CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Leadership Theories

It is not possible to categorize all the leadership theories into specific time periods (Van Wart, 2003). But the dominant themes in leadership literature and their corresponding time periods can be roughly described as follows.

2.1.1 Great Man Theory (Pre 1900).

This theory was the beginning of the understanding of the concept of leadership. Before the rise of the 20th century it was believed that leaders were born, not made (Bird, 1940). Leaders were endowed with superior qualities, which caused them to be different from their followers and allowed them to lead (Cowley, 1928). These theory focused on distinguished men in history such as Napoleon, George Washington, Gandhi, or Martin Luther King, who were able to drastically shift the social and political paradigms of their day (Van Seters & Field, 1990; Van Wart, 2003).

2.1.2 Trait Theory (1900-1948)

In the early 20th century the great man theory evolved into trait theory. The studies looked into individual traits such as intelligence, birth order, socio-economic status, and child rearing practices (Bass, 1960; Bird, 1940; Stogdill, 1948,1974). Stogdill (1948) analyzed 124 trait studies of leadership conducted from 1904 to 1947. The finding was that the average individual in the leadership role is different from the average group member in six clusters of leadership traits. They are capacity (intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality, judgement), achievement
(scholarship, knowledge, athletic accomplishments), responsibility (dependability, initiative, persistence, aggressiveness, self-confidence, desire to excel), participation(activity, sociability, co-operation, adaptability, humour), status (socio-economic position, popularity) and situation (mental level, status, skills, needs and interests of followers, objectives to be achieved).

Barnard (1938) found that the qualities or traits for effective leadership are physique, skill, technology, perception, knowledge, memory, imagination, determination, persistence, endurance and courage. The trait theory of leadership was the basis of many leadership studies that followed (Lussier & Achua, 2001). But numerous empirical studies on trait theory failed to identify any single trait or group of traits associated with good leadership (Jenkins, 1947). There is no unequivocal understanding as to what distinguishes leaders and non-leaders or what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Stogdill (1948, p.64) maintains that a person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits.

2.1.3 Behavioural Theory (1940s – 1950s)

The trait theory gave way to behavioral theories in the 1950s. Behavioral theories examined effective leadership by identifying leader behaviors or actions and their effects on followers’ productivity and job satisfaction (Leech, 1999). The focus of research changed from what leaders are to what leaders do.

The University of Iowa sponsored group of researchers under the leadership of the famous psychologist Kurt Lewin identified three major leadership styles in 1939. They are, a)Authoritarian (Autocratic), b)Democratic (Participatory) and c)Lassez-Fair (delegative) leadership styles (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939).
Researchers at Ohio University, discouraged by the inconclusive nature of trait studies, conducted some of the early behavioral leadership studies in the 1940s (Hemphill & Coons, 1950). They developed the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The LBDQ identified two general types of leader behavior, a) consideration and b) initiating structure (Stodgill, 1974).

Researchers at the University of Michigan concentrated on the impact of leaders’ behavior on the performance of small groups (Likert, 1967). They identified two types of leadership behavior, a) Employee Orientation and b) Production Orientation.

The Leadership Grid model explains how leaders help organizations to reach their goal through two factors, a) Concern for People, and b) Concern for Production (Blake & Mouton, 1964, 1978, 1985).

Fleishman (1973) reported that the task behavior or initiating structure involved acts that organized and defined the tasks and work of people. Relationship behavior or consideration involved acts that build trust, respect and links between leaders and followers.

2.1.4 Contingency Theory (1948-1980s)

Contingency theories dealt with the interaction between the leader traits, the leader behaviors, and the situation in which the leader exists. Leadership effectiveness was the combined result of both the qualities of the leader and the demands of the situation. The contingency theories make the assumption that the effects of one variable on leadership are contingent on other variables (Krzisnik, 2007). This concept opened the way for the possibility that leadership could be different in every situation (Saal & Knight, 1988; Horner, 1997). The main contribution to this approach
was made by Fiedler (1967). Fiedler’s Contingency Model (1967) postulated that the situation moderates the relationship between leader personality traits and effectiveness. Leaders’ effectiveness was contingent upon the demands of the situation. Three major situational variables determine whether a given situation is favourable to the leader: i) Leader-member relations (extent to which the group trusts the leader and willingly follows his/her directions), ii) task structure (degree to which the task is clearly defined) and iii) position power (extent to which the leader has official power to influence others) (Fiedler, 1967). If all these dimensions are high, the situation is favourable to the leader. Fiedler defined two leadership styles – task oriented and relationship oriented. Task oriented behaviours are more effective in situations which are very favourable or very unfavourable, whereas the relationship oriented style is more effective in moderately favourable situations (Leech, 1999). His research emphasized the need to match the leader with the situation (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974).

2.1.5 Situational Theory

Studies attempted to identify “distinctive characteristics of the setting to which the leader’s success could be attributed” (Hoy & Miskel, 1987, p. 273). The situation approach maintains that leadership is determined not so much by the characters of the individuals as by the requirements of social situation (Hencley, 1973).

House’s (1971) path-goal theory of leadership maintained that the leader should analyze the task and choose behaviours that maximized the followers’ potential and willingness to achieve the organization’s goal (House & Dessler, 1974). Leaders must examine the situational factors including the followers’ personal
qualities, the work environment, and select the appropriate style: directive, supportive, participative or achievement oriented (Leech, 1999).

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) founded their situational leadership model theory on the principle that the leader’s behavior falls within two dimensions, task behavior and relationship behavior, each of which is influenced by the situational variable of follower maturity (Blanchard, Zigarmi & Zigarmi, 1987; Smith & Peterson, 1989; Yukl, 1994; Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson, 1996). Leader behaviours (directive/supportive) interact with follower’s behavior (high/low commitment and high/low competence). The interaction of these variables defined four leadership styles: telling, selling, participating and delegating.

Situational theorists found that successful leaders adapted their behaviors to meet the demands of their particular situation (Hersey, 2000). In order to be successful, the leader should adopt different styles of leadership based on the task readiness of the follower (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977).

2.1.6 Transactional Leadership (1970s)

The idea of transactional leadership was first developed by James McGregor Burns in 1978 in his book, Leadership. Burns introduced the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership in this book. Transactional leadership maintains that leader-follower relations were based on negotiation, exchange and contractual dimensions (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Waldman & Bass, 1991; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). There is no common objective for the leaders and the followers (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Leader and followers exchange one thing for another and are concerned with serving their individual interests (Burns, 1978; Sergiovanni, 1990). The leader motivates, praises, rewards, disciplines, reproves, or
threatens based on the success or failure of mutually agreed upon goals (Bryant, 2003). Different types of behavior inherent to transactional leadership are, i) contingent reward (subordinates receive rewards for good performance), ii) management by exception - active (subordinates are monitored and then corrected if necessary in order for them to perform effectively), iii) management by exception – passive (subordinates receive contingent punishment in response to obvious discrepancies from the standard performance).

2.1.7 Transformational Leadership (1970s)

Transformational leadership is the ability to influence followers by changing their beliefs, values and needs (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Transformational leadership involves raising leaders and followers to higher levels of motivation and values (Bass, 1985). It converts followers into leaders (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Tichy & Devanna, 1990).


2.1.7.1 James MacGregor Burns

According to Burns (1978), Transformational leadership “occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one
another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p.20). Transformational leadership is based upon Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs. By elevating the maturity level of followers’ needs to a concern for recognition, achievement, and self-actualization, leaders are able to increase the attainment of goals (Leech, D.W, 1999). The transformational leader seeks to satisfy the higher needs of the follower. Burns posited that leaders are neither born nor made, but they evolve. Leadership is a moral undertaking and a response to human wants. Burns presented Gandhiji, who raised the hope of millions of Indians, as the best example of transformational leadership.

In his latest book ‘Transforming Leadership: A New Pursuit of Happiness’, Burns (2003) suggested ways transactional leaders can learn to become transformational leaders (Rhoden, V., 2012). Burns (1978) thought that transactional and transformational leadership were at opposite ends of the same continuum. Therefore, leaders were either transactional or transformational. Later it was found that transactional and transformational leadership are complimentary and can be demonstrated by the same leader (Bass, 1985; Kouzes & Posner, 1989).

