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Abstract

A Study of Leadership Styles and Foreign English Teachers Job Satisfaction in Adult English Cram Schools of Taipei and Kaohsiung Cities in Taiwan.

Fang Yi Wu

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Gilberto M. Hinojosa

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect school leaders’ leadership style had on the job satisfaction of foreign English teachers in 18 adult English cram schools in Taipei (North) and Kaohsiung (South) in Taiwan. The leadership styles were identified as one of the following: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. The leadership styles were measured using Bass and Avolio’s (2000) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ–5X). Job satisfaction was assessed using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) Scale by Smith et al. (1969). The study used a mixed method to determine the correlation among leadership styles and job satisfaction and demographic variables. Both the leaders and teachers completed the MLQ–5X. The English teachers completed the English version of the JDI and the Job in General Scale. Statistical analysis showed that the relationship between transactional leadership style and job satisfaction was abundant. Analyses showed that both transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles had moderate correlation with satisfaction with pay. The
results can be summarized as follows: (a) gender affects job satisfaction in general and supervision; (b) satisfaction with pay differs among age; (c) years of teaching at an institution influences satisfaction with pay; and (d) participation influences satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. Face-to-face interviews were conducted to determine why there was no significant relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction except for satisfaction with pay. The 12th cram school was the sample target, and results showed that a good teaching environment and easy-going coworkers were important factors that produce satisfaction among foreign English teachers. Many foreign English teachers think there are few opportunities for promotion and some think the school leader provides them with good opportunities for promotion. On the other hand, only a few of the foreign English teachers expressed their satisfaction with pay.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

English is everywhere. Millions of people are learning it. Almost half of the world’s population will be more or less proficient in it within the next 50 years. The need to learn spoken English has become essential in business and for travel.

Language schools in Taiwan, commonly known as “English Cram Schools,” are an essential part of life of the nation. Many people, from students to business people and even factory workers, attend these schools at least once in their lifetime. Many people unfamiliar with English education in Taiwan may question the need for these cram schools because English is taught throughout junior and senior high schools. However, English education in junior and senior high schools emphasizes a grammar-based curriculum because that is what entrance exams measure for entrance into high school and universities. Consequently, even though students are strong in grammar and writing, their listening and speaking skills may be weak. To remedy this, students attend cram schools to improve conversational English.

In the past, Taiwanese parents looked for teachers who went abroad to study to teach their children English. Now they are looking for instructors from English-speaking countries. Taiwanese parents hire native English-speakers simply because they think
these native speakers by definition will be good at teaching English, and this is a normal occurrence in Taiwan today.

English cram schools first appeared in Taiwan as informal educational institutions for students or young children to learn basic English skills. In recent decades, they have become a nationwide business in Taiwan. With thousands of jobs being advertised each month for English instructors, teaching English in Taiwan presents an inviting opportunity for many young Western college graduates in their early 20s and 30s. The schools are usually owned by individuals who recruit Western teachers in order to catch up with the trend. Thus, the process of recruiting Westerners to teach English in the cram schools is now a major development in language education in Taiwan.

Teaching English abroad has numerous rewards for foreign English teachers: they can learn more about other cultures and attitudes, they have the chance for extensive foreign travel, and they are exposed to interesting lifestyles. Most of these English teachers are from the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Ireland, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. They come in substantial numbers, but it is difficult to get them to commit long term to teach in cram schools. In fact, many leave before completing their contract agreement, mostly because they are not satisfied with their working environment. This has become a major problem for many cram schools.
Yet there are some foreign teachers who stay at one school for a long time. These foreign English teachers are willing to commit themselves to one school because they like their relationship with the school leader (or the school director), they enjoy their working environment, and they are satisfied with their jobs.

The success or failure of an organization is determined by human beings, thus management is concerned with this human resources issue. In recent years, leadership style has become an important topic of study in the management field; a good leader guides subordinates to work effectively toward organizational goals.

The main leadership styles used in this research are transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. These three styles are known as the new leadership theories and are used by most academics who study organization leaders (Bogler, 2001, 2002; Heller, 1993; McKee, 1991; Timothy & Ronald, 2004).

A transformational leader typically inspires followers to do more than originally expected. Transformational leadership involves the process of engaging the commitment of the employees in the context of shared values and shared vision. Transformational leadership is particularly relevant in the context of managing change. It involves relationships of mutual trust between the leaders and the followers.

Transactional leaders are leaders who offer some form of need satisfaction in
return for something valued by the employer. This could be increased salary, improved job satisfaction, or recognition. The leader sets clear goals, is adept at understanding the needs of employees, and selects appropriate, motivating rewards.

The laissez-faire manager exercises little control over the group, leaving employees to sort out their role and tackle their work without participating in the process. Once a leader is confident with his or her team and deems the team capable, the leader steps back and lets the employees get on with the task without direct supervision.

Job satisfaction is related to the feelings of employees and can be influenced by factors such as the quality of their relationship with their supervisor or employer, the quality of the physical environment in which they work, or the degree of fulfillment in their work. Job satisfaction is not the same as job motivation; rather, job satisfaction provides an indication of an employee’s well-being induced by the job (Michaelowa, 2002).

Although much research has been done on the relationships between leaders’ leadership styles and teachers’ job satisfaction in elementary schools, colleges, and universities, little of this kind of research has been done with instructors in cram schools. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between the leadership styles of school leaders and the job satisfaction of foreign English teachers in adult
English cram schools in northern and southern Taiwan.

