

The Impact of Leadership on Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Primary Schools in Serbia

MILAN NIKOLIĆ

Full. Prof., PhD in Technical Science, Dept. of Management
University of Novi Sad, Technical Faculty "Mihajlo Pupin", Zrenjanin, Serbia

Email: milan.nikolic@tfzr.uns.ac.rs

Tel: ++381 (0) 62 801 9729,

EDIT TEREK

M.Sc. in Technical Science, Dept. of Management
University of Novi Sad, Technical Faculty "Mihajlo Pupin", Zrenjanin, Serbia

Email: edit@tfzr.uns.ac.rs

Tel: ++381 (0) 63 112 4486

DRAGANA GLUŠAC

Full. Prof. PhD in Technical Science, Department of Methodical Sciences and Technology in Education
University of Novi Sad, Technical Faculty "Mihajlo Pupin", Zrenjanin, Serbia

Email: gdragana@tfzr.uns.ac.rs

Tel: ++381 (0) 62 801 9712

BOJANA GLIGOROVIĆ

M.Sc. in Technical Science, Dept. of Management
University of Novi Sad, Technical Faculty "Mihajlo Pupin", Zrenjanin, Serbia

Email: bojana_gl@yahoo.com

Tel: ++381 (0) 62 801 9706

IVAN TASIĆ

Assoc. Professor PhD in Technical Science, Department of Methodical Sciences and Technology in
Education University of Novi Sad, Technical Faculty "Mihajlo Pupin", Zrenjanin, Serbia

Email: tasici@tfzr.uns.ac.rs

Tel: ++381 (0) 62 801 9736

Abstract

This paper presents the results of research of the effects of leadership on job satisfaction of teachers. It is shown that leadership has a strong and positive impact on job satisfaction of teachers in primary schools in Serbia. The strongest influences have the following dimensions of leadership: Contingent reward behavior, Intellectual Stimulation and Core transformational leader behavior. The moderating effect of gender and age of teachers to the observed relationship was examined. The moderating effect of years of teachers has been confirmed in a few relations, so we can say that there is a slight moderating effect on the relationship between teachers' years on leadership and job satisfaction. Primary schools principals in Serbia should devote considerable attention to developing leadership skills and improving knowledge management. In this way it is possible to achieve increased job satisfaction of teachers, which potentially creates conditions for better and effective functioning of schools.

Key Words: Leadership, Teachers' Job Satisfaction, Primary Schools, Serbia.

Introduction

There are many references that point out the importance of leadership in schools (Aubrey, Godfrey, & Harris, 2013; Barnett & McCormick, 2012; Pashiardis, Savvides, Lytra, & Angelidou, 2011). Research (Odhiambo & Hii, 2012) has shown that the key stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) consider school leadership as extremely important for improving the performance of the school. According to (Lumby, 2012), there is a need for involvement of leadership in order to improve the culture in schools. In New Zealand, significant attention is paid to developing the leadership skills of school principals (Cardno & Youngs, 2013). A special program is developed for this purpose. The reference (Donaldson Jr., 2007) points to the importance of leadership in schools and its impact on teachers to improve their performance. It also points out the unique position of teachers and their important role in creation of leadership in schools. Leadership in schools is important at all levels, both in early childhood (Aubrey et al., 2013), also among university academic program directors (Vilkinas & Ladyshevsky, 2012).

It may be noted that both teachers and students prefer transformational leadership and leadership that encourages more common goals. For example, according to (Bogler, Caspi, & Roccass, 2013), leadership style of teachers affects student satisfaction: students prefer transformational leadership in relation to passive leadership. Transformational leadership significantly and positively affects organizational commitment of vocational teachers in Jordan (Khasawneh, Omari, & Abu-Tineh, 2012). According to (Hallinger & Heck, 2010), collaborative leadership has a significant and direct impact on academic capacity and indirect impact on student learning outcomes.

School leaders have an important role in implementing and managing change in the education system (Razzaq & Forde, 2013). This is significant because the more frequent changes in education. This is also the case in the Serbian education system. According to (Gokçe, 2009), teachers expect greater involvement of principals in terms of frequent changes in the education system. The reference (Barnett & McCormick, 2012) points out that the increasingly complex environment requires that instead of a leader, the school should have a leadership team. Changes in education inevitably imply advancement of teachers. Teachers need to learn, and every school needs to inspire and support the learning process (Wiggins & McTighe, 2006).

In addition to leadership, for the effectiveness of the school one aspect is exceptionally important: teachers' job satisfaction. According to (Shann, 1998), job satisfaction of teachers is a very important factor influencing the commitment and performance of teachers and their retention in their profession. Therefore, job satisfaction of teachers potentially contribute to the overall school effectiveness. The reference (Hoerr, 2013) points to the importance of job satisfaction of teachers for success in the classroom and the overall atmosphere in the school. Hoerr further states that an increase in job satisfaction of teachers can be achieved through learning and promotion of teachers. Teachers this way become more effective, and therefore happier. According to (Wolk, 2008), the overall satisfaction in the school can hardly be realized without teachers who are satisfied with their work. Job satisfaction of teachers is an actual field so new questionnaires are developed to explore job satisfaction of teachers (Ho & Au, 2006). Finally, according to (Fraser & Hodge, 2000), job satisfaction is central in studies relating to work and occupation.

A considerable number of papers are dealing with concrete problems related to job satisfaction of teachers. According to (Ladebo, 2005), teachers in Nigeria who are dissatisfied with work tend to leave the profession more than those who are satisfied. Teachers in China are satisfied if there is support in the management of the school, student progress and cooperation with colleagues (Kwong, Wang, & Clifton, 2010). In reference (Klassen & Anderson, 2009) changes in job satisfaction of teachers in different time periods were investigated. It was found that job satisfaction of teachers in 2007. was less than in 1962., primarily due to increased time demands and behavior of students. Reference (Lam & Yan, 2011) examined the beginning of teachers' job satisfaction, which has a major impact on the teachers remaining in their profession. However, despite some difficulties, the teachers' job brings many pleasures, and this

satisfaction is felt by most teachers (Eisner, 2006). It must be noted that in Serbia this is often not the case. The reasons mainly come from disturbed system of values in our society and low salaries in the education sector.