2.1.7.2 Bernard M. Bass and Colleagues

Bass (1985) expanded Burns’ theory. He postulated that a leader is “one who motivates us to do more than we originally expected to do” (p. 20). Bass and Avolio (1990,1997) developed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to identify the components of transformational leadership. He administered the MLQ to U.S Army officers and proposed that transformational leadership has four components. They are,

i) charisma (gaining trust, respect, and confidence of others by taking a stand on difficult issues, showing conviction, emphasizing the importance of purpose, commitment and values),
ii) inspirational motivation (communicating a vision with fluency and confidence in a positive manner, energizing others and increasing their optimism and enthusiasm for the task ahead),

iii) intellectual stimulation (encouraging followers to think about problems in new ways), and

iv) individual consideration (personal concern expressed by the leader for the follower)

Bass and Avolio (1994) viewed transformational leadership as a process of changing the organization by transforming followers into leaders and leaders into agents of change. Bass (1985) considered transformational leadership as an “add-on” to transactional leadership.

2.1.7.3 Bennis and Nanus (1985)

Bennis and Nanus (1985) identified four leadership characteristics leaders use in transforming organizations. They are:

i) all transforming leaders communicate a clear vision of the future state of their organizations

ii) they have the ability to move their organizations in a direction that transformed the organization’s values and norms

iii) they create trust in their organizations by being a trustworthy and reliable presence in the midst of uncertainty

iv) they emphasize strengths over weaknesses reflecting a feeling of confidence and high expectations in their organizations (Tavanti, M.)

2.1.7.4 Tichy and Devanna

Tichy and Devanna (1986) identified three stages of organizational transformation: recognizing the need for change, creating a vision and
institutionalizing change. Also, seven traits characterizing transformational leaders were identified. Transformational leaders are change agents, courageous, strong believers in people, value driven, dedicated life-long learners, capable of dealing with ambiguity and uncertainty, and visionaries.

2.1.7.5 Stephen R. Covey

In his masterpiece book “The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People”, Covey (1990) formulated his theory of principle – centered leadership. Habit was defined as the intersection of knowledge, skill, and desire. Covey’s seven habits are, i) be proactive, ii) begin with the the end in mind, iii) put first things first, iv) think win-win, v) seek first to understand, then to be understood, vi) synergize, and vii) sharpen the saw. As the seven habits are based on ethically sound principles they bring maximum long term beneficial results (Covey, 1990).

2.1.7.6 Kouzes and Posner

Kouzes and Posner interviewed several ordinary people and categorized their findings in five behaviours. They found that transformational leaders challenge the process, inspire a shared vision, enable others to act, model the way, and encourage the heart (Bass, 1990). Kouzes and Posner (1989) created a survey instrument called the Leadership Practices Inventory to assess the frequency in which the leaders engage in these behaviors. The present is study is based on these five practices of exemplary leader theory and will be discussed in detail later.

2.1.7.7 Kenneth Leithwood

Kenneth Leithwood and his colleagues bridged the work of Burns and Bass with the field of educational administration. He found that former transformational
leadership models failed to include necessary transactional components which were fundamental to the stability of the organization. Leithwood assumes that the principal share leadership with teachers and provide individual support, intellectual stimulation, and personal vision. Leithwood described transformational leadership using the following seven dimensions: “building school vision and establishing school goals, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, modeling best practices and important organizational values, demonstrating high performance expectations, creating a productive school culture, and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions” (Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood et al., cited in Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000, p.114).

2.1.8 Servant Leadership (1970s)

Robert Greenleaf’s (1970) essay entitled ‘The Servant as Leader’ put forward the philosophy of servant leadership for the first time. It is noted for its humane orientation. Humane orientation refers to the concern for the welfare of other people and willingness to sacrifice self-interest to help others (House, et al., 2004). The primary responsibility of leader is to serve others. Greenleaf (1977) raised many questions to test the servant leader: “Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged of society; will they benefit, or at least, not be further deprived?”(pp. 13-14). Servant leadership is a philosophy of life and work.

2.2 Studies on School Leadership

Mahant (1979) examined the administrative behaviour of high school principals in Gujarat. The findings of the study showed that sex, age, experience,
school size, management type, and location had no influence on administrative behaviour. Patel (1983) showed a positive relationship between leadership behaviour of the principals and school climate in the higher secondary schools of Gujarat. The rural-urban dimension had no significant role on leadership behaviour.

Mulhern, & Hoy (1987), teachers would be more satisfied with their job in an open climate, where principals are democratic managers who maintain open channels of communication with the staff. Successful school principals have used a variety of mechanisms to motivate and activate their staff to bring about changes in their school culture (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990).

Blase and Kirby (1992) stated that effective principals were servants to the teachers – guarding instructional time, helping teachers with discipline matters, empowering teachers, and supporting teachers. In the view of Ogden & Germinario (1994), an effective school is that in which the principal and his team are bonded together by the belief that student achievement can best be attained through a common mission, common goals, and shared governance. Scheeren & Bosker (1997) stated that professional principals would always accompany and supervise teachers’ and students’ performance at school, provide a positive and constructive feedback for improving teaching-learning process, encourage a more effective and creative usage of learning times and facilities.

Dayal (1999) found that successful leaders in India possessed the qualities of transformational leaders. Bulach, Price & Boothe (1999) reported that what made the difference between successful and unsuccessful principals were the principals’ human relations skills, level of trust, decision making processes, methods of controlling staff, and ways of dealing with conflict. They stressed the importance of allowing teachers to have say in the vision and direction of school reform efforts. Sinha (2000) found
that Indians have personalized rather than contractual relationship at the workplace. The leader establishes a personal relationship with the follower and this relation extends outside the work environment. Personal touch is close in meaning to individualized consideration except that personal touch is more intimate and includes relationship outside the workplace.

Bogler (2001) indicates that instructional leadership fitted well to the period of 1980s and 1990s because it met the expectations of the public and the administrators about the principals. But instructional leadership could not deal effectively with the changes that took place during the 1990s. Principals were expected to bring visionary leadership into schools, and this paved the way for transformational leadership to the educational settings. Sheikh (2001) maintained that principal is the hub of all the educational efforts and therefore he has to play the role of organizer, leader, governor, business director, coordinator, teacher, guide, philosopher, and friend. Krishnan (2001) states that Indian culture is conducive to emergence of transformational leaders, as the fundamental beliefs that are unique to the Indian worldview – concept of Maya, preference for action, potential divinity, and goal of freedom – facilitate the emergence of transformational leadership. Mehrotra (2002) examined the leadership styles of principals of government and private schools. She found out that principals did not differ significantly in their leadership styles based on the type of school.

Philip (2003) states that debate over the most suitable leadership role for principals has been dominated by two conceptual models: instructional leadership and transformational leadership. The researcher concludes that the effectiveness of a particular leadership model is linked to factors in the external environment and the local context of a school. Hurakalli (2003) stated that there was a strong positive and significant relationship between overall leadership behaviour of secondary school
principals and their mental health. Hallinger (2003) maintained that a key contributing factor to successful change, school improvement, and school effectiveness was the skilful leadership of school principals. Sala (2003) suggested that the leadership of college presidents can significantly influence the organizational climate, and therefore the culture of a college, which in turn influences important performance outcomes.

DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran (2003) described the various roles of the principals as building managers, student disciplinarians, instructional leaders, staff developers, relationship builders, communication and public relations experts, programme developers, grant writers, human relations handlers, and stress managers. Whitaker (2003) stated that many principals did not make a change because they were worried about what those few negative teachers would say or do instead of worrying about the majority of teachers who would help make the school successful, thus giving the negative teachers power by working around them. Whitaker (2006) opined that the greatest gift a principal could give to his/her students and staff was the gift of confidence by letting them know that he/she believed they could do whatever was asked of them. Such confidence of the principal could ultimately instill confidence within them. Ali (2003) examined the leadership styles of the principals of Delhi and found that the principals selected by the Union Public Service Commission (UPSC) preferred authoritarian style whereas the principals promoted from the post of vice-principals preferred democratic style. There was a significant difference in the leadership styles of the recruited and promoted principals.

Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and wahlstrom (2004) stated that school leadership is second only to teacher direct instruction in its contribution to learning. According to Kejriwal and Krishnan (2004) Sattva Guna (awareness) and Vedic worldview enhance transformational leadership whereas Tamas Guna (inertness)
reduces it. Centre for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement (2005) under US department of education claims that leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to student learning at school. Also, leadership effects are usually largest where and when they are needed most. Without a powerful leader, troubled schools are unlikely to be turned around. Chan & Chan (2005) discovered that transformational leadership leads to higher levels of employee extra effort and satisfaction with the leader.