Statement of the Problem

Many researchers consider leadership style as an important variable in influencing an organization’s functions. Leadership style can influence followers’ job performance and job satisfaction (Robbins, 2001). Abundant research has been carried out on the relationships between leaders’ leadership styles and teachers’ job satisfaction in elementary schools, colleges, and universities, but little research has been carried out on cram schools.

This study focused on English teachers’ job satisfaction and investigated how various factors may affect different dimensions of English teachers’ job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has been found to be significantly related with an employee’s turnover intention and job outcome in educational settings (Bogler, 2001, 2002; Heller, 1993; McKee, 1991), as well as in military, business, and other settings (Bordieri, 1988; Butters & Gade, 1982; Packard & Kauppi, 1999; Wilkinson & Wagner, 1993). This study did not examine the issue of turnover rate. However, high turnover is costly for firms. All organizations have some turnover in today’s changing world of work, and reasonable levels of turnover can facilitate organizational flexibility and employee independence. It also can lessen the need for management-initiated layoffs (Robbins, 2001, p. 21).
A turnover rate that is too high, however, also will influence employees and the function of an organization. It can, for example, result in the waste of resources, and in the case of schools, the instability of changing teachers can make students feel insecure and anxious.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect the leadership style of school leaders have on the job satisfaction of foreign English teachers in adult English cram schools in Taipei (North) and Kaohsiung (South) in Taiwan. It was expected that the findings would provide insights for management practices in educational settings.

The leadership styles were identified as one of the three leadership types: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. Foreign English teachers’ job satisfaction was measured using the Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scale.

Definition of Terms

Foreign Teachers

Foreign English teachers are teachers from countries other than Taiwan. Because English has become a required subject in schools across the nation, the best way to create a good language learning environment is to hire expert foreign teachers and make the teaching take place in a “No Chinese” environment.
Cram Schools

Cram schools are usually privately owned. There are many cram schools in Japan, China, Taiwan, Korea, Vietnam, and Hong Kong. In Asian countries, education plays a large role in the lives of the young. The schools known as crammers or tutorials are specialized schools that train students to meet particular goals, most commonly, to pass the entrance examinations of high schools or universities. The English name is derived from the term cramming, which means to study a large amount of material in a short period of time. Cram schools are more common in non-English speaking countries.

Leadership

Rowley (1997) interpreted leadership as concern with a sense of direction and vision and imparting of that vision. For Rowley, leadership involves working with others in teams and the maintenance of relationships; leadership is a careful and relentless process that involves attention to detail. Burns (1978) noted that leadership “is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motive of followers” (p. 18). Nirenberg (2001) defined leadership as a widespread social function necessary for the achievement of collective objectives, rather than just a position in a hierarchy or a chain of command. Thite (2000) discussed
leadership as an important determinant of performance in information technology projects.

*Transformational Leadership*

Burns (1978) described “transformational leadership as a process that motivates followers by appealing to higher ideals and moral values” (p. 20). Hater and Bass (1988) said, “The dynamics of transformational leadership involve strong personal identification with the leader, joining in a shared vision of future, or going beyond the self-exchange of rewards for compliance” (p. 695).

Transformational leadership is a key in organizations’ continuing success because of the importance of team cohesion, organizational commitment, and higher levels of job satisfaction (Avolio & Bass 1999). Burns also argued that transformational leaders elevate, motivate, define values, offer vision, and creatively produce reform in various circumstances and challenges. Bass and Avolio (1993) stated that transformational leaders integrate creative insight, persistence, energy, intuition, and sensitivity to the needs of others.

*Transactional Leadership*

A transactional leader clarifies the performance criteria or articulates what is expected from the employee and what employees will receive in return. Field and Herold
(1997) described transactional leadership as a reward-driven behavior in which the follower behaves in such a manner as to elicit rewards or support from the leader.

Transactional leadership is often contrasted to transformational leadership (Hartog & Van Muijen, 1997). Transactional leadership involves an exchange between leaders and followers (Burns, 1978). Transactional leaders are characterized by the use of contingent reward and management-by-exception (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Transactional leaders use rewards as their primary source of power. Followers comply with the leaders when the reward meets their needs (Flood et al., 2000).

**Laissez-faire Leadership**

Laissez-faire leadership is extremely passive as compared to transformational and transactional leadership (Bass, 1999; Flood, et al., 2000). Laissez-faire leaders avoid decision-making and supervisory responsibility. Such leaders are not sufficiently motivated or adequately skilled to perform supervisory duties (Bass, 1998; Hartog & Van Muijen, 1997).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is the difference between the amount of reward, monetary or otherwise, workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive (Robbins, 2001). Traditional job satisfaction theory holds that work-related variables contribute to
worker satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Waters & Waters, 1969). Mason (1997) defined job satisfaction as a general attitude of individuals toward their jobs. Job satisfaction is the degree to which people like their job; it is a general attitude toward the job (Rocca & Kostanski, 2001). Tan and Quek (2001) also noted that one’s internal values and work environment are the keys to job satisfaction.

Research Questions

The study explored the following research question: What is the relationship between school leaders’ leadership style and foreign English teachers’ overall job satisfaction after controlling for the effects of demographic variables? To determine the answer, the following research questions were developed:

1. What is the relationship between transformational leadership style and overall job satisfaction?

2. What is the relationship between transactional leadership style and overall job satisfaction?

3. What is the relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and overall job satisfaction?

4. Are there differences in job satisfaction among demographic variables?
5. How do foreign teachers in an English cram school in Taiwan describe their school leadership style and job satisfaction?