Teacher job satisfaction is a complex concept and it depends on a number of variables. Professional commitment significantly affects the job satisfaction of teachers in Nigeria, job apathy and satisfaction with pay (Ladebo, 2005). Similarly, job satisfaction of teachers in Turkey significantly and positively affect organizational support and goal progress (Buyukgoze-Kavas, Duffy, Yerin Güneri, & Autin, 2013). Communication has an impact on job satisfaction of teachers: organizational communication in primary schools has an impact on job satisfaction of teachers (De Nobile & McCormick, 2008); effective supervisory communications positively affects job satisfaction (Kim, 2002). Teacher job satisfaction can be increased by introducing some organizational changes, such as year-round school (Haser & Nasser, 2003). In the reference (Butt & Lance, 2005) job satisfaction of teachers was examined, depending on the workload and balance between work-life. Working conditions and working environment has an impact on job satisfaction of women teachers (Schonfeld, 2000). Some references (Wong, Wong & Peng, 2011; Brackett, Palomera, Mojsa-Kaja, Reyes, & Salovey, 2010) show that there is an influence of emotional intelligence on job satisfaction of teachers. Nevertheless, the study about job satisfaction of teachers shows that the social and cultural differences between countries must be acknowledged (Kwong, Wang, & Clifton, 2010).

Leadership and job satisfaction have a strong connection, both in education and in many other areas. Beebe, Blaylock and Sweetser (2009), suggest that having a good relationship with a supervisor leads to increased job satisfaction. According to (Rothfelder, Ottenbacher, & Harrington, 2013), leadership affects job satisfaction of employees in German hotels, and this is especially true of transformational leadership. In the army, there is also a link between transformational leadership and job satisfaction (Yang, Wu, Chang, & Chien, 2011). The references (Do Rego Furtado, Da Graça Câmara Batista, & Ferreira Silva, 2011) demonstrated that leadership in hospitals affects job satisfaction among staff nurses. According to (Walumbwa, Orwa, Wang, & Lawler, 2005), transformational leadership has a strong and positive impact on job satisfaction of employees in Kenyan and U.S. financial companies.

Regarding the impact of leadership on job satisfaction of teachers, which is the subject of this paper, there is also a significant number of researches which confirms the observed link, for example (Cerit, 2009, Evans, 2001). Again, in the focus are the role and impact of transformational leadership. For example, in the reference (Bogler, 2001), among others, it was found that principals' transformational leadership has a positive effect on job satisfaction of teachers. According to (Nguni, Slegers, & Denessen, 2006), transformational leadership has a significant effect on job satisfaction of teachers in primary schools in Tanzania.

Previous exposures can be summarized as follows: leadership in schools and teachers' job satisfaction is a very important area and is up to date in scientific terms. Leadership in schools affects many aspects of the school. Teachers' job satisfaction is influenced by different factors. Therefore, it is always useful to examine precisely the impact of leadership in schools on teachers' job satisfaction. In this paper primary schools in Serbia are in focus of research.

In the last few decades Serbian education has gone through many changes and problems, there were numerous strikes by teachers in primary and secondary schools. There has been a significant decline in the reputation of this profession. In addition, there are direct and indirect impacts of the transition process in the Serbian economy on the education system in Serbia. Many teachers in primary schools in Serbia are not satisfied with their work, particularly by their salary. Since it is difficult to expect salary increases in education at the desired level, it is important to examine other options to increase job satisfaction of teachers. Perhaps the easiest way to achieve this is through improving leadership in schools. Because of this, it is important to determine whether and how leadership in schools can help increasing the job

satisfaction of teachers. The aim of this study was to examine the relationship of leadership and job satisfaction of teachers in primary schools in Serbia. Additional significance of the work is that similar studies were not conducted in Serbia.

Theory and Hypothesis

Burns (1978) described leadership as a process of developing relationships into which leaders influence followers, but also themselves "suffer" influence in the direction of changing their behavior in order to find acceptance or resistance. The first who made difference between transactional and transformational leadership was Burns (1978). According to him, transactional leadership is based on the fact that leaders motivate subordinates through rewards and punishments, while transformational leadership is based on the motivation of subordinates to achieve collective goals.

At transactional leadership followers are motivated by appealing to their own interests. Transactional leaders tend to provide appropriate rewards for their subordinates, in case they work at the required level (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership behaviors are largely focused on monitoring and maintaining the desired level of organizational operations and tasks. According to (Bryman, 1992; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001), transactional leadership has not shown significant results in terms of achieving better business performances. Thus, a bigger importance is given to the theory of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985, Burns, 1978; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977).

In contrast to transactional leaders, transformational leaders are focused on the relationships with their followers (Cannella & Monroe, 1997). In terms of transformational leadership behavior, subordinates are confidence in their leader; they feel good in his presence, respect their leader and admire him (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991). Bass (1990) lists the following characteristics of transformational leaders: charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration. As the characteristics of transactional leader, Bass states: contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive), laissez - faire (disclaims liability avoids making decisions). Tichy and Devanna (1986) noted seven characteristics of transformational leaders: the ability to manage changes, courage, faith in people, values orientation, willingness to continually learn, the ability to cope with problems and have a vision.

Locke (1976) explains job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction is a person's evaluation of his/her job and work context i.e. an attitude reflecting how well people like or dislike their job. It was found that job satisfaction can contribute to the psychological stability of employees in and outside the workplace (Robbins, Peterson, Tedrick, & Carpenter, 2003). Job satisfaction presents the attitude of employees more than it shows their behavior. However, the consequences of this attitude influence the behavior of employees: happy workers regularly come to work, they work better, have better business results and they are loyal to the organization.

Based on the above made considerations, in this paper, the following hypotheses were set:

- H1: Leadership has a statistically significant correlation with the job satisfaction dimensions, in primary schools in Serbia.
- H2: Leadership has a statistically significant predictive effect on the job satisfaction dimensions, in primary schools in Serbia.
- H3: Gender has a moderating effect on the correlation between leadership dimensions and job satisfaction dimensions, in primary schools in Serbia.
- H3: Age has a moderating effect on the correlation between leadership dimensions and job satisfaction dimensions, in primary schools in Serbia.

Method

Survey Instruments (Measures)

Transformational Leadership Behaviour

In order to measure transformational leadership behaviour this research used Transformational Leadership Behaviour Inventory (TLI), developed by Podsakoff and others (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990). The same questionnaire was used in the reference (MacKenzie et al., 2001).

The questionnaire has six dimensions dealing with transformational leadership behavior: articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, having high performance expectations, providing individualized support and providing intellectual stimulation. The first three dimensions have high intercorrelations, so as a result they are merged into a single construct called the core transformational leader behavior (Podsakoff et al., 1990; MacKenzie et al., 2001).

In this way, in the above references, there are finally defined four dimensions of transformational leadership (which are studied in this paper), as follows: Core transformational leader behavior (three - item), High performance expectations (three - item), Supportive leader behavior (four - item) and Intellectual stimulation (four - item). Therefore, the questionnaire for measuring the dimensions of the transformational leadership behavior has a total of 14 items. Dimension Core transformational leader behavior shows substantial capability of leaders, such as having a clear vision, providing an appropriate model for achieving the objectives and motivation of employees accepting the goals.