Littleford (2007) maintains that principals who view teachers as part of their school family will work to provide a positive ambience for all. Madlock (2008) posited leader’s mindfulness regarding effective communication and emotional awareness toward followers increases levels of job satisfaction. According to Nsubuga (2009), unless principals are well equipped with knowledge and skills in management and leadership, they would not be able to improve school performance significantly. Scarby and Shaddin (2008) maintains that guiding a school towards the specific purpose of empowering teachers to lead at all levels can contribute to an effective educational environment.

Kirgan Benjamin G (2009) states that administrative practices need to not only hold teachers as accountable, but also, drive the positive, pro-active strengths that all staff members possess, in order to maintain an effective and dedicated faculty. Northouse (2010) and Yukl (2005) opined that leadership is a process of interaction between leaders and followers where the leader attempts to influence followers to achieve a common goal. Goddard et al. (2010) found a significant direct effect of leadership on teacher collaboration and a significant direct effect of collaboration on student achievement. A significant indirect effect of leadership on student achievement through teacher collaboration was evidenced.
Jacobson (2011) opined that the common practices of successful principals were reconstruction of organization, setting directions for subordinates, and motivating and developing people. Voon, Lo, Ngui, & Ayob (2011) found that transactional and transformational leadership styles had direct relationship with employees’ job satisfaction. Further, the study showed that transformational leadership style has a stronger relationship with job satisfaction than transactional leadership. The researchers conclude that transformational leadership is deemed suitable for managing government organizations. Sahin, S. (2011) found a positive and high level relationship between the principals’ instructional leadership style and school culture.

Sawati, Anwar, & Majoka (2011) examined the leadership styles of secondary school principals and their impact on schools’ performance in Pakistan. The principals’ major leadership styles were democratic, autocratic, freerein, and eclectic. The study did not find any significant effect of any particular style on the schools’ academic results. There were no gender differences in leadership styles of principals. Greb (2011) found no statistically significant correlation between principal leadership style and students’ academic performance.

Sawati, Anwar, & Majoka (2013) found that principals’ leadership styles had no significant correlation with age, experience and qualification of the principals in government schools of Pakistan. Adeyemi and Bolarinwa (2013) defined leadership as the process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly towards the achievement of objectives. Singh (2013) found that principals’ years of experience and age were related to their leadership effectiveness. No significant difference existed between the leadership effectiveness of male and female teachers.
Rani (2014) found out that more experienced and higher age group principals showed effective leadership behaviour in comparison to their less experienced and lower age group counterparts respectively. Gender did not affect the leadership behaviour of the principals. Selesho, & Ntisa (2014) found that high school principals in South Africa used transformational leadership more than transactional leadership. Both transformational and transactional leadership had positive relationships with organizational commitment.

2.2.1 Studies Using LPI

Xu (1991) reported that LPI-Self scores of deans were significantly higher than those from the LPI-Observer (chairpersons) on all five leadership practices. Respondent age, gender, marital status, level of education, academic rank, and number of years in position were not related either to LPI-Observer or LPI-Self scores. Brown (1996) posited that the order of frequency of engagement in leadership practices was Enabling, Encouraging, Modelling, Challenging, and Inspiring. Taylor, C.D., (1996) stated that the leadership practices were not related with different demographic information. Leadership practices did not differ significantly as a result of respondent characteristics such as gender, work status, area of practice, educational degree, age and years of experience.

Leech, Donald, and Fulton (2002) found no significant differences between the perception of middle school and high school teachers about their principals’ five leadership practices. Also, principals most often exhibited the practices of ‘Enabling other to act’ and ‘Modelling the Way’ and least often demonstrated the practice of ‘Encouraging the heart’. Broome (2003) found that the leadership practices of Enable others to act and Model the way were the two most influential predictors of
community college effectiveness. There was a significant relationship between all five leadership practices of the presidents and employment satisfaction in community colleges. Stout-Stewart (2005) discovered that Enable others to act is the preferred leadership practice of female community college presidents. Herbst, Maree, & Sibanda (2006) examined the possible relationship between four facets of emotional intelligence and five practices of exemplary leaders in a higher education institution in South Africa. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Ability Test and the LPI was used to collect data. The study found that emotional intelligence was linked to some of the practices of effective leaders and that facets of emotional intelligence were predictors of transformational leadership behaviours. John, A.K. (2006) found out that demographic variables such as gender, age, level of education, years of experience, and salary were not significantly correlated with any of the five leadership practices. Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson, and Jinks (2007) found that public school principals who rated themselves high in terms of servant leadership were also rated significantly higher by their teachers on the five leadership practices than principals who rated themselves low on servant leadership.

Rhoden (2012) examined the relationships among secondary school principals’ leadership behaviours, school climate, and student achievement. The LPI, School Climate Inventory – Revised, and Florida Comprehensive Assessment Tests were used to collect data. Multiple linear regressions, ANOVA, and partial correlation analyses were used to analyse the data. Student achievement was not found to be significantly related with the five leadership practices. Also, none of the leadership practices significantly predicted school climate. Principals’ experiences as principal and years in present school were not related to their leadership practices.
Hage (2013) examined the relationship between a leader’s self-reported religion and religiosity (independent variable) and leadership practices (dependent variables) among Christian and Muslim organizational leaders in Lebanon. The LPI and the Religiosity Practices Inventory (RPI) were used for data collection. The result showed that there was a significant relationship between religion and the five leadership practices. But there was no significant relationship between religiosity and the five leadership practices. O’Dell (2014) found that there was a relationship between the leadership practices of presidents and the organizational culture of Christian colleges and universities.

Ndiritu, Gikonyo, and Kimani (2014) found out that principals who had less than three years of administrative experience were more transformational leaders than their more than nine years experienced counterparts.

2.3 Theories of Job Satisfaction

The theories that explain the causes of job satisfaction can be grouped into three categories: (a) situational theories, (b) dispositional theories, and (c) interactive theories (Judge et al., 2001).

2.3.1 Situational Theories

Situational theories explain that job satisfaction is derived from the nature of one’s job or other environmental factors. Examples for situational theories are Herzberg’s (1967) Two Factor theory, the Social Information Processing (SIP) approach (Salanick & Pfeffer, 1978), and the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Situational theorists emphasized the role of situational factors such as leadership (Fiedler, 1967; House, 1971; Likert, 1961), task design (Hackman &
Lawler, 1971; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959), and organizational climate and culture (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1996; Schneider, 1987) on job satisfaction.

2.3.2 Dispositional Theories

Dispositional theories propose that job satisfaction stems from personal make-up of the individual (Staw & Ross, 1985). The dispositional approach maintains that job satisfaction is an individual trait. That is, individuals vary in their tendency to be satisfied with their jobs (Staw, Bell, and Clausen, 1986; Arvey et al., 1989). Core Self- evaluations Model put forward by Timothy A. Judge, Edwin A. Locke, and Cathy C. Durham (1998) is an example.

2.3.3 Interactive Theories

Interactive theories assume that job satisfaction results from the interplay of the situation and personality. Examples are Cornell integrative model (Hulin, 1991), and Range of Affect Theory (Value percept theory) by Locke (1976).

2.3.4 Hierarchy of Needs Theory (Abraham Maslow, 1954)

Maslow (1954), in his hierarchy of needs theory proposed that people are motivated by different needs in hierarchical order. Before higher-order needs are fulfilled, lower-order needs need to be satisfied. Maslow’s theory of hierarchy of needs was the first motivation theory that laid the foundation for the theories of job satisfaction.

2.3.5 Two Factor Theory (Herzberg, 1959)

Herzberg’s two factor theory of motivation suggested that work behaviour or characteristics associated with dissatisfaction are different from those associated with
satisfaction. He pointed out two dimensions for employees’ behaviour: i) Hygiene factors – refers to factors outside the job such as working conditions, salary, security, policies, and supervision, ii) Motivator factors – opportunities for achievement, recognition, responsibility, personal growth, and challenge on the job (Dessler & Starke, 2004).

2.3.6 Theory X & Y (McGregor, 1960)

Theory X & Y put forward by McGregor (1960) proposed that the managers’ view about the nature of human being was founded on a group of assumptions. The managers change their behaviour toward their subordinates based on these assumptions about different employees (Robbins, 1998).

