towards the global changes. In order to achieve that aspiration, in this multi-religious, multi-racial, multi-cultural and multi-ethnic country, the education system plays an important and effective role in restructuring the society (Liew, 2001). The familiarity stand in educational management has developed and studies that have been carried out in educational systems surrounded by developing countries have usually been marginalized in the discourse of the related area (Dimmock & Walker, 1998; 2005). Besides, the Malaysian education system is anticipated to train and produce essential manpower needed by this country so that the educational system in this country could catch up with the development achieved by many advanced countries. Nowadays, schools have been given undeniable task in laying the foundation of generating highly motivated, more resourceful and innovative citizens who will be able to engender new knowledge. In order to achieve these goals, schools need to be led by effective head teachers and the students need to be taught by high quality teachers who have high motivation.

Schools not only need to be managed but they need to be led. It is obvious that a person can be a leader without being a manager and a person can be a manager without leading. Bennis and Nanus (1985) contended that leadership and management were qualitatively dissimilar and reciprocally restricted. Managers

value solidity, organize, and effectiveness, whereas leaders, conversely, value flexibility, improvement, and adjustment. Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right things. It does not matter who the leaders are, gender gaps still exist in low-income countries, but are much slighter than in earlier decades. In middle and high-earnings countries lots of these spaces have been upturned (Pande & Ford, 2011). There were some stereotypes that leadership poses were commonly for men and women were deficient in the obligatory behaviour in leading schools (Orphanos, 2010).

Whether schools leaders or head teachers are men or women, they are now given equivalent rights in leading their schools. Senge (1994) stated that leaders were considered heroes, great men who rose up in the era of crises and wars. When leaders were considered heroes, male leadership images were overriding even while efforts were made to integrate female leadership images (Olson, 2002). There are some issues related to women in advancement. Sturn (2001) stated that when organizations' prevalent adoption of procedure segregation gender inequity, while opening doors to women, have also failed to close the gender gap at more senior levels. The study was suggesting that impediments to women's advancement are more difficult and indefinable than premeditated forms of gender discrimination. Though there was some general agreement that women face more obstacles to becoming leaders than men did, especially for leader roles that were male dominated (Eagly & Karou, 2001). We must take note that the quality of a leader did not lie in hereditary or gender quality (Goldberg, 2001). The quality of a leader needs to be trained. It could take years to be sharpened.

According to Lashway, *et. al*, (2004), leadership was still considered as human activity that employs complication in human communication. Both men and women were perceived in traditional stereotypical ways and, as a result, men continue to emerge more often as leaders; thus, leadership positions can only be conquered by males. This biologically driven approach made the concept of women attaining leadership positions as improbable as their becoming men styles of leadership (Applebaum *et. al*., 2002 as cited in Abu-Tineh 2012).

An effective man and woman leader carried out almost the same concept of leadership (Pounder & Coleman, 2002). Brannon (2002) stated that there were many researches in the past related to gender and the role of leadership that showed men and women leadership having parallel perception and method of leadership. Some social scientists have claimed that male and female organizational either differ or lessen the significance of those differences that have been observed (Powell, 1990).

Despite the similarities between men and women leadership, there is a little disagreement on the detailed issue especially related to their behaviour in relation to the school environment. This area of research has taken on greater importance because the most current research in educational leadership has revealed that the school head teacher's impact on student achievement is not a direct one, but rather an indirect impact mediated by the climate of the school (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Witziers, Bosker, & Kruger, 2003). Experts who have written about this topic have generally continued that either dissimilarities or similarities prevail (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). The supporters of dissimilarity included several writers of trade books who have claimed that the leadership styles of men and women were different. The causes why men and women behave in a different way in the leadership roles they fill in public schools continues to attract the attention of educational researchers (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Oplatka, 2006; Oplatka & Herts-Lazarovits, 2006).

Women have traditionally been signified in administration roles even though they fill the majority of teaching positions in primary or secondary schools (Koch & Irby, 2002). Along the lines, women were claimed to be less hierarchical, more accommodating, more collaborative and more oriented to enhancing others' self-worth (Book, 2000; Rosener, 1995 as cited in Eagly *et al.*, 2001). This has influenced by the nature of the women themselves where they are eventually more nurturing and comforting. Moreover, women were more human oriented and more sensitive in interpersonal issue when they became leaders (Zemke, *et. al,*, 2000 as cited in Loughlin). Besides that, women were perceived as caring, nurturing and collaborative (Eagly, *et. al.*, 1992) but, women's traditional and stereotypic styles of

communication were more like those of a good manager than were men's stereotypic styles (Shakeshaft, 1989).

Porat (1991) posit that men in leadership position tend to lead from the front while women lean toward facilitative leadership, enabling others to make contributions through delegation, encouragement and nudging from behind as they portray themselves less dominant. Women were more likely to be more supportive and encouraging than men do. In school environment, the female head teacher's leadership stereotype was more congruent with new 'softer' organization discourses which focus on people-oriented management as a new source of efficiency in postmodern organizations (Blackmore, 1999). Regardless of the findings, Osland (2006) on the other hand, noted that both men and women equated successful management with male characteristics.

As it is related to the school environment, these traits presented by the head teachers might lead to teachers' motivation and job satisfaction. According to Ololube (2006), the significance of job satisfaction and motivation were very crucial to the long-term growth of any educational system around the world. Positive environment can easily be brought about if teachers are satisfied with what they are doing. According to Cranny (1992), job satisfaction was an effective response to a job that resulting from the current comparison of definite outcome with those that is desired. The best can be given to the students when teachers who are teaching them are happy doing the job entrusted to them. In relation, students of highly proficiency in every aspect can be produced if every section of the school works efficiently. It is somehow related to each other.

Job satisfaction has been the most frequently investigated variable in organizational behavior (Spector, 1997). It has been the most preferable research done by the researchers all around the world because its influence on ones' performances at their workplace. Job satisfaction has variety of perceptions and for some researchers, for example Peretomode (1991) and Whawo (1993) have suggested that the higher and the more prestige of the job, the greater the job satisfaction would be. Many workers, however, are satisfied in even the least

prestigious jobs (Ololube, 2006). That is, they simply like what they do and the job they entrusted to. In any case, satisfaction has been regarded as individual as one's mind-set or state of mind. It depends on one's perception. Job satisfaction is very vital in the education field. In order to achieve the satisfaction of the job, teachers need motivation to inculcate themselves to get the best quality of work. Ololube (2006) has also stated that teachers with great motivation can produce dynamic, excellent and dedicated behaviour towards the school growth. An organization such as school mostly relies to subordinates which have high motivation (Adam, 1994). Motivation and job satisfaction influence each other. Schools must give more attention to teachers' job satisfaction because it may encourage teachers' efficiency (Ostroff, 1992). Blasé, Dedrick & Strathe (1986), Lortie (1975), and Randall (1988) found that teachers' job satisfaction and performance related to the head teachers' leadership behaviour. Besides, job satisfaction can be defined as an employee's affective response to a job, supported by the comparison between actual outcomes and desired outcomes (Mosadeghrad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). The degree of job satisfaction and reliability to the organization are influenced by the types of leadership practiced by the head teachers either men or women.

As the demand for effective head teachers in schools continues to increase, the relevancy of this study is there. The researcher intends to study on the relationship of head teachers' leadership styles either they are male or female head teachers with the job satisfaction of the teachers. First of all, it is relevant to explore possible differences between the leadership behaviours of men and women. The question is that, do men and women head teachers behave and act differently as they assume leadership roles in schools? If so, how are their leadership behaviours in school settings can be different? These questions were relevant to ask as women head teachers continue to experience obstacles in attaining leadership roles in schools that are conventionally male dominated (Koch & Irby, 2002; Shakeshaft, 1989).