The three leadership styles used in this study were transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. Demographic variables were age, gender, number of years of teaching in the institution, level of education, participation in administrative duties, and country of origin. Six facets of job satisfaction were examined using the JDI and JIG: People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Pay, Promotion, and Supervision.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made during this research.

1. The participants will not be interfered with or influenced while doing the survey questionnaire.

2. The participants will answer the questionnaires with honesty.

3. The school leaders will claim the closest leadership style to which they think they belong.

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between school leaders’ leadership style and foreign teachers’ job satisfaction in 20 randomly selected adult English cram schools in Taipei (North) and Kaohsiung (South) in Taiwan. Twenty
randomly selected adult English cram schools with 18 school leaders and 217 foreign teachers were the potential participants in this study.

Quantitative Method

The school leaders’ leadership styles were measured using Bass and Avolio’s (2000) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ, Form 5X). The MLQ was originally developed by Bass in 1985; the newly revised version is MLQ–5X. The full-range of leadership includes three dimensions: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. The MLQ also is used to evaluate followers’ extra effort, organizational effectiveness, and followers’ satisfaction with their leaders.

Job satisfaction was assessed using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) Scale by Smith et al. (1969). This study also tried to determine whether or not a relationship can be predicted between school leaders’ leadership styles and foreign teachers’ job satisfaction in adult English cram schools.

The study primarily adopted a quantitative method to determine the correlation between the two variables (leadership styles and job satisfaction). The data from this study were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 13.0 (SPSS13.0).

Most quantitative research tends to create a universal text-free generalization
(McMillan, 2001). Quantitative methods, unlike qualitative methods, are research methods concerned with numbers and anything that is quantifiable. Creswell (1994) asserted that “a quantitative study is consistent with the quantitative paradigm, based on testing a theory composed of variables, measured with numbers, and analyzed with statistical procedures, in order to determine whether the predictive generalizations of the theory hold true” (p. 2).

In quantitative studies, there is an established set of procedures and steps that guide the researcher, and the researcher must be detached from the study as much as possible to avoid bias (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001).

**Qualitative Method**

The aim of qualitative analysis is a complete, detailed description. No attempt is made to assign frequencies to the linguistic features that are identified in the data, and rare phenomena receive (or should receive) the same amount of attention as more frequent phenomena. Qualitative analysis allows for fine distinctions to be drawn because it is not necessary to shoehorn the data into a finite number of classifications. Ambiguities, which are inherent in human language, can be recognized in the analysis.

The main disadvantage of qualitative approaches to corpus analysis is that their findings cannot be extended to wider populations with the same degree of certainty that
quantitative analyses can. This is because the findings of the research are not tested to
discover whether they are statistically significant or due to chance. Due to this
disadvantage, the multi-method approach, including both *qualitative method* and
*quantitative method*, is necessary in today’s research.

**Delimitations and Limitations**

Based on the theories of leadership and job satisfaction, the purpose of this study
was to find the possible relationships between the school leaders’ leadership styles
(transformational, transactional, laissez-faire) and foreign English teachers’ job
satisfaction in adult English cram schools in northern and southern Taiwan. Separate
questionnaires were used for supervisors and instructors; this was intended to help clarify
the type of leadership behavior that the school supervisor uses most frequently.

**Delimitations**

This study was delimited by the fact that the leaders’ leadership style and job
satisfaction surveys were given only to foreign teachers currently teaching in the schools.

**Limitations**

The study contained the following limitations:

1. This research was limited to 20 randomly selected adult English cram schools
   in Taipei City (North) and Kaohsiung city (South) in Taiwan. The population
of this research consisted of 20 supervisors and 300 foreign English teachers
in the same 20 randomly selected adult English Cram schools.

2. The limited research targets directly influence the universality of the results
of research and analysis. This research may include biased inaccuracy in the
data. Thus, the sample obtained may not cover the common characteristics of
all the adult English training schools in Taiwan. This study also only targeted
research on leadership style and instructor job satisfaction.

3. Leadership theory has been studied mostly in normal schools; very few
studies have been conducted in adult English cram schools. But there are
some differences between the normal schools and the adult English cram
schools.

4. Because many variables influence job satisfaction and leadership styles, this
research eliminated some variables to simplify the research procedure.
Therefore, the results of this study may have certain degree of difference
compared to the real situation.

5. As for the reliability of the survey instruments, this research relied mainly
on repliers’ recognition, willingness, and their own explanation to answer
the questionnaires. Therefore, the results are not necessarily suitable for other private enterprises or the organization.

6. All variables in this research were obtained by subjective measurement. Although the five levels in the Likert scale increased the convenience of analysis, it also limited the rigor of the research.

7. The limitations of translations and cultural differences between the population of this research and the population for which the survey instruments were written may influence the validity of the conclusion.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the possible relationships between the school leaders’ leadership styles and foreign English teachers’ job satisfaction in adult English cram schools in Taipei and Kaohsiung city in Taiwan. Scholarly research has established theories to explain factors that influence job satisfaction, but little research has been done on the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction of cram schools.

Employees’ satisfaction and retention have always been important issues for all kinds of organizations and businesses. After all, high levels of absenteeism and employee turnover can affect recruitment and retraining. However, very few organizations in
Taiwan have made job satisfaction a top priority, perhaps because they have failed to understand that satisfied employees tend to be more productive, creative, and committed to their employers.

The results of this study might help school leaders understand more clearly what foreign teachers need and whether their job satisfaction is related to the school leaders’ leadership style. Moreover, school leaders may improve their foreign teachers’ commitment to the school by referring to the results of this study.