2.3.7 Equity Theory (Stacy Adams, 1963)

Equity theory proposed by Stacy Adams (1963) holds that a person identifies the amount of things gained (input) from a relationship compared to the things given (output) to produce an input/output ratio. She/he then compares this ratio to the ratio of other people to decide whether they have an equitable relationship (Walster et al., 1973). If an individual thinks there is inequality between two individuals, the person is likely to be distressed (Huseman et al., 1987).

2.3.8 Expectancy Theory (Victor H. Vroom-1964)

Victor H. Vroom’s Expectancy Theory states that if people believe that their goal is worth achieving and there is the probability that what they do will help them in achieving their goals, people feel motivation to work (Weihrich & Koontz, 1999).
2.3.9 Goal-Setting Theory (Locke, 1968)

Edwin Locke (1968) asserted that some specific goals lead to increased performance than do general goals. Difficult goals demand focus on problems, increase sense of goal importance, and encourage persistence to achieve the goals, resulting in high level of output. Further, feedback triggers higher performance than no feedback.

2.3.10 Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1975-76)

Hackman and Oldham (1976) proposed the Job Characteristics Model that states that there are five core job characteristics. They are task identity, task significance, skill variety, autonomy, and feedback. Jobs that provide these characteristics are likely to be more satisfying and motivating than jobs that do not provide these characteristics.

2.3.11 Range of Affect Theory (Edwin A. Locke, 1976)

Edwin A. Locke’s (1976) Range of Affect Theory is one of the most famous theories of job satisfaction. It states that satisfaction is determined by a discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. A person’s job satisfaction comes from getting what they feel is important rather than fulfilment of their needs. Range of Affect Theory is also called Value Percept Theory (Rice, Gentile, & McFarlin, 1991).

2.3.12 Social Information Processing Model (Salanick & Pfeffer, 1978)

Social Information Processing Model proposed by Salanick & Pfeffer (1978) posits that individual needs and perceptions of job characteristics are not fixed.
Rather, they are influenced by the social environment in which a person is embedded (Pollock, Whitbred, & Contractor, 2000).

2.3.13 Cornell Integrative Model (Hulin, 1991)

This model postulates that job satisfaction is a function of the balance between what the employee puts into the work role and what he/she receives from the work.

2.3.14 Spillover Hypothesis (Spector, 1997)

Spector (1997) proposed the Spillover hypothesis of job satisfaction that the feelings we have in various areas of our lives tend to spillover and affect other areas.

2.3.15 Core Self-evaluations Model (Judge, Locke, and Durham 1998)

Core self-evaluation represents a stable personality trait, which is a predictor of job satisfaction. It involves four personality dimensions; locus of control, neuroticism, self-efficacy and self-esteem.

2.3.16 Evans’ Theory (Evans, L., 1998)

Evans theory of job satisfaction is concerned only about teachers’ job satisfaction. Evans (1998) explains that there are two factors that affect the teachers’ job satisfaction – realistic expectations and relative perspective.

2.4 Studies on Teacher Job Satisfaction

Nayak (1982) studied adjustment and job satisfaction of married and unmarried female teachers. The sample was 735 female teachers in different higher secondary schools of Jabalpur district. No significant difference in job satisfaction was found between married and unmarried female teachers working in rural and urban
areas. A significantly positive relationship between teaching aptitude and job satisfaction was also found. Samad (1986) found that teachers in more open climate school enjoyed job satisfaction than school in less open climate schools in Chandigarh. Reddy (1989) found that over qualified primary school teachers had low job satisfaction.

Saxena (1990) studied a sample of higher secondary school teachers in Madhya Pradesh and did not find any difference in job satisfaction due to gender, stream and experience. Naik (1990) explored the ad hoc teachers of the Baroda University and found that favourable attitude towards the teaching profession, financial consideration and facilities for further studies contributed to teachers’ job satisfaction. Marital status, age, experience and gender had no effect on level of job satisfaction.

Lee et al. (1991) revealed that teachers’ job satisfaction is largely unrelated to demographic differences, but is strongly predicted by teachers’ subjective interpretation of their control over policy and classroom decisions. Aggarwal (1991) conducted a study on primary and secondary school teachers and found that caste, place of work and mother tongue had significant influence on job satisfaction. Age and marital status had no relationship with job satisfaction. Mohan (1992) found that job involvement and general state of health and life had a positive effect on the level of job satisfaction of teachers. A study by Heller, Rex, & Cline (1992) revealed that satisfaction in meeting students’ achievement needs explained 28 percent of the variance in teacher satisfaction. A positive relationship was found between teacher satisfaction and student quality indicators such as reading and math skills and attendance rates in a study conducted by Ostroff (1992).
Heller, Clay, and Perkins (1993) discovered that nearly 50 percentage of the public school teachers sampled were not satisfied with their job. Teachers were least satisfied with the financial aspects of teaching and most satisfied with the co-workers. Further, job satisfaction was not related to school type, years of teaching experience, and gender of the teacher or principal. Beegam (1994) studied a sample of 415 teachers in arts and science colleges affiliated to University of Kerala. The study revealed that the job satisfaction of college teachers was related to personality variables like self-esteem, materialism-spiritualism orientation, and thoughtfulness. In addition, job satisfaction was related to demographic variables like locale, religion, caste, community, education of spouse, and mode of conveyance. Chandraiah (1994) studied a sample of 150 male college teachers and found that middle aged and older aged teachers were more satisfied with their jobs as compared to the younger group of teachers.

Das and Panda (1995) selected their sample of 100 teachers from the higher secondary schools and colleges of Kamrup district of Assam. They found that there was no difference in the degree of job satisfaction of higher secondary teachers and college teachers, and male and female college teachers. Reddy & Babu (1995) stated that teachers working in residential schools were more satisfied than their counterparts belonging to non-residential schools. Senapaty, Panda, and Pradhan (1995) examined the job satisfaction of 54 government and 48 private school teachers working in the district of Koraput in Orissa. The Job Satisfaction Scale by Anand was used for data collection. The result showed no significant difference between government and private school teachers in job satisfaction. Venkataram (1995) conducted his study on 400 teachers from residential and non-residential schools. The result showed that residential school teachers were more satisfied than non-
residential school teachers. Dinham (1995) discovered that teachers’ interpersonal relationships with current and past students, parents, and colleagues were among the major sources of their job satisfaction, whereas structural and administrative factors were the sources of job dissatisfaction.

Thaker (1996) studied the job satisfaction of 900 secondary school principals in Gujarat. He found that gender, age, educational qualification, marital status, and geographical area did not affect the job satisfaction of secondary school principals. Perie, Baker, and Whitener (1997) discovered that extrinsic factors such as salary, perceived support from administrators, school safety, and availability of school resources have been associated with teacher job satisfaction.

Goswami (1998) studied job satisfaction of teachers of central schools of North Eastern region. Four out of five cadres were found to experience dissatisfaction. Teachers who were male, elder, senior, and with graduate and postgraduate qualification experienced more dissatisfaction. Kulsum (1998) studied 586 secondary school teachers of Bangalore city using Job Satisfaction Inventory. She found that the level of job satisfaction of teachers working in open climate type schools and familiar climate type schools did not differ significantly. Further, teachers working in paternal climate type schools and closed climate type schools differed significantly in their level of job satisfaction.

Scott, Cox, & Dinham (1999) found that in U.K., teachers’ job satisfaction was influenced by factors such as student learning and achievement, professional development, relationships with colleagues, and the status and image of teaching. Research by Bavendam (2000) identified six factors that influenced job satisfaction; challenging opportunities at work, positive stress, good leadership, quality of work, fair rewards, adequate freedom, and authority. When these factors were high, job
satisfaction was high and when these factors were low, job satisfaction was low. Tahira (2000) found that female teachers had greater degree of job satisfaction than the male teachers. Zhou and George (2001) posited that employees showed higher levels of job satisfaction as they received useful feedback from co-workers and support from their organizations for creativity. Bogler (2001) reported that the success of an educational institution is dependent on its teachers’ feelings about their work and how satisfied they were with their works.