1.2 Background of the Proble

The traditional views of leaders were people, who fought enemies, energized troops, set directions and make key decisions (Senge, 1994). These were deeply rooted in an individualistic and unsystematic worldview (Abu-Tineh, 2012). Effective leaders exercise indirect but influential authority on the effectiveness of the school and it will definitely lead to the teachers' commitment. The effectiveness of the teachers ultimately will lead to the students' general accomplishment. In the present day, school must be able to prepare students to enhance the ability for new knowledge and it must also create innovative and creative students with different mentality than the students used to be in those old days. As school education has become more multifarious and more complex, superior leadership and effective teachers are essential parts that determine the school effectiveness and efficiency. Effective teachers are defined as teachers with high commitment as well that the sense of obligation who can bring about greater improvement and better achievement of the students. The importance of the head teachers' leadership in providing effective schooling and quality education cannot be overstated because they play the pivotal role on assuring the school effectiveness. It cannot be understated too. Leadership was a critical factor for organizational performance and effectiveness (Conger *et al*, 1988; Schein, 1992; Yukl, 1994).

Another major issue that has been discussed about in the attribution of leadership efficiency is gender differences. Early research on leadership reinforced the premise that leadership was biologically determined and demonstrated through the behaviour of the male (Abu-Tineh, 2012). The study has strongly stated that when one talked about leadership, it must be focusing on a male leadership. Leadership was viewed as a male domain and women have been denied leadership positions because it was assumed that the higher levels of power should be monopolized by men (Burns, 1978). Likely, women have increasingly entered leadership roles that conventionally were occupied mainly by men, and the possibility that the leadership styles of men and women can be similar or different from each other (Kark, 2004). Appelbaum (2003) affirmed that with the argument that men and women are biologically different, researchers began investigating

differences in the effectiveness of men and women as leaders from different perspectives. Women in leadership are facing many barriers and one of the typical barriers for women moving up to higher position was gender based stereotypes (Oakley, 2000).

Primarily, there was the tendency to respond more constructively to men who were self-promoting and to women who were modest (Giacalone & Riordan, 1990; Wosinska, Dabul, Whetstone-Dion, & Cialdini, 1996). This basically has influenced by the personality of women themselves who are more reserved. Gender variables were considered relevant factor in understanding leadership pertaining to agentic and communal characteristics (Eagly *et. al.*, 2000). According to Eagly *et al.*, (2000), agentic characteristics are ascribed more strongly to men than women. These characteristics portray primarily a self confident person who has the ability in controlling and also has the confident tendency. It portrays the characteristics of ambitious person and more dominant. Besides, the agentic people have the character of a person who is dynamic, forceful and bold. In the research, it stated that agentic leaders are also independent and competitive. On the other hand, communal characteristics, as stated in the research done by Eagly *et al.*, (2000) were ascribed to women better than men. Communal characteristics are described as people who are more concern with the welfare of other people. The characteristics of communal people are affectionate and helpful. They are also kind and sympathetic. Communal people are more nurturing and gentle in their action. In employment settings for agented behaviour might include speaking assertively and competing for attention. Leaders who have agentic characteristic will influence others. These leaders are getting involved in initiating activity directed to assigned tasks and making problem-focused suggestions. As for communal characteristics in employment settings, conversely might include speaking tentatively and accepting others' direction. A leader who has communal characteristics in oneself is more supporting and soothing his or her subordinates in the leadership (Eagly *et al.*, 2001). Leaders with these characteristics are also contributing to the solution of relational and interpersonal matters that might rise in the workplace. Other than agentic and communal characteristics, Coleman (2003) found additional issues related to gender such as isolation and procedure for challenging the male stereotype of leadership. Other

differences in male and female leaders are the characteristics of assertiveness and aggressiveness. Assertive and aggressive behaviour are expected in male leadership styles while women are assumed to be caring, more tolerant and nurturing (Littrell & Nkomo, 2005).

Numbers of studies that have been done by many researchers have found that there were a little differences in the natural capabilities of either male or female managers (Oakley, 2000; Powell, 1993), labels shows that women as less competent than men. Women are initially evaluated less favourably than equally competent from men. Women, unlike men, experience a conflict in leadership (Madden, 2004). Women are facing more challenges and conflicts in leadership. A number of studies have come up with pessimistic assumptions of women as leaders (Deal & Stevenson, 1998; Powell & Butterfield, 1989; Schein & Davidson, 1993). Some of the researchers like Jeanquart-Barone and Sekaran (1994) have strongly stated that female subordinates trusted female supervisors less than they put their trust of male supervisors. In this situation, women have been less trusted because of their gender. The ratings of male associated the concept of man with the idea of leadership while the concept of woman linked negatively with ratings for the concept of manager and leader (Krusker & Wintermantel, 1986 as cited in Eagly & Karau, 1992).

Surprisingly, women leaders sometimes underrated their own capabilities. It is a common belief that women are more likely to underrate their leadership abilities and competencies than men. There is no specific data to confirm this finding but there was one study noted that a subgroup of ten female managers rated themselves lower than their supervisors rated them while male managers rated themselves higher (Wohlers & London, 1989). In the Malaysian context, Jayasingam (2001) found that compared to most successful female corporate entrepreneurs, least successful female entrepreneurs possessed more of harsh power such as the power to order and punish. Jayasingam (2009) also found that while keeping the gender of the leaders unknown in the vignette, individuals were more likely to assume a male identity for leaders who displayed masculine style and female for leaders who displayed feminine styles. Female leaders naturally scored higher on communal and emotional skills and therefore obtained higher ranking for charismatic leadership

(Groves, 2005). Blasé and Kirby (1992) and Rhode (2003) found similarities between male and female head teachers in terms of motivating and in delegating tasks to subordinates. Kolb (1999) and Shimanoff & Jenkins (1991) confirmed that there were far more similarities than differences in the leadership behaviours of male and female managers and that they were equally effective. They are more likely to have similar impact on subordinates' satisfaction towards their job.

This eventually points to match to the male and female head teachers' awareness of their own leadership and administration approach and consideration in schools. It has been strongly supported by a report which is reported by Coleman (2003). In the report, Coleman (2003) reported that gender might not be a determinant of leadership style, but has an influence on self-perceptions of men and women leaders. The majority of male and female head teachers shared values about themselves as leaders who are mutually understanding and people-centered. This is a style that has more in common with the female leadership styles than with the male leadership stereotype. Nearly all the facts show little or no difference in the traits and abilities of managerial and professional women and men (Davidson & Burke, 1994).

The choice of leadership style is expected to match the gender role stereotypes and head teachers of the schools must give more attention to teachers' job satisfaction. This promotes to the staff efficiency and staff satisfaction. It is an important factor in improvement of psychological and spiritual force for staff. If it is related the organization is promotion of job satisfaction among teachers. The promotion of job satisfaction among teachers is relatively important because teachers were expected to render a very high job performance with the expectation of high measure of loyalty, patriotism, dedication, hard work and commitment (Ubon & Joshua, 2004 as cited in Lather, 2007).