Overview of Chapters of the Research

Chapter 1 provided an overview of the situation faced by most English cram schools in Taiwan and introduced the problem statement, methodology, and significance of the study. Chapter 2 consists of the literature review and related theories in the areas of leadership, including development of leadership theories, different leadership styles of new leadership theories, job satisfaction theories and related research, teachers’ job satisfaction and reasons for leaving, and leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. Chapter 3 contains the methodology of the research, including research design, research procedure, survey participants, protection of human subjects, instruments, data collection procedure, and data analysis. Chapter 4 contains the results and findings from quantitative and qualitative data collection of randomly selected cram schools. Chapter 5
consists of discussion, conclusion, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Leadership style is an important factor that influences job satisfaction (Lashbrook, 1997). Any organization requires management, and management, in turn, requires a certain degree of leadership ability. School supervisors, for example, direct daily work through some sort of leadership behaviors and their leadership influences the teachers in a direct way. For English cram schools, the relationship between supervisors and teachers proves to be much more direct than that of other schools.

Obviously, different leadership styles will engender different working atmospheres and directly influence the job satisfaction of teachers (Bogler, 2001, 2002; Heller, 1993; McKee, 1991; Timothy & Ronald, 2004). In addition to tracing the literature in leadership theories and instructors’ job satisfaction, this review also probed the relationships between job satisfaction and leadership style.

Development of Leadership Theories

Leadership is a key factor that motivates a group of people to achieve a decided goal. A leader’s behavior influences a follower’s behavior; in other words, to lead is to adopt suitable means and action to communicate with followers so they can work collectively to reach an organizational goal (Chuang, 2002). Burns (1978) indicated that
leadership is hard to comprehend, but it can be observed in human activities. Jacobs and Jaques (1990) stated that to lead is to offer followers a meaningful goal so they are willing to work toward the goal. Kakkar and Lutz (1981) indicated that leadership is a behavior displayed under different situations; it is a consequence of an organizational goal and followers’ demand of satisfaction. Owens (1991) stated that leadership is the interpersonal way of finding followers’ potential needs so that the goals of the organization can be reached by influencing followers.

Figure 1 outlines the development of leadership theories across 100 years: the Trait Era, from the late 1800s until the mid-1940s, when scholars studied individual traits of efficient leaders; the Behavior Era, from mid-1940s and early 1970s, when researchers studied the influences of leaders’ work styles and behaviors on efficiency of leadership in order to provide bases for training leaders; the Contingency Era, from early 1960s till present, when scholars formulated theories that paid close attention to the interaction between behaviors and environments of leaders and followers and the environmental conditions suitable for various styles of leaderships; and the New Leadership Approach, from early 1980s till present, when new theories were proposed to classify leadership into transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire styles. In general, new leadership theories hold that leaders gain trust and respect from followers.
Figure 1. The eras of leadership development.

Trait Theories of Leadership

Trait theories of leadership mainly focus on individual traits of efficient leaders. Stodgill (1948) studied leaders to find common traits among them. This research found that leaders’ traits are body functions involving individual vitality, enthusiasm, appearance; social background (e.g., educational background of higher learning, good social position); wisdom and capacity (e.g., good professional competence, communication skills); character (e.g., self-confidence, domination, initiative, independence, creativity, self-restraint); traits for work (e.g., aspiration for achievements, sense of responsibility, entrepreneur spirit); and good social skills (e.g., administrative capacity, cooperative skills).
Researchers remain interested in the traits of good leaders. Hay (1990) indicated nine traits essential to efficient leadership, including flexibility, sense of responsibility, influence, conceptualization, multi-angle of view, foresight, respect and sensibility, communication skills, and self-knowledge. Rowley (1997) listed four important characteristics, namely intelligence, initiative, self-assurance, and the helicopter trait. Most people believe that successful leaders must have a series of consistent and unique personal traits. In 2000, Rowden indicated six qualities that separate leaders from non-leaders: enterprise, desire for influencing others, integrity, honesty, self-confidence, wisdom, and high skills for work.

Trait theories of leadership neglect situational factors, the relative importance between various traits, and the differentiation between cause and effect. Indeed, these theories cannot fully explain leaders’ behaviors. Trait theories can provide the basis for selecting and training leaders. They only indicate what traits may contribute successful leadership, but there are no guarantees that other environmental factors will not make the difference between successful leadership and failed leadership.

**Behavioral Theory**

Behavioral theorists study the influences of leaders’ work styles and behaviors on the efficiency of leadership to provide the basis for training leaders. Before the 1980s, the
main research findings of behavioral theory included the University of Michigan Leadership Studies (Robbins, 2001) in which researchers investigated the dynamics that influence leadership effectiveness. These studies strived to find ways to measure behaviors that made leaders effective. In the late 1940s, the Ohio State University Leadership Studies (Robbins, 2001), attempted to identify the dimensions of leadership behavior. The staff of Ohio State created a Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ; Nahavandi, 2003) that was designed to discover how leaders carry out their activities. Questions focused on two elements of leadership: initiating structure and task behavior. The Management Grid Theory of Blake and Mouton (1964, 1966) identified two functions of leaderships: the task function concern for production and the relationship function concern for people.