Kaneez (2002) explored job satisfaction of 770 secondary school teachers using Job Satisfaction Scale by Meera Dixit. Male and female and married and unmarried teachers did not differ significantly in the level of job satisfaction. The levels of job satisfaction of teachers working in schools located in urban areas were higher than those working in schools in semi–urban areas. There was no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of teachers working in English, Hindi, and Marathi medium schools. Marathi medium teachers of aided schools were found to have significantly higher level of job satisfaction than those of unaided schools. Mehrotra (2002) studied a sample of 1120 teachers of government and private schools of Delhi. The study revealed that government school teachers had significantly higher job satisfaction than the private school teachers. There was significant difference in the dimensions of pay, work itself, promotion, and supervision. Ganzach (2002) found out that people assign greater weight to intrinsic satisfaction than to pay satisfaction. Judge, Heller, & Mount (2002) found out that there was a relationship between three personality traits and job satisfaction. They were emotional stability, conscientiousness and agreeableness.

was found to be independent of sex, location of school, type of management, age, teaching experience, and educational qualification. Gupta and Jain (2003) found that job satisfaction of nursery teachers was influenced by salary, security, physical conditions, promotion, and recognition. Stokking, Leenders, Jong, and Tartwijk (2003) stated that dissatisfaction and high turnover rate among student teachers in Netherlands were due to lack of proper supervision, encouragement, and independence. Wai-Yum (2003) reported that the lack of recognition and approval of principals and colleagues aroused the work dissatisfaction among teachers in Hong Kong. The attitude of the administrators/principals and parents were vital factors in promoting the job satisfaction of early childhood teachers.

Agarwal (2004) found that mother tongue and place of work were related with the job satisfaction of primary and secondary teachers whereas age and marital status were not. More experienced and government school teachers were found to be more satisfied than less experienced and private school teachers. Raj and Mary (2004) conducted a study on the government school teachers of Pondicherry and found that 39 percentage had high, 40 percentage had average and 21 percentage had low levels of job satisfaction. There was no significant difference in job satisfaction between teachers of different age, gender, type of school, medium of instruction, place of work, educational qualification, salary, religion, subject taught, and years of teaching experience. Donaldson-Feilder & Bond (2004) discovered no relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction of 290 workers in the U.K. Sattar and Jamil (2004) showed that high level of stress among elementary school head teachers negatively affected their job satisfaction. Carlson & Mellor, (2004) found out that workers find satisfaction in those tasks that provide opportunity for autonomy and flexibility.
Chand (2005) explored the job satisfaction of 300 physical education teachers in high schools of Himachal Pradesh. The study revealed that the job satisfaction and work motivation of physical education teachers were not related to the level of sports facilities in the school. Dixit (2005) studied the effect of gender on the extrinsic and intrinsic factors of job satisfaction of primary school teachers. It was found that gender had more effect on extrinsic factors. Ramachandran et al. (2005) maintained that teachers in primary education are unable to give proper time to teaching and learning activities due to their working conditions such as non-academic duties and managerial work given by authorities. As a result, the reputation of teachers might fall down which may lower the level of job satisfaction in teachers.

Jiang (2005) investigated the job satisfaction of early childhood teachers using a questionnaire on 317 teachers from 21 kindergartens in Shanghai. The study found that organizational climate and teachers’ involvement in curriculum reform are the direct factors that affect teachers’ job satisfaction. Bennett, Boesch, & Haltiner (2005) discovered that people’s belief in the meaningfulness of the tasks and the benefits of their activities were the main predictors of job satisfaction. Maenpaa (2005) found that in Finland, half of the teachers were satisfied with their jobs and the rest were dissatisfied. The most important source of satisfaction was working with other teachers and students. The important sources of dissatisfaction were the teaching material, working conditions, the principal, workload and salary. Ramachandran et al., (2005), Ramachandran et al., (2008), and Mooij (2008) discovered that the factors affecting job satisfaction of teachers in rural India were social status, working and living condition, professional development opportunities, salary, and promotion.

Panda (2006) investigated the job satisfaction of 440 college teachers from Assam and Orissa. Job Satisfaction Scale was used as the tool for data collection.
Result showed that sex, experience, location, and status did not affect teachers’ degree of job satisfaction. Zembylas and Papanastasiou, (2006) studied the sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of teachers of Cyprus. They found out that teachers were satisfied with interactions with students, relationship with colleagues, and opportunities to contribute to the growth of individuals and the development of society. Social problems, students’ lack of interest and bad behaviour, centralised educational system, and lack of professional autonomy in schools were found to be the major sources of job dissatisfaction. Lee and Philips, (2006) discovered higher levels of job autonomy and independence correspond to lower levels of work stress. Abbott, Boyd, and Miles (2006) concluded that levels of job satisfaction increased with the presence of various activities at work.

Rathod and Verma (2006) explored a sample of 567 teachers from 115 schools of Indore district in Madhya Pradesh. Teachers’ Job Satisfaction Questionnaire by Kumar and Mutha and Teachers’ Role Commitment Scale by Buddhisagar and Verma were used for data collection. Result revealed that female, senior, high role commitment, urban teachers showed significantly higher job satisfaction than male, junior, low role commitment, rural teachers respectively. Training did not influence job satisfaction. Rebeca (2006) found that positive relationship existed between teachers job satisfaction and non-monetary recognition. The study revealed that the recognition that principals provided to teachers had the strongest positive relationship to job satisfaction of teachers. Bindhu and Sudheeshkumar (2006) studied the job satisfaction and stress coping skills of 500 primary school teachers of Kerala. They found out that male and female teachers differed significantly in their level of job satisfaction and that there was a positive correlation between job satisfaction and stress coping skills.
Choudhury (2007) explored a sample of 400 college teachers and found that there was no significant relationship between professional awareness and job satisfaction. Usha and Shashi (2007) conducted their study on a sample of 184 teachers from 25 secondary schools in Malapuram and Kozhikode districts of Kerala. Teacher Commitment Scale by Usha and Kumar, Self-concept Scale for teachers and Job Satisfaction Inventory by Pillai were used for the study. The result showed that teacher commitment was the best predictor of job satisfaction. Yarriswamy (2007) explored a sample of 131 teacher educators in Karnataka. Result showed that there was no significant difference in the job satisfaction of teacher educators working in government and aided, rural and urban teacher training institutes. Teacher educators did not differ significantly in their level of job satisfaction based on gender and teaching experience. Bindu (2007) revealed that there was a positive correlation between job satisfaction and stress coping skills among primary school teachers. In addition, there was a significant difference in job satisfaction between male and female teachers.

Kamboj (2008) examined a sample of 1360 secondary school teachers in Punjab in his attempt to find the relationship between job satisfaction and self-actualization. Teachers’ Job Satisfaction Scale by Meera Dixit and Self-actualization Inventory by Sharma were used for collecting the data. A significantly positive relationship was found between job satisfaction and self-actualization of secondary school teachers. Liu and Ramsey (2008) discovered that stress from poor working conditions had a strong influence on teachers’ job satisfaction and factors like inadequate time for planning and preparation and heavy workload reduced their satisfaction with teaching job. Jaiyeoba & Jibril (2008) reported that there was a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of secondary school teachers with
years of experience, age, marital status, school size, and educational qualification. Eryaman and Sonmezer, (2008) reported that differences existed between job satisfaction levels of public school teachers and of teachers who were transferred to private schools from public schools due to retirement or resignation. Level of job satisfaction of private school teachers was higher than teachers who work at public schools. The factors that were identified to affect the job satisfaction level positively were salary, social status, being acknowledged, improvement, using talents, administrator – employee relationship, and creativity.

Chamundeswari and Vasanthi (2009) studied the job satisfaction and occupational commitment among teachers. Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and Occupational Commitment Scale were used to collect data from a sample of 588 teachers. The study revealed that there was difference in the job satisfaction and occupational commitment in different categories of schools. The central board school teachers had better job satisfaction than the matriculation board teachers and better occupational commitment than the state board teachers. Job satisfaction and occupational commitment were positively correlated. Sarahbasu (2009) reported that job satisfaction has a significant relationship to the mental health of teachers. Overall job satisfaction and key aspects of job satisfaction were related to mental health of the teachers. Dhillon et al. (2009) conducted a survey of 297 teachers of colleges of education in Punjab using Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction Questionnaires. The result revealed that the level of job satisfaction of teachers was higher than the level of job dissatisfaction.