Dimension High performance expectations indicate the degree to which the leader expects that employees always and at all times give their best and achieve the best results. Dimension Supportive leader behavior shows the extent, to which the leader acknowledges, understands and respects the feelings of employees in the realization of the set goals. Dimension Intellectual stimulation shows the extent to which the leader is ready to support staff in their work to provide them with useful tips and information to encourage them to work and creativity in business.

Transactional Leadership Behaviour

In this paper, transactional leadership behaviour measurement was carried out through two dimensions: Contingent reward behaviour and Contingent punishment behaviour. A four - item Contingent Reward Behaviour Scale (Podsakoff, Todor, Grover, & Huber, 1984; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986; MacKenzie et al., 2001) was used to measure contingent reward behaviour and a three - item Contingent Punishment Behaviour Scale (Podsakoff et al., 1984; MacKenzie et al., 2001) to measure contingent punishment behaviour. Therefore, the questionnaire for measuring the dimensions of the transactional leadership behavior has a total of seven items.

According to (MacKenzie et al., 2001), these two scales are unidimensional and possess good psychometric properties. Dimension Contingent reward behavior demonstrates the degree to which a leader is ready to acknowledge and sent praise to employees who are doing their job. Dimension contingent punishment behavior demonstrates the degree to which a leader shows dissatisfaction if the job was poorly done.

In this paper, the respondents carried out their evaluation of all leadership related items (transformational and transactional leadership behaviour) on seven-point Likert scales ranking from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). This was modelled according to the reference (MacKenzie et al., 2001).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is measured according to the Job Satisfaction Survey questionnaire (Spector, 1985). This questionnaire has 36 items related to nine dimensions of job satisfaction. The answers are measured by the six-point Likert scale ranking from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Dimensions of job satisfaction are defined and described in the following way (Spector, 1985): Pay (Pay and remuneration), Promotion (Promotion opportunities), Supervision (Immediate supervisor), Fringe Benefits (Monetary and nonmonetary fringe benefits), Contingent Rewards (Appreciation, recognition, and rewards for good work), Operating Procedures (Operating policies and procedures), Coworkers (People you work with), Nature of Work (Job tasks themselves), Communication (Communication within the organization).

Participants and Data Collection

The research was carried out in Serbian primary schools. The respondents (teachers) completed a questionnaire. The questionnaire was made up of items measuring the dimensions of transformational leadership behavior, items measuring the dimensions of transactional leadership behavior and items for measuring the dimensions of job satisfaction. In addition, the questionnaire contained questions related to general information on the respondents, including issues about gender and age of the respondents (in this study, age and gender of teachers were used as moderators to examine the relationship between dimensions of leadership in primary schools and dimensions of job satisfaction of teachers). The completing of the questionnaire was conducted in schools during the breaks. The examiner would present the questionnaires shared to teachers, gave some general instructions and waited for teachers to complete the questionnaire.

A total of $N(0) = 383$ teachers from 57 schools completed the questionnaire. After the initial analysis, because of the significant dispersion of results 21 questionnaires were rejected. Thus, the total number of respondents was $N = 362$. The research includes schools in the northern part of Serbia. This area was chosen because of the geographic proximity of the authors. The research was carried out over a period of four months, approximately in the period from 1st March to 1st July 2013.

In a sample of $N = 362$ subjects there were 250 women and 112 men. This small sample number of men is the result of employee structure in the Serbian education system (according to gender). According to (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2011) in our education system 67% women and 33% men are employed. If we observe primary schools, the percentage of women is even higher than in secondary schools and higher education. According to age, the subjects were divided into three groups: young teachers up to 35 years, middle-aged teachers (35 to 50 years) and older teachers (over 50 years). The age of the respondents was as follows: 93 young teachers, 197 middle-aged teachers and 72 older teachers.

Results

The research results were obtained by applying appropriate statistical procedures and methods. In particular, the following analyzes were done: Descriptive statistics, Correlation analysis, Multiple Regression analysis, Hierarchical regression analysis for testing the effects of the moderator effects of gender of the respondents on the dimension of leadership and dimension of job satisfaction of teachers and Hierarchical regression analysis testing the moderator effects of respondents' age dimension of leadership and dimension of job satisfaction of teachers. The results of the research follow.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the dimensions of leadership and job satisfaction is shown in Table 1. In the table, among other things, the names of dimensions, the short names for each dimension (which is used hereafter), mean size, standard deviation and Cronbach's Alpha, is given for each dimension. The values of Cronbach's Alpha range in the interval from $\alpha = 0.703$ to $\alpha = 0.972$.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

Dimensions	Short name	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Cronbach's Alpha
Core transformational leader behavior	L1	1.00	7.00	5.544	1.456	.955
High performance expectations	L2	1.00	7.00	5.646	1.266	.898
Supportive leader behavior	L3	1.00	7.00	5.348	1.607	.972
Intellectual stimulation	L4	1.00	7.00	5.347	1.518	.965
Contingent reward behavior	L5	1.00	7.00	5.162	1.684	.948
Contingent punishment behavior	L6	1.00	7.00	5.238	1.432	.903
Pay	JS1	1.00	6.00	3.071	1.045	.709
Promotion	JS2	1.00	6.00	3.471	1.315	.845
Supervision	JS3	1.00	6.00	4.691	1.143	.870
Fringe benefits	JS4	1.00	6.00	2.954	1.349	.838
Contingent rewards	JS5	1.00	6.00	3.575	1.292	.838
Operating procedures	JS6	1.00	6.00	3.211	1.043	.703
Coworkers	JS7	1.00	6.00	4.598	.934	.784
Nature of work	JS8	1.00	6.00	5.267	.849	.855
Communication	JS9	1.00	6.00	4.809	.950	.827
Valid N (listwise)	362					

Correlation Analysis

In table 2. the results of correlation analysis are presented: correlation dimension of leadership and dimensions of job satisfaction. These results refer to the total sample of N = 362 respondents. Pearson correlation is used. In Table 2. statistically significant correlations are indicated as follows: * P <0.05; ** p <0.01. It may be noted that all correlations are statistically significant ** p <0.01.