Those theories studied leaders’ behaviors by focusing on employees and production and leaders’ management and employees’ participation. Such theories have managed to describe consistent relationships between leaders’ behaviors and work performances of groups; yet, they neglect situational factors of leadership. Bass (1985) developed transformational leadership theory to improve upon earlier theories by emphasizing both the rational and emotional bases of subordinate motivation and behavior (Koh et al., 1995).
Contingency Theory

Contingency theory of leadership pays close attention to interaction between behaviors and environments of leaders and employees and the environmental conditions suitable for various styles of leaderships. This theory focuses on situational conditions influencing leadership. Before the 1970s, the main research findings of contingency theory included the contingency model (Fiedler, 1967), path-goal theory (House, 1971), situational leadership theory (Heresy & Blanchard, 1969, 1993), and the leader-participation model (Vroom & Yetton, 1973).

Such theories study styles of leadership in various situations, including the characters of employees, the relations between leaders and employees, the nature of work, and other situational factors. Recent transcultural research has discovered that culture is an important factor in influencing leaders’ behaviors. Indeed, leaders in different countries exhibit behavior patterns that can be attributed primarily to their distinct cultures (Bennell, 1977).

According to contingency theory, certain leadership styles cannot be applied universally; leaders’ behavior is altered by the character of the individual leader and by the conditions of employees. Later research findings indicated that leaders’ behaviors are not essential in all cases; for example, leadership substitute theory (Kerr & Jermier as
cited in Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1996) pointed out that employees can effectively fulfill their tasks without superior leadership in certain environments. Thus, environmental factors are regarded as substitute for leadership. However, contingency theory is considered by some as being too complicated and difficult for practitioners, which presents certain limitations on the application of such theory.

**New Leadership Approach**

When Bass discussed transformational leadership theory, he (1985) classified leadership style into transformational leadership and transactional leadership. Bass (1985), Howell and Avolio (1993), Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995) and Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1997) indicated five factors relating to those two leadership styles. As shown in Table 1, those factors relating to transformational leadership include charismatic leadership (CH), intellectual stimulation (IS), and individual consideration (IC); while factors relating to transactional leadership include contingent rewards (CR) and management-by-exception (MBE). Later, in order to emphasize the importance of charisma, Bass separated out inspirational motivation (IM) from charismatic leadership (CH) as an individual factor.

Bass, Avolio, and Yammarino (1990) further applied charismatic leadership to leaders’ traits or behaviors, presenting charismatic leadership as attributed charisma (AC) and idealized influence/behavioral charisma (II). To emphasize the importance of MBE,
Avolio et al. (Humphreys, 2001) classified it into active (MBEA) and passive (MBEP).

Thus, transformational leadership and transactional leadership have eight factors, and further include laissez-faire leadership as the ninth factor (Bass, 1998).

Table 1

*Leadership Styles and Factors of New Leadership Approach*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Styles</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Charisma and Inspirational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Consideration (IC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>Contingency Reward (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management-by-exception Active (MBE-A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire Leadership</td>
<td>Management-by-exception Passive (MBE-P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laissez-faire (LF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditional leadership theory regards relationships between leaders and employees as between the active and the passive. Contingency theory insists that leaders design proper behaviors in accordance with situational factors and employees accept such behaviors only passively. New leadership theory holds that leaders gain trust and respect from employees; thus, leadership is a kind of continuously adjusted process in which a leader’s behavior changes according to feedback from employees. New leadership theory
also insists that leaders and employees reach a common ground, while leaders gradually imbue employees with belongingness to the organization by the leaders’ attraction and behaviors.

Meanwhile, new leadership theory emphasizes employees’ working skills and capabilities to solve problems, encouraging employees to query current systems and situations to solve problems in rational and creative way. Furthermore, new leadership theory combines leaders’ behaviors with construction of organizational cultures. New leadership theory often imbues employees with organizational values; thus, employees can well identify themselves with organizational goals and organizational cultures, thereby improving organizational performances as a whole.

Leadership Styles of the New Leadership Approaches

New leadership approaches classify leadership styles as transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. Following are descriptions and definitions of these styles according to the new leadership approach.

_Transformational Leadership Style_

According to Burns (1978), “transformational leadership relates to the process by which leaders and employees encourage and support one another to reach higher level of morality and motivation” (p. 20). Transformational leaders have better relationships with
their supervisors and make more of a contribution to the organization than do those who are only transactional (Bass, 1990). Transformational leadership occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they entice their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group.

Avolio (1999) stated that transformational leadership is fundamentally “morally uplifting” (p. 34). Such leaders stimulate challenge as opposed to suppressing it when it arises. Transformational leaders can improve employees’ confidence based on transformation of organizational culture (Bass & Avolio, 1993); thus, employees will make extra efforts to pursue higher objectives of the organization.

Factors of Transformational Leadership Style

Charisma is considered the most critical behavior in the transformational leadership model (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990). This dimension is characterized by the providing of vision and a sense of mission, and gaining respect and trust. Transformational leadership divides this charisma factor into attributed and behavioral idealized influence components (Humphreys, 2001).

Attributed charisma (AC). Attributed charisma emphasizes leaders’ traits. According to Conger and Kanungo (1987), charisma describes the source of power. Such
power is not based on tradition or formal authority but is from individual sacred and
heroic qualities and model behaviors. Bass (1985) insisted that charismatic leaders should
have traits of self-confidence, self-respect, self-independence, transformation and ability
to solve internal conflicts. Charismatic leaders are eager for power, confident, and
persuasive; thus, adherents’ reliance on leaders can be promoted (House, 1992).
Charismatic leaders are keen on employees’ needs and will venture to promote reform
with perfect future vision (Conger & Kanungo). Charismatic leaders have traits of
self-respect, self-restraint, generosity, open-mindedness, and good faith, as well as
consideration for others.