Job satisfaction and motivation are significantly and crucially vital to the long-term development of any educational system around the world. Similarly, professional knowledge, abilities and capabilities can be seen when a person is taking on and mastering the difficult appointed to him or her at educational

achievement and performance (Filak & Sheldon, 2003). Studies on job satisfaction have been an overall construct and as a facet construct (Holdaway, 1978). It has been studied in different countries all over the world. Teacher's job satisfaction is a single, wide-ranging measure that is a statistically significant predictor of effective schools (Zigarreli, 1996 as cited in Bogler, 2007). Job satisfaction is a kind of emotional and affective coping with job as well as its conditions in dealing with a subordinate life in their working place. It can also be defined as an overall feeling about ones job or career in terms of specifies and details of every aspect. Happock (1935) as cited in Saeed *et al* (2007) was one of the first researchers to study job satisfaction. He found that workers were more satisfied with a supervisor who was understanding and helpful (as in cited, Bass, 1990). Teachers who are satisfied with their job will more likely to make progression in the productivity and it lead to better working relations. This includes better relationship with their colleagues and provides better performance as teachers. They present positive feeling about work; a sense of personal worth and a sense of personal fulfillment which were related to achievement and responsibility (Wetherell, 2002). Teachers identified organizational support, management, good student behaviour, positive school atmosphere and teacher autonomy as factors connected with higher job satisfaction. Therefore, the focus of this study is to investigate the perceived leadership style of men and women head teachers in order to determine which gender-based leadership that most preferable among teachers based on the data collected from secondary and primary schools. This study also an attempt to determine measure whether teachers satisfy with their job as teachers with either male or female head teachers' leadership styles.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Leadership is one comprehensive experience that is rising and has been addressed from different viewpoint. Researchers have found numerous perspectives on leadership. There are infinite leadership models that have been developed to define leadership behaviour. Leaders have been enlightened and trained in terms of the characters they should portray to their subordinates. They also have been educated about mannerism, influence and persuasion, relationship patterns, role

relationships and as administrative figures (Pearce, Sims, Cox, Ball, Schnell, Smith, and Trevino, 2003; Yukl, 2006). Leaders must act accordingly and gender differences in leadership styles have been identified as one of the possible causes of the under representation of females in school administration (Eagly, Karau, & Johnson, 1992). Shakeshaft (1989) reported that studies of female and male approaches to leadership showed a distinct difference in the way women and men manage. The differences and the similarities direct to the subordinates' job satisfaction and motivation. In this context of study, the differences and the similarities lead to teachers' job satisfaction and job motivation in schools.

Due to the increasing demands from all areas, the traditionally roles of teachers have been delineated all over again. Teachers' commitment or attachment to the job and workplace should be an important factor for school to focus on quality and better teaching. If the teachers bound to be satisfied with their school environment, they will be more productive. In order to the teachers to give their commitment and productivity to the school, they have to be motivated. On contrary, the condition of the workplace is positively related to teachers' job satisfaction. Besides the condition of the workplace, climate too, effects satisfaction of the teachers in schools (Winter and Sweeney, 1994). School culture and head teacher's leadership style effects job satisfaction. The results of researches done upon this subject matter have indicated that head teachers' leadership behaviour fostered different perceptions of teachers on school culture and also in teachers' satisfaction and commitment to their job. This relatively influenced by a head teacher's leadership which has been a critical factor for the school's performance through determining teachers' beliefs and values. It also determines teachers' attitudes and work behaviour as well as motivation. This research is made for understanding the perceived of men and women head teachers' leadership styles in schools by teachers and the relation to teachers' job satisfaction and motivation to enhance their performance in schools. As stated in researches done in the previous years, teachers' job attitudes directly determine teachers' work behaviour and performance (Cheng, 1990; Coppedge, 1993; Powell and Beard, 1986 as cited in L.C. Shum,1997).

1.4 Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are:

1. To identify head teachers' leadership style practiced by male and female head teachers as perceived by teachers.

2. To identify male and female head teachers lead using different leadership styles.

3. To identify teachers' perception on male and female head teachers with their job satisfaction.

4. To identify the relationships between head teachers' gender and leadership styles with teachers' job satisfaction.

1.5 Research Questions

This study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the leadership style practiced by male and female head teachers as perceived by teachers?

2. Do male and female head teachers lead using different leadership styles?

3. What is the perception of teachers on male and female head teachers with their job satisfaction?

4. Are there any relationships between head teachers' gender and leadership styles with teachers' job satisfaction?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The significance of the study can be seen from the aspect of leadership styles among male and female head teachers. The 21st century's education system brings new changes to managerial functioning; requiring re-thinking by human resource professionals and organizational behaviour theorists that related to the leadership styles of head teachers. One significant change that has been identified is in the expandable of the employees in many aspects. In the case of Malaysian context, there are now more women in the workplace than in the past. Women have filled many positions in management posts and senior leadership roles. Several theories, models and measurements instruments have been developed and used to compare the effectiveness of men and women in leadership roles. This relatively related to head teachers in order to evaluate their efficiency and the leadership styles as the head of the schools.

This research will also assist the head teachers to be more effective and the significance of it to teachers' motivation and job satisfaction. The style of effective leadership led by the head teachers will motivate teachers to give more in completing their tasks and doing the responsibilities in schools. Besides, this research also assists the head teachers to get to know what teachers want from them in order to complete their work more effectively. By recognizing this knowledge is definitely helping the head teachers to understand the subordinates' or in this context, the teachers' attitude. Most importantly, how do teachers perceive female head teachers compared to male head teachers and which leadership styles posit by male or female head teachers are more effective in order to fulfill teachers' job satisfaction as well as motivation. A study such as this makes it easier for other researchers to make comparison between male and female leadership roles for head teachers in schools as well as the perception of teachers on them with their motivation and job satisfaction in the schools.

1.7 Scope and Delimitation

Delimitations of this study concern the boundary of the problem, the individuals to be studied, and the setting of the study. Limitations of this study include the bias of the researcher and the effect of the observer in the environment on the actions of the subjects. It also consists of the role of perception and memory to recreate history and the generalization ability of the findings. Since this research on male and female leaderships and the relationship between job satisfactions among primary and secondary school teachers in Muar and Ledang is a dynamic process, many findings will only be the answer. A survey instruments was used to carry out the research study. All the data was analyzed by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 of the data analysis software application. The scope of this study was delimitated to the school teachers in Muar and Ledang. The respondents could be the teachers from primary schools and secondary schools to gather information on their male and female head teachers. There were ten schools participated with the total of 120 teachers as the respondents. The study includes primary schools as well as secondary schools in Muar and Ledang led by both male and female head teachers equally. The findings on teachers' motivation and job satisfaction in these schools are only applicable to what criterions had stated. The results of this study may not be generalized to institutions, colleges, religious schools, boarding schools and others than stated.

1.8 Definition of Terms

These words are used widely in this research and will be explained based on the context of the research:

1. Effective : Successful in producing a desired or intended result. *(source from Dictionary.com)* Effective also means the ability to command a team with strong leadership skills can foster loyalty, inspire action and increase productivity in the schools they work at. Employees and workers look to leaders for encouragement and support in their daily job, and it is critical to develop the skills needed to

lead with purpose while in a location of authority. Leadership goes beyond mere management capabilities and offers tools that can be used widely in any other areas in life. As it is related to this study, this can be related to the schools where they work at and people whom they work with. Kouzes & Posner (1995) defined effective as the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations. In this research, this word is used to describe an attitude of the head teachers leading in schools as aspired leaders.

2. Gender : The state of being male or female. *(source from Collin English Dictionary – HarperCollinsPublishers 1991, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003).* Gender also refers to a culture's social construction of differences between the sexes; male and female. These include the different character, positions, behaviours, approaches, and skills males and females are expected to put on view. Gender displays support claims membership in different sex. It happens to be different in observation and different way of thinking and leading the schools. There could be different way of treating subordinates too which are the teachers at the schools. Gender refers to the psychological and societal formation of what it means to be a male or a female (Valian, 1999). In this conception of gender as socially constructed, gender is seen as filling all aspects of our lives (West & Zimmerman, 1991). In this research, this word is used to describe the gender of the head teachers either men or women.