Table 2. Pearson coefficients of correlation between leadership and job satisfaction dimensions

	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	JS1	JS2	JS3	JS4	JS5	JS6	JS7	JS8	JS9
L1															
L2	.620**														
L3	.797**	.552**													
L4	.837**	.716**	.806**												
L5	.778**	.522**	.830**	.795**											
L6	.490**	.604**	.415**	.583**	.509**										
JS1	.453**	.365**	.425**	.516**	.485**	.414**									
JS2	.546**	.393**	.543**	.572**	.627**	.422**	.727**								
JS3	.795**	.496**	.772**	.735**	.770**	.434**	.449**	.595**							
JS4	.424**	.259**	.419**	.447**	.478**	.330**	.776**	.752**	.439**						
JS5	.585**	.388**	.573**	.633**	.678**	.425**	.723**	.816**	.612**	.763**					
JS6	.428**	.256**	.410**	.428**	.482**	.366**	.696**	.603**	.417**	.657**	.630**				
JS7	.574**	.423**	.503**	.540**	.553**	.403**	.469**	.509**	.581**	.374**	.523**	.445**			
JS8	.472**	.381**	.379**	.500**	.406**	.318**	.276**	.336**	.493**	.159**	.366**	.187**	.531**		
JS9	.650**	.438**	.566**	.608**	.619**	.372**	.476**	.516**	.661**	.377**	.599**	.408**	.740**	.671**	

Regression Analysis

Multiple Regression analysis was used to determine the predictive effects of leadership dimensions (independent variables) on job satisfaction (dependent variable). The results of the regression analysis are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Regression analysis (Dependent Variable: JS dimensions; Predictors: L dimensions)

Dependent	Independent	β	T	Sig.	R ²	F	F Sig.
JS1 - Pay	L1	.028	.311	.756	.301	25.464	.000
	L2	-.060	-.873	.383			
	L3	-.071	-.768	.443			
	L4	.335	3.181	.002			
	L5	.201	2.229	.026			
	L6	.168	2.823	.005			
JS2 - Promotion	L1	.067	.814	.416	.416	42.187	.000
	L2	-.039	-.616	.538			
	L3	-.006	-.074	.941			
	L4	.139	1.439	.151			
	L5	.432	5.244	.000			
	L6	.114	2.091	.037			
JS3 - Supervision	L1	.413	7.103	.000	.705	141.093	.000
	L2	-.053	-1.181	.239			
	L3	.234	3.875	.000			
	L4	.027	.395	.693			
	L5	.249	4.243	.000			
	L6	.024	.612	.541			
JS4 - Fringe Benefits	L1	.072	.778	.437	.255	20.300	.000
	L2	-.150	-2.123	.034			
	L3	.005	.048	.962			
	L4	.198	1.818	.070			
	L5	.274	2.946	.003			
	L6	.128	2.085	.038			
JS5 - Contingent Rewards	L1	.050	.652	.515	.494	57.828	.000
	L2	-.123	-2.103	.036			
	L3	-.095	-1.206	.229			
	L4	.325	3.628	.000			
	L5	.484	6.310	.000			
	L6	.078	1.540	.124			
JS6 - Operating Procedures	L1	.130	1.424	.155	.266	21.455	.000
	L2	-.157	-2.231	.026			
	L3	-.004	-.040	.968			
	L4	.078	.721	.471			
	L5	.303	3.275	.001			
	L6	.198	3.245	.001			
JS7 - Coworkers	L1	.326	3.835	.000	.370	34.758	.000
	L2	.045	.689	.491			
	L3	-.034	-.386	.700			
	L4	.011	.108	.914			
	L5	.245	2.861	.004			
	L6	.099	1.752	.081			
JS8 - Nature of Work	L1	.231	2.523	.012	.267	21.603	.000
	L2	.027	.383	.702			
	L3	-.166	-1.745	.082			
	L4	.380	3.517	.000			
	L5	.040	.433	.665			
	L6	.016	.268	.789			
JS9 - Communication	L1	.393	4.995	.000	.459	50.193	.000
	L2	.014	.237	.813			
	L3	-.076	-.935	.350			
	L4	.103	1.116	.265			
	L5	.290	3.654	.000			
	L6	-.006	-.109	.913			

Gender as a Moderator of the Relationships between L dimensions and JS dimensions

In this part the moderator effects of gender of the respondents on the dimension of leadership and dimension of job satisfaction of teachers are shown. Firstly a correlation analysis of the dimensions of leadership and dimensions of job satisfaction was done, separately for women and men (results shown in Table 4). These results relate to the whole sample N = 362 respondents (250 women and 112 men). Pearson correlation was used. In Table 4, statistically significant correlations are indicated as follows: *p<0.05; **p<0.01.

Results of correlation analysis for the dimensions of leadership and dimensions of job satisfaction, especially for women and men, are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Correlation coefficients between L dimensions and JS dimensions for women and men

Gender	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	JS1	JS2	JS3	JS4	JS5	JS6	JS7	JS8	JS9
W	L1														
	L2	.600**													
	L3	.790**	.535**												
	L4	.834**	.710**	.795**											
	L5	.782**	.495**	.839**	.787**										
	L6	.467**	.580**	.391**	.571**	.478**									
	JS1	.453**	.370**	.414**	.517**	.480**	.410**								
	JS2	.558**	.378**	.544**	.581**	.621**	.413**	.746**							
	JS3	.815**	.485**	.797**	.748**	.792**	.407**	.452**	.593**						
	JS4	.433**	.267**	.423**	.459**	.476**	.322**	.783**	.751**	.451**					
	JS5	.581**	.372**	.569**	.635**	.669**	.418**	.722**	.814**	.610**	.758**				
	JS6	.460**	.250**	.429**	.451**	.501**	.368**	.716**	.619**	.454**	.675**	.646**			
	JS7	.560**	.398**	.506**	.535**	.556**	.378**	.488**	.517**	.574**	.400**	.523**	.465**		
	JS8	.430**	.353**	.371**	.486**	.383**	.282**	.253**	.326**	.441**	.164**	.359**	.190**	.501**	
JS9	.617**	.395**	.561**	.582**	.610**	.335**	.468**	.509**	.647**	.390**	.586**	.430**	.734**	.642**	
M	L1														
	L2	.703**													
	L3	.829**	.636**												
	L4	.853**	.747**	.860**											
	L5	.764**	.654**	.787**	.835**										
	L6	.592**	.725**	.531**	.642**	.661**									
	JS1	.459**	.353**	.478**	.517**	.504**	.433**								
	JS2	.495**	.450**	.542**	.533**	.657**	.464**	.658**							
	JS3	.727**	.523**	.681**	.698**	.710**	.578**	.463**	.607**						
	JS4	.397**	.251**	.409**	.400**	.489**	.364**	.750**	.770**	.437**					
	JS5	.602**	.465**	.596**	.628**	.719**	.460**	.724**	.832**	.647**	.789**				
	JS6	.301**	.310**	.324**	.328**	.391**	.356**	.610**	.549**	.310**	.567**	.563**			
	JS7	.633**	.529**	.491**	.565**	.539**	.513**	.394**	.473**	.624**	.269**	.525**	.365**		
	JS8	.630**	.457**	.432**	.580**	.529**	.489**	.381**	.369**	.638**	.187**	.418**	.231**	.658**	
JS9	.776**	.592**	.595**	.722**	.670**	.535**	.516**	.539**	.716**	.347**	.655**	.339**	.766**	.773**	

To test the moderating effect of gender Hierarchical regression analysis was used. Hierarchical regression was used to analyze the significance of the regression coefficient of the product predictor variable for the independent variable Li (i = 1, 2, ..., 6) the dependent variable JSi (j = 1, 2, ..., 9) and the moderating variable gender. Hierarchical regression analysis has three steps. In the first step, Li is a predictor, in the second step, the gender is the predictor, and in the last step an interactive variable G x Li is added to the model.