Gupta and Sahu (2009) examined a sample of 200 vocational teachers in Moradabad district. Male teachers were found to have significantly higher level of job satisfaction than the female teachers did. Nasir and Zaki (2009) examined the job
satisfaction of senior secondary school teachers. The degree of job satisfaction among female teachers was found to be significantly higher than that of the male teachers. In addition, teachers holding postgraduate degree were significantly more satisfied than the teachers holding PhD degree. Saveri (2009) explored the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction among teachers in higher secondary schools in Tamil Nadu. Job Satisfaction Scale and Life Satisfaction Scale were used to collect data. In job satisfaction, there was a significant difference between the teachers of aided and government schools and senior and junior teachers. In addition, a significant positive relationship was found between job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

Sharma et al. (2009) studied a sample of 184 elementary school teachers from the government schools and private schools of Bhopal City. They studied the organizational health and job satisfaction of teachers and relationship between the two variables. Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire and School organizational Health Questionnaire were used to collect data. Private schools were found to have better total organizational health than the government schools. Teachers of private schools showed highly satisfactory level of job satisfaction whereas the teachers of government schools showed only above average level of job satisfaction. There was a positive correlation between organizational health of schools and job satisfaction of teachers. Basu (2009) found that job satisfaction had a significant relationship with mental health. Satisfied teachers showed significantly better mental health than their unsatisfied counterparts. Sumangala and Ushadevi (2009) surveyed 300 secondary school women teachers of Kerala and found out that job satisfaction was not capable of predicting success in teaching.

Muchhal and Satish (2010) studied the relation between accountability of primary school teachers and their job satisfaction. 150 primary school teachers from
Baghpat district of Uttar Pradesh was selected as the sample. The result showed that 20% of the teachers were more satisfied, 46.67% average satisfied, and 33.33% were less satisfied with their job. In addition, there was a positive correlation between teachers’ accountability and job satisfaction. Neelkandan (2010) studied the relationship between organizational health and teacher job satisfaction. 420 teachers from Cuddalore district of Tamil Nadu comprised the sample. The result showed that there was a significant relation between organizational health and job satisfaction of school teachers.

Sylvester (2010) conducted a study on 100 teacher educators of Madurai. The study found that job satisfaction of teacher educators did not differ significantly with their gender or locality. Number of years of teaching experience did not influence the job satisfaction of teacher educators. There was no significant relationship between job satisfaction and attitude of teacher educators towards their profession. Goteti (2010) found that secondary school teachers’ teaching competency was related with job satisfaction. Job satisfaction differs significantly with demographic variables like sex, locality, educational qualification, marital status, teaching experience, and type of management. Klassen and Chiu (2010) found out that teachers with high teaching stress had lower job satisfaction. Shafqat, Hashmi and Syed (2010) examined a sample of 150 public and private school teachers and found that there was no significant difference in job satisfaction between teachers of public and private schools.

Kaur and Sidana (2011) found that male teachers had significantly higher job satisfaction than female teachers. Yilmaz and Dilmac (2011) found a significant relationship between job satisfaction and humanitarian values. Telef (2011) found out that self-efficacy has statistically significant positive relationship with teachers’ job
satisfaction and life satisfaction. Sridevi (2011) revealed that teachers working in aided institutions were highly satisfied with their jobs than the teachers of government and unaided institutions. Teachers’ gender and length of service were not found to have significant relationship with their job satisfaction. Singh and Pal (2011) reported a significantly higher correlation between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness. Bandhana (2011) found that job satisfaction of both male and female Kendriya Vidyalaya teachers are not related with their values.

Gangadharrao (2012) found that female teachers are more satisfied than their male counterparts. Antim Kumari and Kiran Sharma (2012) found that work values are significantly related to job satisfaction. Zarisfizadeh (2012) discovered that personal growth and achievement were the most influencing job satisfaction factors whereas high workload was the main source of dissatisfaction for English teachers in Malaysia. Fasilizadeh, Oreyzi & Nouri (2012), Najaf and Mousavi (2012), and Mousavi, Yarmohammadi, Nostrat and Tarasi (2012) found out a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. A study by Salim, Nasir, Arip, and Mustafa (2012) showed a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction and no effect of gender was observed on the relationship between the two variables. The increasing responsibilities of teachers have forced them into a hectic and busy schedule, which has led them to experience high level of stress, unhappiness, and job dissatisfaction in recent time (Salim, Nasir, Arip & Mustafa, 2012).

According to Almiala, ‘many newly qualified teachers often resign from their teaching job within first few years because of low salary and burdening workload.’ (Almiala, 2008, p.6,7 as cited in Zarisfizadeh,2012). Gupta, Pasrija, and Bansal (2012) reported that female teachers were significantly more satisfied than their male
counterparts. Further, more experienced teachers, rural teachers, postgraduate teachers, and private school teachers were reported to be significantly more satisfied than their counterparts. Another study by Bhayana (2012) found no difference between male and female teachers in their level of job satisfaction. More experienced teachers had significantly more job satisfaction than the less experienced teachers.

Nadeem et al. (2013) found that there was no significant difference between rural and urban teachers on job satisfaction. Gupta and Gehlawat, (2013) explored a sample of 400 secondary schools in Haryana and revealed that there was no significant difference in the job satisfaction of male and female teachers. There were significant difference in the job satisfaction of more experienced and less experienced teachers. Teachers working in private schools had a significantly higher job satisfaction than those in government schools. Khajuria and Arora (2013) explored the job satisfaction and values of secondary school teachers in Haryana. Teachers’ Job Satisfaction Scale developed by Dr. Meera Dixit and Teacher Values Inventory were used to collect data. No significant correlation was found between job satisfaction and values of secondary teachers. In addition, male and female teachers did not differ significantly on job satisfaction.

Ganai and Ali, (2013) conducted a study on 100 higher secondary school teachers of Jammu & Kashmir and found that senior teachers and science teachers were more satisfied with their job than junior teachers and social science teachers respectively. Jadhav, S.G. and Pujar, R.R. (2013) found a significant positive correlation between occupational self-efficacy and job satisfaction of 50 primary school teacher couples in Karnataka. Markow, Macia, Lee & Interactive (2013) studied the job satisfaction of the US teachers from 1984 to 2012 and reported that the percentage of very satisfied teachers in 1984, 2008 and 2012 were 40%, 62% and
39% respectively. Ghosh, M. (2013) studied the job satisfaction of primary school teachers in West Bengal, India and found that 24% of teachers were high, 54% average, and 22% low on their level of job satisfaction.

Akomolafe and Ogunmakin, (2014) found that emotional intelligence, occupational stress, and self-efficacy jointly predicted job satisfaction. Further, emotional intelligence is more important than self-efficacy while occupational stress alone did not predict job satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Nigeria. Sharma and Rana, (2014) studied job satisfaction of secondary school teachers in relation to stress and anxiety. Data was collected from 200 teachers of Punjab. They found that job satisfaction was significantly related with stress and anxiety. Further, government school teachers were found to have more satisfaction than their private school counterparts.

2.5 Teacher Job Satisfaction and Performance

Job satisfaction of teachers at all levels has important implications for the entire educational enterprise (Riday, Bingham, and Harvey, 1984). It is difficult to imagine that teacher satisfaction would not somehow translate into important effects in the teaching-learning process (Lee, Dedrick, & Smith, 1991). Mertler (1992) discovered that teachers who were satisfied with their job were more productive, ultimately producing motivated students and better student achievement.

Lack of job satisfaction is responsible for frequent teachers absenteeism, aggressive behaviour towards colleagues and learners, early exit from the teaching profession, and psychological withdrawal from work (Mwanwenda, 1995). An employee become happy with his/her job when his/her expectations of joining the organization are fulfilled, and this increases their efficiency and performance (Nelson
and Quick, 1995). Therefore, understanding the factors contributing to teachers’ job satisfaction is vital in making the educational system of the country a success (Perie et al., 1997). Absence of job satisfaction often leads to lethargy and reduced organizational commitment (Moser, 1997). Lack of job satisfaction is also a predictor of quitting the job (Jamal, 1997).