*Idealized influence (II) or behavioral charisma.* Idealized charisma emphasizes
behaviors of charismatic leaders (Bass, 1999). Charismatic leaders have great power and
influence. Employees want to identify with them, and they have a high degree of trust
and confidence in them. Charismatic leaders inspire and excite their employees with the
idea that they may be able to accomplish great things with extra effort (Bass, 1990).
According to House (1992), charismatic leaders manage to act as capable leaders to
provide practical and affective vision for organizations and encourage employees to work
for organizations; charismatic leaders also show high-confidence and high expectation of
employees by words and deeds to inspire employees with enthusiasm and vitality.
Therefore, employees will devote themselves to realizing objectives of organizations.

Conger and Kanungo (1987) held that leaders should help to free employees from difficult positions; thus, influences of leaders on employees should be improved so as to bring up charismatic leaders.

*Inspirational motivation (IM).* Originally as a factor of charismatic leadership, inspirational motivation has been classified as an individual factor in order to emphasize its importance (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Because leaders often present symbols of ideals and encourage adherents to understand their sacred missions and lofty goals by emotional proposition, adherents are willing to follow such leaders. This dimension is characterized by the communication of high expectations, using symbols to focus efforts, and expressing important purposes in simple ways.

*Intellectual stimulation (IS).* “Intellectual stimulation refers to leaders encouraging employees to challenge various traditional methods, values, beliefs and goals for continuous innovation and breakthrough” (Bass, 1985, p. 6). Transformational leaders motivate employees to change their subjective opinions, methods of solving problems, modes of thinking, imaginations, beliefs, and values. Moreover, transformational leaders stimulate employees’ conceptualization, comprehension, and identification of a problem’s nature. According to Humphreys (2001), an intellectually
stimulating leader assists followers in looking at old problems from new and different perspectives.

\textit{Individual consideration (IC).} The mutual obligation between the leaders and the followers facilitates the transformational leader’s individual consideration (Bass, 1999). According to Avolio and Bass (as cited in Koh et al., 1995), transformational leaders are typically willing to delegate projects to stimulate and create experiences and to treat each follower with respect as a unique individual. These scholars also hold that individual consideration should be classified into developmental orientation, individual orientation, and mentoring orientation. Humphreys (2001) also stated that a leader in the individual consideration dimension tends to pay close attention to the individual differences among his or her followers.

\textit{Transactional Leadership Style}

According to Burns (1978), “transactional leadership style relates to a process through which leaders and employees agree to transact things of value including the spiritual and material to realize their objectives; thus, the two parties can transact profits and services with each other” (p. 19). Bass (1999) had similar views, namely, that transactional leadership relates to a process where leaders and employees continuously negotiate and transact with each other. During such transactions, leaders undertake to
clarify roles of employees, inspire employees with confidence, understand employees’ needs and desires and clearly tell employees how to fulfill their demands and desires.

Leaders transact with employees by right of economic conditions so that employees can follow their agreement to provide labor services to fulfill their material and mental demands with maximum benefits.

*Factors of Transactional Leadership Style*

*Contingency reward (CR).* Bass (1985) emphasized that “proper opportunities should be grasped and relevant methods should be adopted to set goals or apply reward; employees who behave well should be praised in their presence” (p. 6). Avolio and Bass (1999) indicated that the contingent reward factor is represented in terms of constructive and positive exchange with employees. Waldman, Bass, and Yammarino (1990) also determined that contingent reward leader behavior is correlated to follower attitudes and performance.

*Management-by-exception active (MBEA).* According to Avolio and Bass (1999), management-by-exception indicates that leaders should be involved in relevant matters only if members make mistakes or damage progress. In other words, transactional leaders should act when there is evidence that employees are not following plans. Bass and Avolio considered that (active) management-by-exception should adopt certain standards
to evaluate employees’ performances; during that process, leaders should continuously check employees’ performances and take actions immediately if employees’ performances are not up to standard.

**Laissez-Faire Leadership Style and its Factors**

**Factors of Laissez-faire Leadership Style**

*Management-by-exception passive (MBEP).* According to Bass and Avolio (1990), under leaders adopting (passive) management-by-exception, employees should be responsible for everything in the company whether important or not, and leaders should take actions only if problems occur or the situation becomes serious.

*Laissez-faire.* Bass (1985) undertook to research leadership using factor analyses; such factors include transformational leadership and transactional leadership, as well as non-leadership. In 1990, Bass presented the non-leadership factor yet it has failed to receive much attention because it is not seen as an important factor. However, Bass and Avolio (1990) held that such a factor did exist and therefore should be properly studied; it has been measured on the MLQ.

Non-leadership is also called laissez-faire leadership (LF). According to the definition by Bass and Avolio (1990), laissez-faire leadership relates to a process by which leaders let employees go their own way while trying their best not to get involved
in matters of the organization. Thus, decision-making may often be delayed; such leaders will not pay attention to employees’ feedback, rewards, and interventions, nor will they try to encourage others or understand and fulfill employees’ demands.

These different leadership styles and relevant factors are reflected in the very detailed Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Using MLQ, researchers can judge employees’ attitudes toward jobs and leaders according to different leadership styles.

Job Satisfaction Research Among Employees

Job satisfaction refers to an individual’s positive emotional reaction to a particular job. It is an affective reaction to a job that results from the person’s comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired, anticipated, or deserved (Oshagbemi, 1999).