The moderator effect was tested by examining the change in R square, which is attributable to the interaction term. If the interactive member, who was added in the final step of the regression analysis produced a significant R-square, it can be concluded that the gender of the respondents is a moderator ratio dimension of Li and JSj. The results of the hierarchical regression analyze are presented in Table 5., but only the results which confirmed the moderating effect of gender.

Table 5. Hierarchical regression analysis with gender as a moderator (only pairs where a moderating influence of gender on the correlations between some L dimensions and some JS dimensions is confirmed)

Independent variable	Dependent variable	R square	F-change
L1 - Core transformational leader behavior	JS8 - Nature of work	.223	103.280
		.242	9.042
	JS9 - Communication	.257	7.112
		.423	263.951
		.424	.766
L2 - High performance expectations	JS9 - Communication	.431	4.032
		.192	85.359
		.192	.122
L4 - Intellectual stimulation	JS8 - Nature of work	.201	3.878
		.250	119.715
	JS9 - Communication	.269	9.789
		.278	4.411
		.370	211.231
L5 - Contingent reward behavior	JS8 - Nature of work	.371	.919
		.380	4.893
		.165	71.085
L6 - Contingent punishment behavior	JS8 - Nature of work	.188	10.186
		.199	5.137
	JS9 - Communication	.101	40.638
		.124	9.275
		.140	6.650
		.138	57.686
		.141	1.098
		.152	4.708

Age as a moderator of the relationships between L dimensions and JS dimensions

In this part, the results of the moderator effects of age of the respondents on the dimension of leadership and dimension of job satisfaction of teachers in primary schools are presented.

Firstly a correlation analysis was performed of the dimensions of leadership and dimensions of job satisfaction, separately for young teachers, middle-aged teachers and older teachers (results are given in Table 6). These results refer to the total sample of N = 362 respondents (93 younger teachers, 197 middle-aged teachers and 72 older teachers). Pearson correlation was used. In Table 6, statistically significant correlations are indicated as follows: *p<0.05; **p<0.01.

The results of correlation analysis dimensions of leadership and dimensions of job satisfaction, for young teachers, middle-aged teachers and older teachers are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Correlation coefficients between L dimensions and JS dimensions for age

Age	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	JS1	JS2	JS3	JS4	JS5	JS6	JS7	JS8	JS9
Y	L1														
	L2	.483**													
	L3	.765**	.402**												
	L4	.804**	.561**	.765**											
	L5	.807**	.401**	.852**	.803**										
	L6	.441**	.518**	.342**	.510**	.396**									
	JS1	.363**	.336**	.367**	.430**	.482**	.409**								
	JS2	.506**	.378**	.451**	.517**	.619**	.435**	.765**							
	JS3	.836**	.377**	.738**	.777**	.787**	.434**	.408**	.540**						
	JS4	.410**	.302**	.400**	.469**	.545**	.354**	.820**	.802**	.457**					
	JS5	.538**	.265**	.470**	.599**	.666**	.351**	.709**	.829**	.572**	.807**				
	JS6	.393**	.226**	.402**	.445**	.525**	.405**	.776**	.658**	.422**	.737**	.686**			
	JS7	.628**	.326**	.438**	.500**	.543**	.499**	.475**	.597**	.605**	.449**	.608**	.431**		
	JS8	.570**	.383**	.320**	.609**	.372**	.355**	.256**	.355**	.478**	.214**	.407**	.138**	.553**	
JS9	.722**	.359**	.514**	.620**	.609**	.445**	.425**	.572**	.655**	.426**	.622**	.354**	.832**	.718**	
M	L1														
	L2	.631**													
	L3	.801**	.557**												
	L4	.846**	.699**	.813**											
	L5	.761**	.509**	.806**	.777**										
	L6	.437**	.567**	.334**	.528**	.494**									
	JS1	.457**	.322**	.411**	.534**	.480**	.389**								
	JS2	.552**	.387**	.556**	.613**	.660**	.410**	.727**							
	JS3	.784**	.526**	.791**	.746**	.756**	.378**	.474**	.614**						
	JS4	.457**	.261**	.438**	.485**	.498**	.329**	.772**	.743**	.463**					
	JS5	.585**	.393**	.602**	.640**	.683**	.405**	.733**	.850**	.630**	.791**				
	JS6	.418**	.271**	.399**	.423**	.471**	.350**	.650**	.583**	.406**	.643**	.611**			
	JS7	.556**	.428**	.503**	.568**	.549**	.332**	.512**	.513**	.558**	.388**	.506**	.505**		
	JS8	.426**	.320**	.441**	.468**	.425**	.279**	.354**	.394**	.497**	.224**	.383**	.268**	.488**	
JS9	.610**	.456**	.583**	.615**	.605**	.320**	.547**	.539**	.641**	.433**	.598**	.465**	.694**	.623**	
O	L1														
	L2	.724**													
	L3	.824**	.725**												
	L4	.845**	.892**	.837**											
	L5	.818**	.723**	.873**	.843**										
	L6	.632**	.788**	.668**	.760**	.666**									
	JS1	.528**	.506**	.519**	.572**	.512**	.464**								
	JS2	.575**	.466**	.601**	.534**	.562**	.434**	.695**							
	JS3	.805**	.604**	.755**	.685**	.796**	.574**	.431**	.595**						
	JS4	.373**	.261**	.394**	.352**	.356**	.287**	.719**	.725**	.342**					
	JS5	.638**	.552**	.608**	.666**	.695**	.534**	.697**	.709**	.607**	.615**				
	JS6	.534**	.337**	.466**	.455**	.457**	.369**	.710**	.627**	.454**	.580**	.604**			
	JS7	.586**	.554**	.588**	.535**	.575**	.478**	.368**	.409**	.623**	.244**	.473**	.317**		
	JS8	.497**	.449**	.354**	.470**	.442**	.407**	.212**	.246**	.561**	.033**	.362**	.158**	.624**	
JS9	.705**	.528**	.623**	.606**	.684**	.429**	.417**	.431**	.759**	.203**	.609**	.375**	.717**	.730**	

The abbreviations in the table 6: Y – Younger teachers till the age 35, M – Middle-aged teachers (from 35 till 50 years), O – Older teachers (over 50 years). To test the moderating effect of age Hierarchical regression analysis was used. Hierarchical regression was used to analyze the significance of the regression coefficient of the product predictor variable for the independent variable Li (i = 1, 2,..., 6), the dependent

variable JS_i (j = 1, 2, ..., 9) and moderating variable age. Hierarchical regression analysis has three steps. In the first step, L_i is a predictor, in the second step, the age is the predictor, and in the last step an interactive variable A x L_i is added to the model. The moderator effect was tested by examining the change in R square, which is attributable to the interaction term. If the interactive member, who was added in the final step of the regression analysis produced a significant R-square, it can be concluded that the gender of the respondents is a moderator ratio dimension of L_i and JS_j. The results of the hierarchical regression analyze are presented in Table 7., but only the results which confirmed the moderating effect of age.