3. Job satisfaction : Fulfillment of one's wishes, expectations, needs or the pleasure in doing one's work. *(source from Macmillandictionary.com).* Job satisfaction in this context refers to the feeling of pleasure or encouragement that a job provides a person. A person who is satisfied with his job is said to have high job satisfaction. Job satisfaction too refers to the fulfillment that a person obtains from performing his job. The satisfaction can take many forms; satisfaction at the work that he or she has accomplished, satisfaction at the effort he puts into the job, satisfaction at the help he or she has provided others but all engage some degree of psychological contentment. Job satisfaction can often be difficult to measure, because people define satisfaction in different ways. In this context, teachers who have high job satisfaction will likely to provide better performance in their job as teachers. Michelangleo (2002) as cited in Coolsen (2010) stated

that job satisfaction is related to the feelings of the employees and can be influenced by factors such as the quality of the relationship with their supervisor or employer. The reputation of the environment in which they work or the degree of accomplishment in their work. Job satisfaction is not the same as job motivation; rather job satisfaction affords an indication of an employee's well-being induced by the job. It is the feeling a worker has about his or her job experiences in relation to previous experiences, current expectations, or available substitute (Chang *et al*, 2009). Weiss, Dawiss and Lofquist (1967) as cited in Ozyurt *et al* (2006) posit that job satisfaction is defined as employees like or dislike their jobs in broad-spectrum. This explains explicitly how the teacher feels when he or she works in a school for the head teachers in that school.

4. Leadership : The action of leading a group of people or an organization. *(source from Dictionary.com)*. It also been defined as interpersonal authority, exercised in situations and aimed at the whole communication process towards the achievement of a specified goal or goals (Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik, 1961). In the education context, leadership is the process of enrolling and directing the talents and energies of teachers, pupils or students and parents toward achieving common educational aspires. Leadership style can be viewed as a series of managerial attitudes, behaviours, characteristics and skills. These views based on individuals and organizational values, leadership interest and reliability of employees in different situations they are facing (Mosadeghrad, 2003 as cited in A.M.M. Rahd, 2006). In this context, this word describes the action takes by the head teachers in leading their schools.

5. Head teacher : The educator who has the authority of the school. *(source from wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn)*. Head teacher is defined as a person who has the exclusive authority of the school. According to Trevor Male (2006), a head teacher is the de facto leader as well as the manager of the school. Pragmatically, head teachers are perceived as the symbolic leaders of the schools. Head teachers are expected to have formal relationship with their subordinates. Their leaderships are the focal point of the schools' success. Head

teachers can also be the epitome of the schools in action. An effective head teacher constructs leadership capability in their schools through encouraging others to spread out vision and the process that support the implementation of the vision created into practice. In this research, these words are used to determine the head of the schools whether they are headmaster, headmistress or principal.

6. Motivation : The desire or willingness to do something. *(source from Collin English Dictionary – HarperCollinsPublishers 1991, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003).* Motivation in this research refers only to the reasons a person performs a job, regardless of whether the job brings him or her pleasure he or she needs. Motivation refers to the reasons, the motive that a person performs a particular job that need to be done. A person's motives for doing a particular job can vary extensively. While some do a job because it makes them happy, others do it simply because they are paid to do it. They might be thinking that without a regular salary they would end up homeless and famished. A person's motives for performing the work he or she does are not always inevitable and being the interest of the researchers. Motivation activates human energy. Human energy is a force that leads people in order to attempt to do in satisfying their needs. All human behaviour is motivated to some degree; and that the critical factor is the direction of the motivation. Gellerman (1963) emphasizes that internal anxieties are at the base of motivation. The word is used in this research to tell about the teachers' willingness in doing their work in school.

1.9 Conclusion

Leaderships are always dynamic manner in relation of an individual who has the authority to the people under him or her. In this era of globalization, it is important for the schools' head teachers to understand the principles of leadership and motivation to help them to manage the schools more effectively. The motivation is merely not only for the head teachers but also for the teachers in order to get satisfaction in doing their works at school. Various types of leaderships should be

practiced at school. Head teachers should take any consideration on the best leadership styles should be practiced in the schools. This is based on the assumption that there is no right way to lead that suits all situations. Either men or women head teachers should practice varieties of ways to lead and manage their schools in order to motivate the teachers and give them the satisfaction in doing their jobs.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, S. H., Thong, L. H., Chin, T., Noh, I. M., Book, L. Y., Joon, O. T., & Pihie, Z. A. L. (1999). Management in Malaysia.

Aburdene, P., Naisbitt, J., Attman, J., & Herrman, A. (1992). *Megatrends for Women* (pp. xvii-xvii). New York: Villard Books.

Abu-Tineh, A. (2013). Leadership Effectiveness in Jordanian Educational Institutions A Comparison of Jordanian Female and Male Leaders. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *41*(1), 79-94.

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations.*Gender & Society*, *4*(2), 139-158.

Adam Jr, E. E. (1994). Alternative Quality Improvement Practices and Organization Performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, *12*(1), 27-44.

Aladejana, F., & Aladejana, T. I. (2005). Leadership in Education: The Place of Nigerian Women. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, *33*(2), 69-75.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2004). She May Be Good, but Pity She's Not a Bloke!. In *The Proceedings of the Annual BPS Occupational Psychology Conference 2004*(pp. 20-25).

Alnajjar, A. A. (1996). Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Among Employees in the United Arab Emirates. *Psychological Reports*, *79*(1), 315-321.

Amedy, L. (1999). *A Qualitative Study of Female Superintendents: Leadership Behaviors in Context* (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University).

Andersen, J. A., & Hansson, P. H. (2011). At the End of the Road? On Differences between Women and Men in Leadership Behaviour. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *32*(5), 428-441.

Ansari, M. A., Ahmad, Z. A., & Aafaqi, R. (2004). Organizational Leadership in the Malaysian Context. *Leading in High Growth Asia: Managing Relationship for Teamwork and Change*, 109-138.

Appelbaum, S. H., & Shapiro, B. T. (1993). Why Can't Men Lead Like Women?.*Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *14*(7), 28-34.

Appelbaum, S. H., Audet, L., & Miller, J. C. (2003). Gender and Leadership? Leadership and Gender?. A Journey Through the Landscape of Theories.*Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *24*(1), 43-51.

Arnold, H. J., & Feldman, D. C. (1982). A Multivariate Analysis of the Determinants of Job Turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*(3), 350.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the Components of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Using the Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *72*(4), 441- 462.

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment: Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment and Moderating Role of Structural Distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*(8), 951-968.

Barnett, R. C., & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Women, Men, Work, and Family. *American Psychologist*, *56*(10), 781.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting Unit Performance by Assessing Transformational and Transactional Leadership.*Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(2), 207-217.

Bennis, W. G. Nanus. B.(1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The Strategy for Taking Charge. *Richard Lynch (2000) Corporate Strategy*, 444.

Bhal, K. T., & Ansari, M. A. (2007). Leader-Member Exchange-Subordinate Outcomes Relationship: Role of Voice and Justice. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *28*(1), 20-35.

Bishay, A. (1996). Teacher Motivation and Job Satisfaction: A Study Employing the Experience Sampling Method. *Journal of Undergraduate Sciences*, *3*(3), 147-155.

Bjork, L.G. (2000). Introduction: Women in the Superintendency – Advances in Research and Theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. eag.sagepub.com.

Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling Women: Feminism, Leadership, and Educational Change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Blase, J., Dedrick, C., & Strathe, M. (1986). Leadership Behavior of School Principals in Relation to Teacher Stress, Satisfaction, and Performance. *The Journal of Humanistic Education and Development*, *24*(4), 159-171.

Blount, J. M. (1999). Manliness and the Gendered Construction of School Administration in the USA. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*,*2*(2), 55-68.

Bogler, R. (2001). The Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher Job Satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *37*(5), 662-683.

Bogler, R. (2002). Two Profiles of Schoolteachers: A Discriminant Analysis of Job Satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*(6), 665-673.

Bosak, J., Sczesny, S., & Eagly, A. H. (2008). Communion and Agency Judgments of Women and Men as a Function of Role Information and Response Format. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*(7), 1148-1155.

Brannon, D., Zinn, J. S., Mor, V., & Davis, J. (2002). An Exploration of Job, Organizational, and Environmental Factors Associated with High and Low Nursing Assistant Turnover. *The Gerontologist*, *42*(2), 159-168.