There is a growing body of evidence that when teachers feel good about their work, student achievement improves (Morgan and O’Leary, 2004). Job satisfaction is related with enhanced job performance, positive work values, high levels of employee motivation, and lower rates of absenteeism, turnover and burnout (Begley & Czajka, 1993; Chiu, 2000; Tharenou, 1993; all cited in Bull, 2005). Nguni et al. (2006) stated that teachers who are satisfied with their job were more enthusiastic and interested in devoting more energy and time to student achievement. Attitudes of the teacher, his/her physical well-being, life expectancy, absenteeism and turnover, and success in the profession, are all dependent on the level of job satisfaction of the teachers. (Steyn, 1992, as cited in George et al., 2008). But when the job fails to satisfy the employee, he/she loses performance and efficiency and may eventually quit the job. So it is important to keep the workers happy and satisfied by recognizing and regulating the factors that affect job satisfaction (Eryaman and Sonmez, 2008).

The consequences of job dissatisfaction are absenteeism from schools, turnover intentions and turnover, aggressive behaviour towards colleagues and pupils, early exit from the teaching profession and psychological withdrawal from work (George & Jones, 2008; Robbins & Judge, 2009). Job satisfaction enhances organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour and employee well-being (George & Jones, 2008; Robbins & Judge, 2009; Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013).
2.6 Principal Leadership and Teacher Job satisfaction

Ara Nasreen (1986) conducted a study on 780 teachers from intermediate colleges in Gorakhpur region and found that principals’ leadership behaviour was positively related to teachers’ job satisfaction. Deluga & Souza (1991) and Bryman (1992) maintained that transformational leaders could raise the level of job satisfaction of followers by motivating followers and showing them close attention. Teachers’ perception of principals’ transformational leadership skills has significant impact on teachers’ job satisfaction (Rossmiller, 1992). Mason (1998) found that the inspirational motivation factor of transformational leadership was a positive predictor of job satisfaction of teachers.

Leary, P.A., Sullivan, M.E. and Ray, D.A. (1999) studied the relationship between job satisfaction of the faculty and the leadership styles of their immediate supervisors of West Virginia. Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale (MCMJSS) were used to collect data. The study showed a significant relationship between leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction. Lipsey and Wilson (2001) concluded that when the leadership behaviour of school managers increased, the level of job satisfaction of teachers also increased.

Silins and Mulford (2002) found high level of teacher job satisfaction in school systems where transformational leadership is practised by the principal. Bogler (2001) revealed that lack of effective leadership skills had negatively impacted teachers’ job satisfaction. Richards (2003) reported that teachers who worked for long periods of time with the same principal were able to work closely with that principal. The teachers felt comfortable and satisfied with those principals. Carr & Evans (2006)
maintains that principals who provide an environment of support and compassion can make a positive difference for teachers’ work experience.

Griffith (2004) showed that principal transformational leadership was not associated directly with either school staff turnover or student achievement progress. But it showed an indirect effect, through staff job satisfaction, on school staff turnover (negative) and on student achievement (positive). Principal leadership practice is one of the positive factors that influence job satisfaction (Miears, 2004). Otto & Arnold (2005) stated that when teachers perceive an environment of support from principals, their level of job satisfaction increases.

Mishra (2005) studied the relationship of organizational climate with leadership behaviour of principal and teachers job satisfaction. 184 teachers of 46 aided and unaided secondary schools situated in rural and urban areas of Allahabad district constituted the sample. The study found that positive relationship existed between leadership behaviour of principals and teacher job satisfaction. Healthy and open climate of the school enhanced the job satisfaction of teachers.

Ejimofor (2007) asserted that teachers’ perception of principals’ transformational leadership skills have significant impact on teachers’ job satisfaction. Buluc (2009) stated that school principals’ transformational leadership skills could influence employees more easily and direct them to perform organizational goals. Williams, M.D. (2009) used Paul Spector’s Job Satisfaction Survey to examine how leadership behaviours of principals relate to teachers’ job satisfaction. The study found out that eight factors of leadership relate to teacher job satisfaction. Cerit (2009), Jackson & McDermott (2009) identified principals’ leadership behaviours as the significant determinants of overall job satisfaction among teachers.
Hamidifar (2010) studied the relationship between leadership and employee job satisfaction at Islamic Azad University in Tehran, Iran. He found out that there is significant negative influence of laissez-faire leadership on subordinates’ job satisfaction. In addition, the study has shown a positive influence of transformational leadership on employee job satisfaction. Hui et al. (2013) found out that principal’s decision-making style plays the role of a mediator between teachers’ job satisfaction and principals’ leadership style. Aydin, Sarier & Uysal (2013) concluded that transformational leadership style affected job satisfaction of teachers in a positive way. As the leadership style of administrators changed from transactional to transformational, the level of job satisfaction of teachers rose.

Werang & Lena (2014) revealed that there was a significant relationship between principals’ leadership and teachers’ job performance and between school organizational climate and teachers’ job performance. Din, A.B.M. (2014) examined the principals’ leadership style and job satisfaction among primary school teachers in Malaysia. The study found a moderate significant relationship between leadership styles of the principal and teachers’ job satisfaction.

Verma (2014) revealed that transformational leadership styles of principals had a significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. The inspirational motivation and individualized consideration leadership styles were shown to be positive significant predictors of job satisfaction of teachers. Laissez faire leadership style had a negative relationship with teachers’ job satisfaction.

2.6.1 Studies Using LPI

Xu (1991) investigated the relationship between perceptions of academic deans and department chairpersons regarding the leadership behaviour of deans, and
how this was related to the job satisfaction of department chairs. The LPI and Index of Job Satisfaction (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) were used to collect data. Results showed that LPI-Self (deans) scores were significantly higher than those from the LPI-Observer (chairpersons) on all five leadership practices. There was a significant positive relationship between chairpersons’ perception of the leadership behaviour of their deans and the chairpersons’ job satisfaction. Respondent age, gender, marital status, level of education, academic rank, and number of years in position were not related either to LPI-Observer or LPI-Self scores. There was no relationship between any of the demographic variables and job satisfaction scores.

Dauffenbach (1995) found no correlations between the deans’ leadership practices and the job satisfaction of department chairs. But correlations were found between various leadership practices (self) and various facets of job satisfaction for both deans and department chairs. There were no significant relationship between leadership practices of the deans and their gender, age, and length of service.

Taylor, C.D. (1996) examined if relationships exist between staff nurses’ perception of their manager’s leadership behaviours and the staff nurses’ job satisfaction. The study revealed that job satisfaction was significantly correlated with all five leadership practices. Leadership practices did not differ significantly as a result of respondent characteristics such as gender, work status, area of practice, educational degree, age and years of experience.

Brown (1996) surveyed 300 New York University reading recovery teachers. The study found a significant relationship between leadership practices of the reading recovery teachers and their job satisfaction, and higher average scores in leadership practices than business groups reported in the literature. The order of frequency of engagement in leadership practices was Enabling, Encouraging, Modelling,
Challenging, and Inspiring. The leadership practices were not related with different
demographic information.

McBroom (2000) examined the relationship between the leadership practices of 28 middle school principals and their impact on the job satisfaction of 591 teachers in North Carolina. The tools used were Leadership Practices Inventory and Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (Bentley & Rempel, 1980). The study found that the teachers’ overall job satisfaction was related to the principals’ leadership practice of Encouraging, but not the other four leadership practices. The overall leadership scores of principals were significantly different for age, race, and gender but not for level of education or years of administrative experience.

Chin, T.B. (2005) found that LPI scores were significantly correlated with measures of job satisfaction of nurses. Multiple regression analysis showed that 51 percent of the variance in job satisfaction was explained by the five leadership practices.

Martin, F.C. (2006) found that the rank order for the leadership practices was Enable, Encourage, Model, Challenge, and Inspire among NASA employees. There was a positive and significant correlation between overall leadership and job satisfaction ($r = .67$).

John, A.K. (2006) studied a sample of employees in a private for-profit college in Western United States and found that all the five leadership practices measured using LPI (Observer) were each significantly correlated with job satisfaction. But leaders’ perception of their own leadership practices measured using LPI (Self) was not significantly correlated with job satisfaction of their followers. Besides, demographic variables such as gender, age, level of education, years of
experience, and salary were not found to be significantly correlated with any of the five leadership practices.

Klein & Tinker (2007) studied the relationship between job satisfaction of faculty within the Wisconsin Technical College System and the leadership practices of their direct supervisor. The study found a significant positive correlation between overall leadership practices of the direct supervisor and overall job satisfaction and different facets of job satisfaction of the faculty. But no significant correlations were found between overall leadership practices and satisfaction with pay or with fringe benefits.