Table 7. Hierarchical regression analysis with age as a moderator (only pairs where a moderating influence of age on the correlations between some L dimensions and some JS dimensions is confirmed)

Independent variable	Dependent variable	R square	F-change
L1 - Core transformational leader behavior	JS3 - Supervision	.631	616.591
		.632	.667
		.639	6.488
	JS7 - Coworkers	.330	177.342
		.331	.392
		.338	4.167
	JS9 - Communication	.423	263.951
		.425	1.386
		.437	7.466
L4 - Intellectual stimulation	JS3 - Supervision	.541	423.639
		.541	.067
		.546	3.812
	JS9 - Communication	.370	211.231
		.371	.642
		.377	3.705

Discussion

Table 2. shows a statistically significant correlation between dimensions of leadership and dimensions of job satisfaction in primary schools in Serbia. All correlations are strong and positive. This confirms the hypothesis H1. From the dimensions of job satisfaction, the strongest correlation dimension has JS3 - Supervision. This makes sense given that the school principals are leaders and supervisors at the same time. So, if teachers are satisfied with leadership, most likely they are satisfied with supervision. In contrast, from the dimensions of job satisfaction, the lowest correlation dimension has JS6 - Operating Procedures. This is due to the relatively small influence of the principals towards the daily work of teachers, which involves teaching, assessment of students, managing various records etc.

From the dimensions of leadership the strongest correlation has L5 - Contingent reward behavior, afterwards L4 - Intellectual stimulation and L1 - Core transformational leader behavior. Rewarding and intellectual stimulation has extremely positive effect on job satisfaction of teachers. It is obvious that any kind of reward (whether monetary or in the form of recognition) means a lot to teachers in terms of size when JS1 - Pay and JS4 - Fringe benefits have the lowest average values of all the dimensions of job satisfaction (that can be seen in Table 1). The influence of intellectual stimulation is expected as teachers are people with higher education, so they generally appreciate every kind of intellectual stimulation and progress. In addition, teachers significantly rate the visionary and strategic component in the work of the school principal.

From the dimensions of leadership the weakest correlation has L2 - High performance expectations, afterwards L6 - Contingent punishment behavior. The expectation of high-performance at teachers obviously creates a sense of disorder steady mode. Teachers are often not ready for such changes, firstly because compromising personal comfort, secondly because the feeling that they themselves know best how to do things. In addition, achieving high performance can be particularly unpopular if there is a required number of procedures and administrative duties, which inhibit the creativity of teachers. Obviously punishment can only contribute to the decrease of job satisfaction of teachers, which is common within people who have higher education and generally expect more understanding and respect.

Table 3 shows the high values of the corrected determination indexes of R^2 , which are in the range from 0.255 up to 0.705. In this way the predictive effects of leadership on job satisfaction of teachers in primary schools in Serbia was confirmed. Hence, the hypothesis H2 was confirmed. Based on the value R^2 , under the biggest influence of leadership, are the following dimensions of job satisfaction: JS3 - Supervision ($R^2 = 0.705$) and JS5 - Contingent Rewards ($R^2 = 0.494$). In table 3. it can be seen that from the dimensions of leadership, the greatest impact on job satisfaction of teachers have L5 - Contingent reward behavior, then L1 - Core transformational leader behavior and L4 - Intellectual stimulation. In addition, it should be noted that the dimensions of L2 - High performance expectations often has a negative impact on the dimensions of job satisfaction. These results are consistent with the results of the correlation analysis.

Among the results of the regression analysis (Table 3), the dimension of leadership L5 - Contingent reward behavior particularly singles out. According to the Social Exchange Theory (SET) exchange relationship between specific actors, is defined as "actions contingent on rewarding reactions from others" (Blau, 1964, p.91). Action of one side leads to the other party's response. If one side provides a benefit, the person gaining the benefit should answer honestly and politely (Kelley & Thibault, 1978). Also, according to some authors (Lawler, 1971; Siegrist, 1996), lack of rewards that employees believe they deserve, can lead to a significant decrease in job satisfaction, often for a longer period of time. It can be concluded that reward has a positive effect on almost all dimensions of job satisfaction.

Dimension L1 - Core transformational leader behavior, represents a visionary characteristic of the principal and his ability to realize the desired (required) objectives. Such principal inspires employees and give them confidence and trust. Safety is very important in terms of financial instability and frequent changes in the educational system of Serbia. It should be taken into account that the unemployment rate in Serbia is very high (over 25%) and that in the Serbian education system there is a significant surplus of workers. According to (De Witte, 1999), high level of unemployment affects the perception of employees that their job is not safe, and they develop the fear that they can lose their work. In addition to safety, in terms of an uncertain environment, it is important that employees have confidence in their leader. The level of uncertainty in a social exchange setting is directly related to the development of trust between individuals in the organizations (Kollock, 1994). Based on these considerations it is clear that the principals who are highly rated for the core transformational leader behavior, contribute significantly to job satisfaction of employees.

Dimension L4 - Intellectual stimulation also stands out as a significant predictor of the following dimensions of job satisfaction of teachers: JS1 - Pay, JS5 - Contingent Rewards and JS8 - Nature of Work. Work in primary schools in Serbia is not paid enough, there are no special rewards, and reputation of the profession is in danger in the past two to three decades, and therefore the profession of a teacher is not respected in society as it should be. Therefore, any form of intellectual stimulation by the principal, can significantly improve the perception of teachers' salaries, incentives and the nature of the job. Teachers in this way gain importance that they think they deserve. In such circumstances, it looks better, even though the wages do not change depending on the intellectual stimulation. In addition, it should be noted that the intellectual stimulation, among other things, involves two-way communication and two-way communication has a significant effect on job satisfaction of employees (Longenecker & Nykodym, 1996).

The weak effect of size L3 - Supportive leader behavior on job satisfaction of teachers can be considered as a surprise. A possible explanation for this situation can be that in times of crisis, changes and uncertainty, employees give more importance to strategic capabilities and righteousness of the principal. These are the qualities that give them confidence and trust, rather than support, which can often only be declarative, without specific, mandatory benefits to the employees.