Brookover, W., Beamer, L., Efthim, H., Hathaway, D., Lezotte, L., Miller, S., & Tornatzky, L. (1982). Creating Effective Schools. *Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications*.

Cardinal, R. N., & Aitken, M. R. (2013). *ANOVA for the Behavioral Sciences Researcher*. Psychology Press.

Catalyst, inc. (2007). *The Double-Bind Dilemma for Women in Leadership: Damned If You Do, Doomed If You Don't*. Catalyst.

Celikten, M. (2005). A Perspective on Women Principals in Turkey. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *8*(3), 207-221.

Chang, W. Y., Ma, J. C., Chiu, H. T., Lin, K. C., & Lee, P. H. (2009). Job Satisfaction and Perceptions of Quality of Patient Care, Collaboration and Teamwork in Acute Care Hospitals. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *65*(9), 1946-1955.

Coffey, A., & Delamont, S. (2000). Feminism and the Classroom Teacher: Research. *Praxis, Pedagogy*.

Coleman, M. (2003). Gender and the Orthodoxies of Leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, *23*(3), 325-339.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 637-647.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*. Jossey-Bass.

Coolsen, M. K., Taylor, V. F., & Reese, D. (2010). Job Affirmation:"My Job Made Me the Person I Am Today!". *Business Research Yearbook*, *17*, 549-556.

Cosier, R. A., & Dalton, D. R. (1990). Positive Effects of Conflict: A Field Assessment. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *1*(1), 81-92.

Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. (1992). Job Satisfaction: How People Feel About Their Jobs.

Crow, G. M., & Weindling, D. (2010). Learning to be Political: New English Headteachers' Roles. *Educational Policy*, *24*(1), 137-158.

Cuadrado, I., Navas, M., Molero, F., Ferrer, E., & Morales, J. (2012). Gender Differences in Leadership Styles as a Function of Leader and Subordinates' Sex and Type of Organization. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *42*(12), 3083-3113.

Cubillo, L., & Brown, M. (2003). Women into Educational Leadership and Management: International Differences? *Journal of Educational Administration*, *41*(3), 278-291.

Cummings, G. G., Olson, K., Hayduk, L., Bakker, D., Fitch, M., Green, E.& Conlon, M. (2008). The Relationship between Nursing Leadership and Nurses' Job Satisfaction in Canadian Oncology Work Environments. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *16*(5), 508-518.

Dainty, A. R., Bagilhole, B. M., Ansari, K. H., & Jackson, J. (2004). Creating Equality in the Construction Industry: An Agenda for Change for Women and Ethnic Minorities. *Journal of Construction Research*, *5*(01), 75-86.

Dana, J. A., & Bourisaw, D. M. (2006). *Women in the Superintendency: Discarded Leadership*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, 4501 Forbes Blvd., Suite 200, Lanham, MD 20706.

Davidson, M. J., & Burke, R. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Women in Management: Current Research Issues* (Vol. 1). SAGE Publications Limited.

Davidson, M., & Burke, R. J. (2004). *Women in Management Worldwide: Facts, Figures, and Analysis*. Ashgate Pub Limited.

Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a Stewardship Theory of Management. *Academy of Management Review*, *22*(1), 20-47.Deal, J. J., & Stevenson, M. A. (1998). Perceptions of Female and Male Managers in the 1990s: Plus ça Change... *Sex Roles*, *38*(3-4), 287-300.

Dobbins, G. H., & Platz, S. J. (1986). Sex Differences in Leadership: How Real Are They?. *Academy of Management Review*, 118-127.

Drukpa, S. (2010). *Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Teachers in Thimphu District of Bhutan* (Doctoral dissertation, Mahidol University).

Due Billing, Y., & Alvesson, M. (2000). Questioning the Notion of Feminine Leadership: A Critical Perspective on the Gender Labelling of Leadership. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *7*(3), 144-157.

Dunoon, D. (2002). Rethinking Leadership for the Public Sector. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, *61*(3), 3-18.

Dwyer, D. C., Lee, G. V., Rowan, B., & Bossert, S. T. (1982). The Principal's Role in Instructional Management: Five Participant Observation Studies of Principals in   Action. *San Francisco: Far West Laboratory*.

Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving Relational Authenticity in Leadership: Does Gender Matter?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(3), 459-474.

Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female Leadership Advantage and Disadvantage: Resolving the Contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*(1), 1-12.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The Female Leadership Advantage: An Evaluation of the Evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(6), 807-834.

Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The Leadership Styles of Women and Men. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(4), 781-797.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*(3), 573.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Women and Men. *Psychological bulletin*, *129*(4), 569.

Ejimofor, F. O. (2007). *Principals' Transformational Leadership Skills and Their Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Nigeria* (Doctoral dissertation, Cleveland State University).

Ekvall, G., & Arvonen, J. (1991). Change-Centered Leadership: An Extension of the Two-Dimensional Model. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *7*(1), 17-26.

Ely, R. J., Ibarra, H., & Kolb, D. M. (2011). Taking Gender into Account: Theory and Design for Women's Leadership Development Programs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *10*(3), 474-493.

Embry, A., Padgett, M. Y., & Caldwell, C. B. (2008). Can Leaders Step Outside of the Gender Box? An Examination of Leadership and Gender Role Stereotypes. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *15*(1), 30-45.

Emery, C. R., & Barker, K. J. (2007). Effect of Commitment, Job Involvement and Teams on Customer Satisfaction and Profit. *Team Performance Management*, *13*(3/4), 90-101.

Engen, M. L., Leeden, R., & Willemsen, T. M. (2001). Gender, Context and Leadership Styles: A Field Ftudy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *74*(5), 581-598.

Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of Perceived Discrimination on Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*.

Evans, L. (1997). Understanding Teacher Morale and Job Satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *13*(8), 831-845.

Fennell, H. A. (2005). Living Leadership in an Era of Change. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *8*(2), 145-165.

Filak, V. F., & Sheldon, K. M. (2003). Student Psychological Need Satisfaction and College Teacher-Course Evaluations. *Educational Psychology*, *23*(3), 235-247.

Fleishman, E. A., & Harris, E. F. (1962). Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, *15*(1), 43-56.

Fullan, M. (2004). *Change Forces with a Vengeance*. Routledge.

Gardiner, M., & Tiggemann, M. (1999). Gender Differences in Leadership Style, Job Stress and Mental Health in Male and Female Dominated Industries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *72*(3), 301-315.

Gellerman, S. W. (1963). *Motivation and Productivity* (p. 220). New York: American Management Association.

Giacalone, R. A., & Riordan, C. A. (1990). Effect of Self-Presentation on Perceptions and Recognition in an Organization. *The Journal of Psychology*, *124*(1), 25-38.

Gibson, C. B. (1995). An Investigation of Gender Differences in Leadership Across Four Countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 255-279.

Gibson, I. Donnelly, 2000, 'Organizational Behavior', Structure, Processes.

Gilley, A. M. (2005). *The Manager as Change Leader*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Glass, T. E., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. C. (2001). *The Study of the American Superintendency, 2000: A Look at the Superintendent of Education in the New Millennium*. R&L Education.

Goldberg, M. F. (2001). Leadership in Education: Five Commonalities. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *82*(10), 757-761.

Golembiewski, R. T., & Sink, D. (1979). Od Interventions in Urban Settings, I: Public-sector Constraints on Planned Change. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *1*(1), 1-30.

Golembiewski, R. T., Billingsley, K., & Yeager, S. (1976). Measuring Change and Persistence in Human Affairs: Types of Change Generated by OD Designs. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *12*(2), 133-157.

Grogan, M., & Brunner, C. C. (2005). Women Leading Systems: What the Latest Facts and Figures Say about Women in the Superintendency Today. *School Administrator*, *62*(2), 46.