Mathew, J. (2007) studied the correlation between head teachers’ leadership practices and teachers’ job satisfaction in the state of Kerala, India. A random sample of 200 teachers from 10 government and 10 aided secondary schools were taken as the sample of the study. The LPI was used to measure the leadership practices of the head teachers whereas the Minnessotta Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to assess teachers’ job satisfaction. The study discovered that all the five leadership practices of the LPI and all the 21 job satisfaction factors of the MSQ were related.

2.7 Summary

Regarding the relationship between principal leadership practices and demographics, there is no unanimity among the researchers. Some researchers have found that principals’ age, race, and gender are related with their leadership practices (McBroom, 2000). Some other researchers failed to find any relationship with principals’ leadership practices and gender, age, marital status, and level of education (Dauffenbach, 1995; Xu, 1991, Taylor, 1996; John, A.K., 2006).

Many studies compared the LPI-Self scores and LPI-Observer scores of principals. The LPI-Self scores of principals were found to be higher than the LPI-
Observer scores, as perceived by their constituents (Xu, 1991; Rozeboom, 2008). Xu (1991) and Rhoden, V. (2012) found out that the principals’ number of years in present position is not related to his/her leadership practices. Ndiritu, Gikonyo, and Kimani (2014) found out that principals who had less than three years of administrative experience were more transformational leaders than their more than nine years experienced counterparts. Principals’ length of service was also not found to be related with their leadership practices (Dauffenbach, 1995; Taylor, 1996; John, A.K., 2006). Rhoden, V. (2012) found out that principals’ years in present school was not related to their leadership practices.

A large number of studies have been conducted in the area of job satisfaction of teachers both in India and abroad. Job satisfaction was analyzed with respect to age, gender, years of teaching experience, educational qualification, marital status, salary, type of institution, locality of institution, school climate, emotional intelligence, predictors of satisfaction etc.

There are mixed results on the relationship between teachers’ job satisfaction and gender. Many researchers proved that gender played a role in the job satisfaction of teachers (Sridevi, 2011; Bindhu and Sudheeshkumar, 2006). Many researchers found no relationship between the two variables (Bhayana, 2012; Gehlawat, 2013; Khajuria and Arora, 2013; Yarriswamy, 2007; Raj and Mary, 2004; Rao and Sridhar, 2003; Naik, 1990; Thaker, 1996; Saxena, 1990; Heller, Clay, and Perkins, 1993). Some researchers have found that male teachers have significantly higher job satisfaction than their female counterparts (Gupta and Sahu, 2009; Kaur and Sidana, 2011). Some other researchers have found that female teachers have significantly higher job satisfaction than their male counterparts (Nasir and Zaki, 2009; Gangadharrao, 2012; Gupta, Pasrija, and Bansal, 2012).
Regarding the relationship between teachers’ job satisfaction and type of school also, there is no unanimity among the researchers. Many researchers showed that there is no significant relationship between the two variables (Raj and Mary, 2004; Rao and Sridhar, 2003; Heller, Clay, and Perkins, 1993; Shafqat, Hashmi and Syed, 2010). Many studies have shown that teachers in government schools have higher job satisfaction (Mehrotra, 2002; Sharma and Rana, 2014). Many researchers have proved that teachers in private schools have higher job satisfaction than those of government schools (Eryaman and Sonmezer, 2008; Gupta and Gehlawat, 2013). Teachers of central schools (Chamundeswari and Vasanthi, 2009) and aided schools (Sridevi, 2011) are also found to have higher job satisfaction than those of other types of schools.

Some researches show that length of service is related with teachers’ job satisfaction (Sridevi, 2011; Gupta, Pasrija, and Bansal, 2012; Goswami, 1998; Jaiyeoba & Jibril, 2008; Goteti, 2010; Bhayana, 2012). Some other studies showed the opposite result (Yarriswamy , 2007; Rao and Sridhar, 2003; Raj and Mary, 2004; Naik, 1990; Heller, Clay, and Perkins, 1993). In the case of relationship between age and teachers’ job satisfaction also, there is no unanimity among researchers. Researchers like Jaiyeoba & Jibril (2008) and Goswami (1998) found a significant relationship between the two variables. Researchers like Rao and Sridhar (2003), Agarwal (2004), Raj and Mary (2004), Naik (1990), Das and Panda (1995), Thaker (1996), Aggarwal (1991) have shown that there is no relationship between the two variables.

Regarding the relationship between educational qualification and teachers’ job satisfaction, there are findings in both directions. Gupta, Pasrija, and Bansal (2012), Goswami (1998), Jaiyeoba & Jibril (2008), and Goteti (2010) found that there is a
significant relationship between the two variables. Researchers like Rao and Sridhar (2003), Raj and Mary (2004), and Thaker (1996) reported that there is no significant relationship between the two variables.


No significant relationship is found between teachers’ job satisfaction and attitude towards profession (Sylvester, 2010), values (Khajuria & Arora, 2013; Bandhana, 2011), training (Rathod & Verma, 2006), professional awareness (Choudhury, 2007), emotional intelligence (Donaldson-Feilder & Bond, 2004), marital status (Agarwal, 2004), salary, subject taught, medium of instruction (Raj and Mary, 2004), and geographical area (Thaker, 1996).
The analysis of the related literature helps one to understand the important predictors of job satisfaction among school teachers. The important predictors are recognition of principals (Rebeca, 2006), salary, social status, being acknowledged, improvement, using talents, administrator-employee relationship, and creativity (Eryaman and Sonmezer, 2008), personal growth and achievement (Zarisfizadeh, 2012), working and living condition, professional development opportunities and promotion (Ramachandran et al., 2005), teacher commitment (Usha and Shashi, 2007), teachers’ belief in the meaningfulness of the tasks and the benefits of their activities (Bennett, Boesch, & Haltiner, 2005), organizational climate and teachers’ involvement in curriculum reform (Jiang, 2005), interpersonal relationships with current and past students, parents, and colleagues (Dinham, 1995), facilities for further studies (Naik, 1990), Teachers’ subjective interpretation of their control over policy and classroom decisions (Lee et al., 1991), student learning and achievement, the status and image of teaching (Scott, Cox, & Dinham, 1999), challenging opportunities at work, positive stress, good leadership, quality of work, fair rewards, adequate freedom, and authority (Bavendam, 2000).

The important factors that bring job dissatisfaction to teachers are low salary and burdening workload (Almiala, 2008), inadequate time for planning and preparation (Liu and Ramsey, 2008), teaching material, working conditions, the principal (Maenpaa, 2005), social problems, students’ lack of interest and bad behaviour, centralised educational system, and lack of professional autonomy in schools (Zembylas and Papanastasiou, 2006).

A review of literature shows that teacher job satisfaction is related with student achievement (Mertler, 1992; Morgan and O’Leary, 2004; Nguni et al., 2006), teaching-learning process (Lee, Dedrick, & Smith, 1991), attitudes of the teacher,
his/her physical well-being, life expectancy, absenteeism and turnover, and success in the profession (Steyn, 1992, as cited in George et al., 2008; Mwanwenda, 1995), enhanced job performance, positive work values, high levels of employee motivation (Begley & Czajka, 1993; Chiu, 2000; Tharenou, 1993; all cited in Bull, 2005). Job satisfaction enhances organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour and employee well-being (George & Jones, 2008; Robbins & Judge, 2009; Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013).

A lot of research has been done on the influence of principals’ leadership behaviours on teachers’ job satisfaction (Griffith, 2004). Although the studies have yielded mixed results, there is a definite direction in the findings, with most of the studies finding a positive relationship between principal leadership practices and teacher job satisfaction (Aydin, Sarier & Uysal, 2013; Amadeo, 2008; Inbarasu, 2008; Anderson, 2005; Cerit, 2009; Miears, 2004; Thompson, 2002; Mathew, 2007). Grosso (2008) stated that the transactional leadership behaviours had no positive relationship with faculty job satisfaction. Laissez-faire leadership of the principals had negative relationship with teachers’ job satisfaction (Stumpf, 2003; Dastoor et al., 2003; Tucker et al., 1992). Dauffenbach (1995) did not find any significant relationship between principals’ leadership practices and teachers’ job satisfaction. Reilly (1975), Roberts (1978), and Hampton, Dubinsky & Skinner (1986) failed to find any relationship between the two variables in non-education areas.

The concepts of leadership and job satisfaction were examined in detail in this chapter. The next chapter deals with the methods and procedures employed in this study.