Connotation of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to perceptions that people hold of work or the correlative attitudes composed of all aspects of work. Hoppock (1935) brought this definition forward for the first time. He took job satisfaction as a kind of physical and physiological satisfactory feeling toward work and working circumstances. Hoppock also said that a person may be satisfied, dissatisfied, or uncertain; he or she may be satisfied with some aspects of the job and dissatisfied with others, and such satisfaction may vary from day to day and be rationalized. In other words, job satisfaction is a kind of subjective response
that workers make towards their working conditions.

When studying job satisfaction, different theory constructions are adopted according to different target groups and these theories usually are categorized into three types:

1. Overall job satisfaction—Kalleberg (1977) defined job satisfaction as a unitary concept, a general attitude toward the job as a whole.

2. Expectation Discrepancy—Porter and Lawler (1968) defined job satisfaction as the gap between an individual actual reward and the expected reward; satisfaction is high when the gap is small but low when the gap is big.

3. Frame of Reference—Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) thought that job satisfaction was the result obtained by individuals, including the job itself, pay, supervisor, promotion, and coworkers. It could also be called Job Facet Satisfaction (Syu, 1996).

Based on these basic concepts, many scholars have brought forward their own perspectives on job satisfaction. Vroom (1964) proposed that job satisfaction comprises feelings or emotional responses that the employees held toward their roles at work. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) believed that job satisfaction is something like the distance between the actual value and the expected rewards in a certain working circumstance (i.e.,
the smaller the distance, the higher the job satisfaction; contrarily, the greater the distance, the lower the job satisfaction). In spite of nuanced differences among scholars on the delimitation of job satisfaction, most of them agree on the emotional responses that the employees hold toward their roles in work.

Essentiality of Job Satisfaction

All organizations, of course, are composed of people, and their moods and emotions are closely linked with work efficiency. Job satisfaction is one of the criteria for establishing a healthy organizational structure and can be used to forecast behavior factors for organizations (Seashore & Taber, 1975). The higher job satisfaction, the lower the turnover tendency becomes; contrarily, the lower the job satisfaction, the higher the turnover tendency becomes. Thus, job satisfaction is the condition of establishing a healthy organizational environment.

Job satisfaction is defined as the feelings an employee has about his or her job experiences in relation to previous job experiences and other available alternatives (Stanton & Crossley, 2000). Job satisfaction must not be omitted when considering behavior in an organization. High job satisfaction helps employees to cooperate actively with each other to reach the common target for their organization, to follow company rules, to be more interested in their work, to complete their work with greater spontaneity,
and to be faithful to their organizations. Attention to job satisfaction can help identify misplaced strategies and plans at a preliminary stage for proper supervision.

In addition to helping to adopt remedies, attention to job satisfaction can be used as an important factor in decision making. However, Glen (2003) did not agree that satisfaction guarantees productivity. In fact, he believed that it probably does the opposite, and that satisfaction does not equal creativity.

*Theories Related to Job Satisfaction*

The theories of job satisfaction have changed with the development of psychology. The specific theories are represented as follows.

*Need-hierarchy Theory by Maslow*

Maslow divided humans’ basic needs into five levels: physiological, safety, love and belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization (Robbins, 2001). Physiological needs are the basic organism and basic needs of life maintenance, such as food and shelter. Safety needs are the need to avoid threats and fears, these are aimed at meeting people’s survival needs. Social needs are those of mutual agreement and affection, rooted in people’s intercommunications including kinship, friendship, and solicitude.

Esteem means the need for agreement, approval, care, and respect. If such needs are fulfilled, people will feel self-esteem, self-confidence, and self-respect; they will feel
self-contempt and self-dejection if they cannot achieve these esteem needs.

Self-actualization is the need to exert one’s capabilities and potentials to reach the top state of creativity.

Maslow’s defining work was his development of the hierarchy of needs; he believed that the human beings were aspired to become self-actualizing (Bennis, 1998).

Need Achievement Theory by McClelland

Three aspects of this theory are closely linked with individuals’ working attitudes. The first is the need for achievement ($nAch$) or to do better. When individuals desire to achieve something, they follow an internal motivation to obtain fulfillment. Obviously, achievements have their differences in grade, and high achievements require a willingness to take responsibility to solve problems, to systematically work to set an appropriate target, and to work for rewards (Robbins, 2001).

The second is the need for affiliation ($nAff$). This is the need for admission, affection and friendship as well as the desire to establish socially interactive behavior relationships. High affiliation needs focus on intercommunicative activities and preference for social relationships above organization tasks (Robbins, 2001).

Finally, there is the need for power ($nPow$), or the desire to obtain power and authority. Those who have a high need for power always desire to dominate or control
others (Robbins, 2001).

*Expectancy Theory by Vroom*

Expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) posits that the strength of a tendency to act in a certain way depends on the strength of an expectation that the act will be followed by a given outcome and on the attractiveness of that outcome to the individual (Robbins, 2001). Expectancy theory focuses on three key elements: effort-performance relationship, performance-reward relationship, and rewards-personal goals relationship. This theory helps explain why some workers are not motivated and only do the minimum to get by. Moreover, as a contingency model, the theory also recognizes that there is no universal principle for explaining everyone’s motivations (Robbins, 2001).

*Equity Theory by Adams*

Adams formulated the equity theory of job motivation in 1965 (Robbins, 2001). It is based on the idea that people will make comparisons with others to help decide what is fair and reasonable in an exchange. Adams considered that job satisfaction was decided by individuals’ understanding of the equity between work and reward. The framework for equity theory, which is also called social comparison theory, consists of three variants: (a) all the input that individuals put in work; (b) all rewards they achieve; and (c) the comparison between input and output and the parallel comparison between those with
equal levels.