Groves, K. S. (2005). Gender Differences in Social and Emotional Skills and Charismatic Leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *11*(3), 30-46.

Growe, R., & Montgomery, P. (1999). *Women and the Leadership Paradigm: Bridging   the Gender Gap*. ERIC Clearinghouse.

Gummer, B. (1998). Social Relations in an Organizational Context: Social Capital, Real Work, and Structural Holes. *Administration in Social Work*, *22*(3), 87-105.

Gupta, A., & McDaniel, J. (2002). Creating Competitive Advantage by Effectively Managing Knowledge: A Framework for Knowledge Management. *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, *3*(2), 40-49.

Habibullah, A. H. M., & Sinha, J. B. (1980). Motivational Climate and Leadership Styles. *Vikalpa*, *5*(2), 85-93.

Haines, G. A. (2007). *Job Satisfaction Among High School Principals in Mississippi*. ProQuest.

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

Haughey, M., & Murphy, P. J. (1984). Extending Continuing Professional Education in   an Era of Fiscal Constraint.

Herzberg, F. M. (1959). B. & Snyderman, B.(1959). The Motivation to Work. *2, li*.

Hofstede, G., Van Deusen, C. A., Mueller, C. B., Charles, T. A., & The Business Goals Network. (2002). What Goals Do Business Leaders Pursue? A study in Fifteen   Countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 785-803.

Holdaway, E. A. (1978). Facet and Overall Satisfaction of Teachers. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *14*(1), 30-47.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004).*Culture, Leadership, and Organizations*. Sage.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The Ethics of Charismatic Leadership: Submission or Liberation?. *The Executive*, *6*(2), 43-54.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Bliss, J. R. (1990). Organizational Climate, School Health, and Effectiveness: A Comparative Analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *26*(3), 260-279.

Huang, Y. C., Yang, C. C., & Wu, H. H. (2012). The Comparison of Gender Distribution Among School Principals and Teachers in Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea. *International Education Studies*, *5*(4), p1.

Hukpati, C. A. (2009). Transformational Leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaciton: A Comparative Study of Private and Public Tertiary Institutions in Ghana.

Hunt, J. G. (1999). Transformational/Charismatic Leadership's Transformation of the Field: An Historical Essay. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 129-144.

Ifinedo, P. (2003). Employee Motivation and Job Satisfaction in Finnish organizations: A Study of Employees in the Oulu Region, Finland. *Master of Business Administration Thesis, University of London*.

Ismail, M.R. (2012). Teachers' Perceptions of Principal Leadership Styles and How They Impact Teacher Job Satisfaction *(Doctoral Dissertation. Colorado State University)*

Jacobs, R. L., & McClelland, D. C. (1994). Moving up the Corporate Ladder: A Longitudinal Study of the Leadership Motive Pattern and Managerial Success in Women and Men. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*,*46*(1), 32.

James, L. R., Choi, C. C., Ko, C. H. E., McNeil, P. K., Minton, M. K., Wright, M. A., & Kim, K. I. (2008). Organizational and Psychological Climate: A Review of Theory and Research. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *17*(1), 5-32.

Jayasingam, S., & Cheng, M. Y. (2009). Leadership Style and Perception of Effectiveness: Enlightening Malaysian Managers. *Asian Social Science*, *5*(2), P54.

Jayaweera, S. (1997). Women, Education and Empowerment in Asia. *Gender and Education*, *9*(4), 411-424.

Jeanquart-Barone, S., & Sekaran, U. (1994). Effects of Supervisor's Gender on American Women's Trust. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *134*(2), 253-255.

Jenkins, H. O. (1991). *Getting it Right: A Handbook for Successful School Leadership*. Basil Blackwell.

Judey, M. (2010). Transformational Leadership: A Study of Gender Differences in Private Universities. *Review of Business Research Papers*, *4*, 118-125.

K.P. Samu, A. (1998). Factors Relating to Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Teachers in the District of Balakong *(Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Putra Malaysia)*.

Kaplan, S. A., Warren, C. R., Barsky, A. P., & Thoresen, C. J. (2009). A Note on the Relationship Between Affect (ivity) and Differing Conceptualizations of Job Satisfaction: Some Unexpected Meta-analytic Findings. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *18*(1), 29-54.

Kark, R. (2004). The Transformational Leader: Who is (s) he? A Feminist Perspective. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *17*(2), 160-176.

Kennedy, J. C. (2002). Leadership in Malaysia: Traditional Values, International Outlook. *The Academy of Management Executive*, *16*(3), 15-26.

Khan, T., & Mishra, G. P. (2013). Promotion As Job Satisfaction, A Study On Colleges Of Muscat, Sultanate Of Oman. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *5*(5), 56-62.

Koch, J. (2002). *Defining and Redefining Gender Equity in Education* (Vol. 1). Information Age Pub Incorporated.

Kolb, J. A. (1999). The Effect of Gender Role, Attitude Toward Leadership, and Self-Confidence on Leader Emergence: Implications for Leadership Development. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *10*(4), 305-320.

Koopman, P. L. (2000). Feminine Leadership-A Review of Gender Differences in Managerial Behaviour and Effectiveness. *Women in Management: Current Research Issues*, *2*, 120.

Krüger, M. L. (2008). School Leadership, Sex and Gender: Welcome to Difference. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *11*(2), 155-168.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and Transformational Leadership: A Constructive/Developmental Analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 648-657.

Kythreotis, A., Pashiardis, P., & Kyriakides, L. (2010). The Influence of School Leadership Styles and Culture on Students' Achievement in Cyprus Primary Schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *48*(2), 218-240.

Ladd, H., Fiske, E. B., & Ruijs, N. (2009). Parental Choice in the Netherlands: Growing Concerns About Segregation. *Prepared for School Choice and School Improvement: Research in State, District, and Community Contexts Vanderbilt University*.

Lai, T. T., Luen, A. P. D. W. K., & Hong, N. M. (2011). School Principal Leadership Styles And Teachers Organizational Commitment. A Research Agenda. In *2nd International Conference on Business and Economic Research (2nd ICBER 2011) Proceeding*. Conference Master Resources.

Lambert, L. (2002). A Framework for Shared Leadership. *Educational Leadership*,*59*(8), 37-40.

Lashway, L. (1996). Ethical Leadership. Retrieved 15 April, 2004.

Lather, A. S., & Jain, S. (2007). Need Behavioural Orientation of Dynamos and Drones in Organizations: A Maruti Experience. *VIKALPA*, *32*(1), 45.

Leithwood, K. A., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of Research: How Leadership Influences Student Learning*. Toronto: University of Minnesota.

Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). Successful School Leadership. *What It Is and How it Influences Pupil Learning*, (800).

Lemay, L. (2009). The Practice of Collective and Strategic Leadership in the Public Sector. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*,*14*(1), 1-19.

Lewis, P. S., Goodman, S. H., & Fandt, P. M. (1995). *Management: Challenges in the 21st century*. West Publishing Company.

Liew, K.C. (2001). *Gender Differences in Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction: Perceptions of Principals and Teachers* (Masters of Education. International Islamic University Malaysia)

Limerick, B., & Anderson, C. (1999). Female Administrators and School-Based Management New Models in an Era of Change?. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *27*(4), 401-414.

Littrell, R. F., & Nkomo, S. M. (2005). Gender and Race Differences in Leader Behaviour Preferences in South Africa. *Women in Management Review*, *20*(8),562-580.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction1.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). Work Motivation and Satisfaction: Light at the End of the Tunnel. *Psychological Science*, *1*(4), 240-246.

London, M., & Wohlers, A. J. (1991). Agreement between Subordinate and Self-Ratings in Upward Feedback. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*(2), 375-390.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study* (pp. 1-54). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lumby, J., & Azaola, C. (2011). Women Principals in Small Schools in South Africa. *Australian Journal of Education*, *55*(1), 73-85.