Table 4. shows that there is a strong correlation between the dimensions of leadership and dimensions of job satisfaction of teachers, both women and men. Further analysis, presented in Table 5. (Hierarchical regression analysis), however, indicate a slightly moderating effect of gender on the observed relationship. Hierarchical regression analysis showed eight relations in which there is a moderating effect of gender. It should be noted that the moderating effect of gender can be seen at only two dimensions of job satisfaction: JS8 - Nature of Work and JS9 - Communication. Due to the fact that moderating effect of gender is not given in full, it can be concluded that the hypothesis H3 is partly confirmed, apropos confirmed in these two dimensions of job satisfaction.

The moderating effect of gender in these two dimensions has the following direction: leadership has more influence on job satisfaction within male teachers than female teachers. For an explanation of this situation, first of all, it should be noted that in this study, average dimensions of job satisfaction among male and female teachers are evenly distributed. This result is similar to the results of research in Cyprus. In this paper it was concluded that the gender of the teachers have no effect on their job satisfaction (Eliophotou Menon & Athanasoula-Reppa, 2011). On the other hand, there are studies that confirm that women are more satisfied with work in schools than man (Ladebo 2005; Ghazi & Maringe, 2011). The results obtained in this study indicate that in three dimensions of job satisfaction, there is a slightly higher job satisfaction among female teachers. These are the following dimensions: JS3 - Supervision, JS8 - Nature of Work and JS9 - Communication. Just in two from these three dimensions gender is the moderating effect. Based on these data, the moderating effect of gender in these two dimensions of job satisfaction (JS8 - Nature of Work and JS9 - Communication), can be explained as follows: men are less satisfied with their job in schools so they are more sensitive to the impact of leadership and leadership can increase or decrease their job satisfaction.

Table 6. shows that there is a strong correlation between the dimensions of leadership and job satisfaction of teachers in all three age groups of teachers (younger teachers, middle-aged teachers and older teachers). Further analysis, presented in Table 7. (Hierarchical regression analysis), however, indicate a slightly moderating effect of the years of teachers to the observed relationship. Hierarchical regression analysis showed five relationships in which there is a moderating effect of years. Moderating influence is present just at two dimensions of leadership: L1 - Core transformational leader behavior and L4 - Intellectual stimulation, as well at three dimensions of job satisfaction: JS3 - Supervision, JS7 - Coworkers and JS9 - Communication. According to this it can be concluded that the hypothesis H4 is partially confirmed.

Some studies show the impact of years of teachers on job satisfaction. For example, according to (Ghazi & Maringe, 2011) younger and older teachers in Pakistan are significantly more satisfied with the work of teacher than their middle aged colleagues. Similarly, in the reference (Eliophotou Menon & Athanasoula-Reppa, 2011) it was shown that experienced teachers in Cyprus are more satisfied with their work. Based on the average score for the satisfaction of all three groups of teachers by age, in this study, there was no significant difference in the job satisfaction of teachers by age. Therefore, the explanation of cases where there is a moderating effect of years is based on the values of correlation coefficients in Table 6.

In the case of dimension L1 - Core transformational leader behavior, it is noted that between younger and older teachers there is a significant influence of the following dimension of leadership on certain dimensions of job satisfaction (JS3 - Supervision, JS7 - Coworkers and JS9 - Communication). Explanation of this phenomenon is that younger teachers are at the beginning of their career; this is the period when visionary and strategic components in the principals' work cause much greater sensitivity to the

relationship with the principal, with colleagues, as well as internal communication in the school. In case of older teachers the result is similar, but it can be interpreted as the result of experiences that shape their vision of what relationship they want to have with the principal and their colleagues. Any deviation from their wishes, lead to increased susceptibility toward certain dimensions of job satisfaction.

In the case of dimension L4 - Intellectual stimulation, it is noted that with increasing age the influence of teachers on three dimensions of job satisfaction decreases (JS3 - Supervision and JS9 - Communication). This situation is not surprising given that with increasing age there is a decrease in ambition for improvement and learning, and also adapting to changes is more difficult. Young teachers value intellectual stimulation more, and if it fails, it causes sustainable decline in job satisfaction than in case of older teachers.

Conclusion

The research has shown that leadership has a strong and positive impact on job satisfaction of teachers in primary schools in Serbia. The principals of primary schools in Serbia should devote considerable attention to developing leadership skills and leader member exchange development. In doing so, special attention should be paid to the visionary and strategic component in the work of the principals, intellectual stimulation and fairly rewarding of employees. Practically, this means that school teachers should regularly provide information about the goals and plans of the school, the results achieved and the position of the school. Also, school principals should support and encourage teachers to improve their knowledge and creativity in their work, and to recognize and properly evaluate the results of teachers, through cash prizes, public praises, recognition, etc.

The proposal is that seminars, courses and workshops in the field of leadership and management in schools in Serbia should be organized for the school principals. This is a relatively easy, quick and inexpensive way to promote leadership in schools. Benefits can be very large: by creating a quality of leadership in schools, it is possible to achieve increased job satisfaction of teachers, and therefore better performance of teachers, students, and successful functioning of schools as a whole.

References

- 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.
- Aubrey, C., Godfrey, R., & Harris, A. (2013). How Do They Manage? An Investigation of Early Childhood Leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(1), 5-29.
- Barnett, K., & McCormick, J. (2012) Leadership and Team Dynamics in Senior Executive Leadership Teams. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(6), 653-671.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision, *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-36.
- Beebe, A., Blaylock, A., & Sweetser, K.D. (2009). Job satisfaction in public relations internships, *Public Relations Review*, 35(2), 156-158.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.
- Bogler, R. (2001). The Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher Job Satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662-683.
- Bogler, R., Caspi, A., & Roccas, S. (2013). Transformational and Passive Leadership: An Initial Investigation of University Instructors as Leaders in a Virtual Learning Environment. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(3), 372-392.