Madden, M. E. (2004). Division 35 Presidential Address: Gender and Leadership in Higher Education. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *29*(2005), 3-14.

Male, T. (2006). *Being An Effective Headteacher*. SAGE.

Malone, T. (2007). *The Social Ecology of Women As Transformational Leaders* (Doctoral dissertation, Union Institute).

Manning, T. T. (2002). Gender, Managerial Level, Transformational Leadership and Work Satisfaction. *Women in Management Review*, *17*(5), 207-216.

Maslow, A. H., Frager, R., & Fadiman, J. (1970). *Motivation and Personality* (Vol. 2). New York: Harper & Row.

Mathieu, J. E., & Farr, J. L. (1991). Further Evidence for the Discriminant Validity of Measures of Organizational Commitment, Job Involvement, and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*(1), 127.

Mbwiria, K. N. (2010). *Influence of Principals Leadership Styles on Teachers' Career Commitment in Secondary Schools in Imenti South District in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University College).

McCray, C. R., & Beachum, F. D. (2010). An Analysis of How the Gender and Race of School Principals Influence Their Perception of Multicultural Education. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, *5*(4).

McEwan, E. K. (2003). Ten Traits of Highly Effective Principals: From Good to Great Performance.

Mertler, C. A. (2002). Job Satisfaction and Perception of Motivation Among Middle and High School Teachers. *American Secondary Education*, 43-53.

Miller, D. T., Taylor, B., & Buck, M. L. (1991). Gender Gaps: Who Needs to be Explained?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*(1), 5.

Moey, Y. C. (2008). A Study on the Leadership Behavior and Leadership Effectiveness of Malaysian Managers: The Moderating Effect of Gender

Moore, S., Grunberg, L., & Greenberg, E. (2005). Are Female Supervisors Good for Employee Job Experiences, Health, and Wellbeing? *Women in Management Review*, *20*(2), 86-95.

Montgomery, P.S., Growe, R (2003). Advancing Women in Leadership Journal. *Visionary Leaders by Design.*

Morrison, A. M., & von Glinow, M. A. (1990). Women and Minorities in Management. *American Psychologist*, *45*(2), 200.

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. The Centre For Creative Leadership.(1987). Breaking the Glass Ceiling: Can Women Reach the Top of America's Largest Corporations. *Reading: Addison-Wesley.*

Muchiri, M. K., Cooksey, R. W., Di Milia, L. V., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). Gender and Managerial Level Differences in Perceptions of Effective Leadership.*Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *32*(5), 462-492.

Nadim, M., Chaudhry, M. S., Kalyar, M. N., & Riaz, T. Effects of Motivational Factors on Teachers' Job Satisfaction : A Study on Public Sector   Degree College Of Punjab, Pakistan.

Naylor, P., & Cowie, H. (1999). The Effectiveness of Peer Support Systems in Challenging School Bullying: The Perspectives and Experiences of Teachers and Pupils. *Journal of Adolescence*, *22*(4), 467-479.

Nazarudin, M. N., Fauzee, O., Sofian, M., & Abd Latif, R. (2008). Headmaster's Transformational Leadership and Teacher's Organisational Commitment in Primary School. *The Journal of Global Business Management*, *4*(2), 32-42.

Northouse, P. G.,(2007) Leadership Theory and Practice.

Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-Based Barriers to Senior Management Positions: Understanding the Scarcity of Female CEOs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *27*(4), 321-334.

O'Driscoll, M. P., & Randall, D. M. (1999). Perceived Organisational Support, Satisfaction with Rewards, and Employee Job Involvement and Organisational Commitment. *Applied Psychology*, *48*(2), 197-209.

Ohene-Kuntoh, K. O. F. I. (2012). *Job Satisfaction of Special School Education Teachers in Akuapem North District of the   Eastern   Region   of Ghana* (Doctoral   Dissertation).

Ololube, N. P. (2006). Teachers Job Satisfaction and Motivation for School Effectiveness: An Assessment. *Essays in Education*, *18*(1-19).

Omar, A., & Davidson, M. J. (2001). Women in Management: A Comparative Cross- Cultural Overview. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*,*8*(3/4), 35-67.

Omboko, F., Oyoo, S. O., Kanyaprasith, K., Hewson, M. G., Praphairaksit, N., Siripipatthanakul, S., & Hussain, A. Being a Female Head Teacher: The Tanzanian Experience. *International Journal of Learning*, *17*(12).

Omoyemiju, M. A., & Adediwura, A. A. (2011). A Study of Teachers' Perception of Schools' Organizational Health in Osun State. *World Journal of Education*, *1*(1), p165.

Oplatka, I. (2006). Women in Educational Administration Within Developing ountries: Towards a New International Research Agenda. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *44*(6), 604-624.

Orphanos, S. "Are Women Better than Men in Running Elementary Schools?" The Parents' Perspective.

Orr, M. T., & Pounder, D. G. (2010). Teaching and Preparing School Leaders. *Finding, Preparing, and Supporting School Leaders: Critical Issues, Useful Solutions*, 11-40.

Oshagbemi, T., & Gill, R. (2003). Gender Differences and Similarities in the Leadership Styles and Behaviour of UK managers. *Women in Management Review*, *18*(6), 288-298.

Osland, J. S., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., & Osland, A. (2006). 11 Developing Global Leadership Capabilities and Global Mindset: A Review. *Handbook of Research in International Human Resource Management*, 197.

Ostroff, C. (1992). The Relationship Between Satisfaction, Attitudes, and Performance: An Organizational Level Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*(6), 963.

Oyetunji, C. O. (2009). *The Relationship between Leadership Style and School Climate in Botswana Secondary Schools* (Doctoral Dissertation).

Ozga, J. (1993). *Women in Educational Management*. Open University Pr.

Pace, A., & Pace, J. (2005). Gender Differences in Headteacher Leadership and. *Journal of Maltese Education Research*, *3*(1).

Pande, R., & Ford, D. (2011). Gender Quotas and Female Leadership: A Review.

Papastamatis, A., Panitsidou, E. A., Giavrimis, P., & Papanis, E. (2009). Facilitating Teachers' and Educators' Effective Professional Development. *Review of European Studies*, *1*(2), P83.

Pearce, C. L., Sims Jr, H. P., Cox, J. F., Ball, G., Schnell, E., Smith, K. A., & Trevino, L. (2003). Transactors, Transformers and Beyond: A Multi-Method Development of a Theoretical Typology of Leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, *22*(4), 273-307.

Peretomode, V. F. (1991). *Educational Administration: Applied Concepts and Theoretical Perspectives for Students and Practitioners*. Joja Educational Research and Publishers.

Petzko, V. N., Clark, D. C., Valentine, J. W., Hackmann, D. G., Norn, J. R., & Lucas, S.E. (2002). Leaders and Leadership in Middle Level Schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, *86*(631), 3-15.

Pfeifer, D., & Love, M. (2004). Leadership in Aotearoa New Zealand: A Cross-Cultural Study. *Prism*, *2*.

Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential Challenge Stressor-Hindrance Stressor Relationships with Job Attitudes, Turnover Intentions, Turnover, and Withdrawal Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(2), 438.

Poirier, D. O. (2009). *A Principal's and Teachers' Perceptions and Understandings of Instructional Leadership: A Case Study of One School* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Saskatchewan).

Porat, K. L. (1991). Women in Administration: The Difference is Positive. *The Clearing House*, *64*(6), 412-414.

Pounder, D. G. (1999). Teacher teams: Exploring Job Characteristics and Work-Related Outcomes of Work Group Enhancement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *35*(3), 317-348.

Pounder, J. S., & Coleman, M. (2002). Women–Better Leaders Than Men? In General and Educational Management It Still "All Depends". *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *23*(3), 122-133.