- Brackett, M.A., Palomera, R., Mojsa-Kaja, J., Reyes, M.R., & Salovey, P. (2010) Emotion-regulation ability, burnout, and job satisfaction among British secondary-school teachers. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(4), 406-417.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Butt, G., & Lance, A. (2005). Secondary Teacher Workload and Job Satisfaction: Do Successful Strategies for Change Exist? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 33(4), 401-422.
- Buyukgoze-Kavas, A., Duffy, R.D., Yerin Güneri, O., & Autin, K.L. (2013). Job Satisfaction Among Turkish Teachers: Exploring Differences by School Level. *Journal of Career Assessment*, doi: 1069072713493980, In Press.
- Cannella, A.A.Jr., & Monroe, M.J. (1997). Contrasting perspectives on strategic leaders: Toward a more realistic view of top managers. *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 213-237.
- Cardno, C., & Youngs, H. (2013). Leadership Development for Experienced New Zealand Principals: Perceptions of Effectiveness. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(3), 256-271.
- Cerit, Y. (2009). The Effects of Servant Leadership Behaviours of School Principals on Teachers' Job Satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(5), 600-623.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 637-647.
- De Nobile, J.J., & McCormick, J. (2008). Organizational Communication and Job Satisfaction in Australian Catholic Primary Schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 36(1), 101-122.
- De Witte, H. (1999). Job insecurity and psychological wellbeing: Review of the literature and exploration of some unresolved issues, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 155-177.
- Donaldson Jr., G.A. (2007). What Do Teachers Bring to Leadership? *Educational leadership*, 65(1), 26-29.
- Do Rego Furtado, L.C., Da Graça Câmara Batista, M. & Ferreira Silva, F.J. (2011). Leadership and job satisfaction among Azorean hospital nurses: an application of the situational leadership model. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 19(8), 1047-1057.
- Eisner, E. (2006). The Satisfactions of Teaching. *Educational leadership*, 63(6), 44-46.
- Eliophotou Menon, M. & Athanasoula-Reppa, A. (2011). Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers: the role of gender and experience, *School Leadership & Management*, 31(5), 435-450.
- Evans, L. (2001). Delving Deeper into Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation among Education Professionals: Re-examining the Leadership Dimension. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 29(3), 291-306.
- Fraser, J., & Hodge, M. (2000). Job Satisfaction in Higher Education: Examining Gender in Professional Work Settings. *Sociological Inquiry*, 70(2), 172-178.
- Ghazi, S.R. & Maringe, F. (2011). Age, gender and job satisfaction among elementary school head teachers in Pakistan. *Education, Knowledge and Economy*, 5(1-2), 17-27.
- Gokçe, F. (2009). Behaviour of Turkish Elementary School Principals in the Change Process: An Analysis of the Perceptions of Both Teachers and School Principals. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(2), 198-215.
- Hallinger, Ph., & Heck, R.H. (2010). Leadership for Learning: Does Collaborative Leadership Make a Difference in School Improvement? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38(6), 654-678.
- Haser, S.G., & Nasser, I. (2003). Teacher Job Satisfaction in a Year-Round School. *Educational leadership*, 60(8), 65-67.
- Ho C.L., & Au, W.T. (2006). Teaching Satisfaction Scale: Measuring Job Satisfaction of Teachers. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(1), 172-185.
- Hoerr, T.R. (2013). Principal Connection / Is Your School Happy? *Educational leadership*, 70(8), 86-87.
- House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*. Eds. James G. Hunt & Lars L. Larson. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R.J., Spangler, W.D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the u.s. presidency: a psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3), 364-396.

- Kelley, H. H., & Thibault, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relationships: A theory of interdependence*. New York: John Wiley.
- Khasawneh, S., Omari, A. & Abu-Tineh, A. (2012). The Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment: The Case for Vocational Teachers in Jordan. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(4), 494-508.
- Kim, S. (2002). Participative Management and Job Satisfaction: Lessons for Management Leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 231-241.
- Klassen, R.M. & Anderson, C.J.K. (2009). How times change: Secondary teachers' job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in 1962 and 2007. *British Educational Research Journal*, 35(5), 745-759.
- Kollock, P. (1994). The Emergence of Exchange Structures: An Experimental Study of Uncertainty, Commitment, and Trust. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 313-345.
- Kwong, J., Wang, H. & Clifton, R.A. (2010). Rethinking Our Assumptions about Teachers' Job Satisfaction in China and the West. *Australian Journal of Education*, 54(2), 115-132.
- Ladebo, O.J. (2005). Effects of Work-related Attitudes on the Intention to Leave the Profession: An Examination of School Teachers in Nigeria. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 33(3), 355-369.
- Lam, B., & Yan, H. (2011). Beginning teachers' job satisfaction: the impact of school-based factors. *Teacher Development: An international journal of teachers' professional development*, 15(3), 333-348.
- Lawler, E. E., III. (1971). *Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Longenecker, C. O., & Nykodym, N. (1996). Public Sector Performance Appraisal Effectiveness: A Case Study. *Public Personnel Management*, 25(2), 151-164.
- Lumby, J. (2012). Leading Organizational Culture: Issues of Power and Equity, *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(5), 576-591.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, Ph.M., & Rich, G.A. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29(2), 115-134.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P. & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, 17(2), 145-177.
- Odhiambo, G., & Hii, A. (2012). Key Stakeholders' Perceptions of Effective School Leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(2), 232-247.
- Pashiardis, P., Savvides, V., Lytra, E., & Angelidou, K. (2011). Successful School Leadership in Rural Contexts: The Case of Cyprus. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 39(5), 536-553.
- Podsakoff, Ph.M., Todor, W.D., Grover, R.A., & Huber, V.L. (1984). Situational moderators of leader reward and punishment behaviors: fact or fiction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34(1), 21-63.
- Podsakoff, Ph.M., & Organ, D.W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 531-544.
- Podsakoff, Ph.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Razzaq, J., & Forde, Ch. (2013). The Impact of Educational Change on School Leaders: Experiences of Pakistani School Leaders. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(1), 63-78.
- Robbins, M.J., Peterson, M., Tedrick, T., & Carpenter, J.R. (2003). Job satisfaction on NCAA Division III Athletic Directions: Impact on Job Design and Time on Task. *International Sport Journal*. 7(2), 46-57.
- Rothfelder, K., Ottenbacher, M.C., & Harrington, R.J. (2013). The Impact of Transformational, Transactional and Non-Leadership Styles on Employee Job Satisfaction in the German Hospitality Industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, doi: 1467358413493636, In Press.

- Schonfeld, I.S. (2000). Short research paper: An updated look at depressive symptoms and job satisfaction in first-year women teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(3), 363-371.
- Shann, M.H. (1998). Professional commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 92(2), 67-73.
- Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort / low-reward conditions'. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1(1), 27-41.
- Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693-713.
- Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia (2011). Women and Men in the Republic of Serbia, Belgrade.
- Tichy, N.M., & Devanna, M.A. (1986). *The Transformational Leader*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Vilkinas, T., & Ladyshevsky, R.K. (2012). Leadership Behaviour and Effectiveness of Academic Program Directors in Australian Universities. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(1), 109-126.
- Walumbwa, F.O., Orwa, B., Wang, P., & Lawler, J.J. (2005). Transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: A comparative study of Kenyan and U.S. financial firms. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(2), 235-256.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2006). Examining the Teaching Life. *Educational leadership*, 63(6), 26-29.
- Wolk, S. (2008). Joy in School. *Educational leadership*, 66(1), 8-15.
- Wong, C.S., Wong, P.M., & Peng, K.Z. (2011). Effect of Middle-level Leader and Teacher Emotional Intelligence on School Teachers' Job Satisfaction: The Case of Hong Kong. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38(1), 59-70.
- Yang, F.H., Wu, M., Chang, C.C., & Chien, Y. (2011). Elucidating the Relationships among Transformational Leadership, Job Satisfaction, Commitment Foci and Commitment Bases in the Public Sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 40(3), 265-278.