Powell, G. N. (1990). One More Time: Do Female and Male Managers Differ?. *The Executive*, *4*(3), 68-75.

Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Parent, J. D. (2002). Gender and Managerial Stereotypes: Have the Times Changed?. *Journal of Management*, *28*(2), 177-193.

Prochaska, J. O., DiClemente, C. C., & Norcross, J. C. (1992). In Search of the Structure of Change. In *Self Change* (pp. 87-114). Springer New York.

Rad, A. M. M., & Yarmohammadian, M. H. (2006). A Study of Relationship between Managers' Leadership Style and Employees' Job Satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services*, *19*(2), 11-28.

Ramlall, S. (2004). A Review of Employee Motivation Theories and Their Implications for Employee Retention within Organizations. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, *5*(1/2), 52-63.

Reynolds, C., White, R., Brayman, C., & Moore, S. (2008). Women and Secondary School Principal Rotation/Succession: A Study of the Beliefs of Decision Makers in Four Provinces. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 32-54.

Riehl, C., & Byrd, M. A. (1997). Gender Differences among New Recruits to School Administration: Cautionary Footnotes to an Optimistic Tale. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *19*(1), 45-64.

Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *44*(5), 635-674.

Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways Women Lead.

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized Management and Backlash Toward Agentic Women: The Hidden Costs to Women of a Kinder, Gentler Image of Middle Managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(5), 1004.

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive Gender Stereotypes and Backlash Toward Agentic Women. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(4), 743-762.

Ruhl-Smith, C. D. (1991). *Teacher Attitudes Toward Students: Implications for Job Satisfaction in a Sample of Elementary Teachers from Suburban Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Miami University, Department of Educational Leadership).

Saeed, R., Azizollah, A., Zahra, A., Abdolghayoum, N., Zaman, A., & Peyman, Y. (2011). Effect of Female Principal's Management Styles on Teacher's Job Satisfaction in* Isfahan-Iran, Girls High Schools. *International Education Studies*, *4*(3), p124.

Samuelsson, P., Sukhorukov, E. V., & Büttiker, M. (2004). Two-Particle Aharonov-Bohm Effect and Entanglement in the Electronic Hanbury Brown–Twiss Setup. *Physical Review Letters*, *92*(2), 026805.

Schein, V. E. (2001). A Global Look at Psychological Barriers to Women's Progress in Management. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(4), 675-688.

Sen, S., Sekaran, M., & Hale, J. (1994, October). Learning to Coordinate Without Sharing Information. In *AAAI* (Vol. 94, pp. 426-431).

Senge, P. M. (Ed.). (1994). *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook*. Random House Digital, Inc..

Seymour-Smith, S., Wetherell, M., & Phoenix, A. (2002). 'My Wife Ordered Me to Come!': A Discursive Analysis of Doctors' and Nurses' Accounts of Men's Use of General Practitioners. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *7*(3), 253-267.

Shaharbi, A. A. (2010). *Leadership Behaviour and Practices of a Head Teacher in an Excellent School* (Doctoral dissertation, Open University Malaysia).

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in Educational Administration*. Sage Publications, Corwin Press, 2455 Teller Road, Newbury Park, CA 91320.

Shakeshaft, C., Nowell, I., & Perry, A. (1991). Gender and Supervision. *Theory Into Practice*, *30*(2), 134-139.

Shum, L. C., & Cheng, Y. C. (1997). Perceptions of Women Principals' Leadership and Teachers' Work Attitudes. *Journal of Educational Administration*,*35*(2), 165-   184.

Smith, K. K., Matkin, G. S., & Fritz, S. (2004). A Review of Gender and Full-Range Leadership Research and Suggestions for Future Research. *Faculty Publications: Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communication Department*, 30.

Smith, S. C., & Piele, P. K. (Eds.). (2006). *School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence in Student Learning*. Corwin-Volume Discounts.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences* (Vol. 3). SAGE Publications, Incorporated.

Statistics Solutions. (2013). ANOVA [WWW Document]. Retrieved from https://www.statisticssolutions.com/academic-solutions/resources/directory-of-statistical-analyses/anova/

Stelter, N. Z. (2002). Gender Differences in Leadership: Current Social Issues and Future Organizational Implications. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *8*(4), 88-99.

Sturm, S. (2001). Second Generation Employment Discrimination: A Structural Approach. *Colum. L. Rev.*, *101*, 458.

Sur, H., Hayran, O., Mumcu, G., Soylemez, D., Atli, H., & Yildirim, C. (2004). Factors Affecting Dental Job Satisfaction A Cross-Sectional Survey in Turkey.*Evaluation & the Health Professions*, *27*(2), 152-164.

Sykes, A. (1993). *An Introduction to Regression Analysis*. Law School, University of Chicago.

Takala, T., & Aaltio, I. (2004). Charismatic Leadership and Ethics from Gender Perspective. *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies*,*9*(1).

Tallerico, M. (2000). Gaining Access to the Superintendency: Headhunting, Gender, and Color. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *36*(1), 18-43.

Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I. R., & Massarik, F. (1961). *Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Taylor, P., Morin, R., Cohn, D. V., Clark, A., & Wang, W. (2008). A Paradox in Public Attitudes, Men or Women: Who's the Better Leader?. *Washington, DC: Pew Research Center*.

Tokar, D. M., & Subich, L. M. (1997). Relative Contributions of Congruence and Personality Dimensions to Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *50*(3), 482-491.

Trinidad, C., & Normore, A. H. (2005). Leadership and Gender: A Dangerous Liaison?. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *26*(7), 574-590.

Turan, S., & Ebicliolu, N. (2002). A Study of Gender Differences and Leadership Characteristics of Elementary School Principals. *Educational Administration: In Theory and Practice*, *31*, 444-58.

Valian, V. (1999). Cognitive Bases of Gender Bias, The. *Brook. L. Rev.*, *65*, 1037.

Valian, V. (1999). *Why So Slow?: The Advancement of Women*. The MIT Press.

Van Eupen, S. Female Leadership for a Sustainable European Management Model (EMM).

Vecchio, R. P. (2002). Leadership and Gender Advantage. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(6), 643-671.

Walker, A., & Dimmock, C. (2005). Developing Leadership in Context. *Developing Leadership: Creating the Schools of Tomorrow*, 80-94.

West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (1993). Power, Inequality, and the Accomplishment of Gender: An Ethnomethodological View. *Theory on Gender/Feminism on Theory*, 151-174.

Wetherell, K. M. (2002). Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction.

Whawo, D. D. (1993). Educational Administration: Planning and Supervision. *Benin City: Jodah Publications*.

Wilson, B., Squires, M. A. E., Widger, K., Cranley, L., & Tourangeau, A. N. N. (2008). Job Satisfaction Among a Multigenerational Nursing Workforce. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *16*(6), 716-723.

Winter, J. S., & Sweeney, J. (1994). Improving School Climate; Administrators Are Key. *NASSP Bulletin*, *78*(564), 65-59.

Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Krüger, M. L. (2003). Educational Leadership and Student Achievement: The Elusive Search for an Association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *39*(3), 398-425.

Wohlers, A. I., & London, M. (1989). Ratings of Managerial Characteristics: Evaluation Difficulty, Co-Worker Agreement, and Self-Awareness. *Personnel Psychology*, *42*(2), 235-261.

Wood, T. D. (2012). Teacher Perceptions of Gender-Based Differences Among Elementary School Teachers. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *4*(2), 317-345.

Wosinska, W., Dabul, A. J., Whetstone-Dion, R., & Cialdini, R. B. (1996). Self-Presentational Responses to Success in the Organization: The Costs and Benefits of Modesty. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *18*(2), 229-242.

Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational Leadership and Multiple Levels of Analysis. *Human Relations*, *43*(10), 975-995.

Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior: Integrating a Half Century of Behavior Research. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *9*(1), 15-32.