Workers examine their experience, age, educational background, status, and efforts, and then estimate whether their rewards including salary, status, and promotion chance are appropriate. If they find inequality in reward, they may try to change their input or their outcomes, distort their perception of self, distort their perception of others, choose a different referent, or leave the field (Wasler et al., 1978). Thus, whether the subjective estimation is fair or not can be decided through the comparison. When individuals find fairness, they may have satisfactory feelings; if not, they may have dissatisfactory feelings. Adams believed that the strength of an individual’s motive lies in the inequality of input and reward. When individuals receive a complaint, they may take actions to increase or decrease their effort according to their motivation.

*Motivation-Hygiene Theory by Herzberg*

The motivation-hygiene theory is also called the two-factors theory. Herzberg (1966) did not consider job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as two ends of a continuum. He put job satisfaction and dissatisfaction into different categories that were not connected with one another. The two-factors theory emphasizes that low job satisfaction does not mean that the individual is dissatisfied with the job. Herzberg pointed out that workplace behavior is mostly affected either by hygiene (the work environment) or by
motivation (the challenge of the work itself). The best result comes from improving the challenge of the work, not from improving the quality of the work environment (Fisher, 1999).

*ERG Theory by Alderfer*

Alderfer (1972) agreed with Maslow’s (1954) hierarchical view of needs. Alderfer posited that as a need is fulfilled, its strength diminishes and the strength of the next need up the hierarchy increases. Moreover, Alderfer revised the basic Maslow’s theory and divided humans’ needs into the following three aspects (Robbins, 2001).

First are Existence Needs, or psychological and safety needs. These include the substantial conditions for living and physical conditions for working (e.g., salary, welfare, hunger, and thirst). Existence needs are similar to Maslow’s psychological and safety needs.

Next are Relatedness Needs, or the correlative needs of significance and all social potentials of individuals in their working environments. When considering the harmonious relations in school, for example, this kind of need fulfillment refers to the fulfillment of shared feelings and related intercommunication. Relatedness needs share some similarities with safety needs, namely social needs in Maslow’s theory.

Finally, there are Growth Needs. These refer to the needs of individuals’ dignity
and growth pursuits, including all kinds of potentials and creativities in pursuing success. If individuals can combine self-capability and self-dignity to realize ambition, they can fulfill their needs. This is similar to self-actualization needs in Maslow’s theory.

Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction

There are many factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction. Studies about the relationship between school leader’s leadership style and faculty job satisfaction can be found for many educational settings. Results of these studies have supported the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001 & 2002; Heller, 1993; McKee, 1991; Timothy & Ronald, 2004; Walumbwa et al., 2005; Yan, 1989). Employees tend to be more satisfied when their managers are good leaders. Smith (2000) conducted a research on perceived behavior of principals by teachers in elementary schools. He defined “leadership as the process or activity of influencing an individual or group in efforts towards achieving a goal” (p. 4). Directors of schools must fully consider ways to inspire teachers with enthusiasm to improve their job satisfaction. This includes motivating employees to do a good job, striving for excellence, or just taking action (Bavendam, 2000).

The research findings of Podsakoff (1996) point out that the influence of charismatic leadership on employees’ behaviors can be explained by employees’
confidence in leaders. Although behaviors of transformational leaders directly influence employees’ consciousness of their own roles and task allocations, these leaders can further influence employees’ awareness of leaders’ efficiency. Transformational leaders’ efficiency is revealed through the leaders’ communication skills, employees’ consciousness of their roles, clarity of tasks, and openness of communication during fulfillment of whole organizational goals.

Considerable research has shown that leader behavior can have profound and consistent influence on several facets of employee satisfaction. Bass (1998) showed that transformational leadership can have a significantly greater effect than transactional leadership in predicting employee satisfaction with the leader. Also, according to Koh et al. (1995), a transformational leadership style strengthens employees’ sense of belongingness and meets employees’ needs for self-actualization; therefore, production rate increases while turnover rate decreases.

Variables Influencing Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is the basic attitude of a worker, and the most complete theory of job satisfaction was brought out by Seashore and Taber in 1975. They divided job satisfaction into two main variables: cause and effect. The cause variable includes environment attributes such as the political and economic environment, quality of work,
and working environment. It also includes personal attributes such as demographic data, personal characteristics, personal recognition and expectation, and temporary personal characteristics. The effect variable includes a personal reaction such as passive attack and retreat. It also includes an organizational reaction, such as production, job performance, absenteeism, and flowing rate as well as social reactions such as gross national product, the stability of the politic, and life quality.

Perie and Baker (1997) indicated that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors affect a teacher’s satisfaction. For teachers, intrinsic satisfaction can come from such as classroom activities and daily interaction with students. Extrinsic factors include salary, perceived support from administrators, school safety, and availability of school resources.

Ingersoll (2001) indicated that the teacher turnover rate resulting from teachers’ job dissatisfaction and pursuit of better jobs is much higher than the teacher retirement rate. Meanwhile, low salaries, inadequate support from the school administration, student discipline problems, and insufficient staffing contribute to higher rates of turnover. A number of studies suggest that higher wages reduce the propensity of teachers resigning (Brewer, 1996; Dolton & Van Der Klaauw, 1995; Mont & Reese, 1996; Murnane & Olsen, 1989; Stinebrickner, 2001).

Because the number of teachers is increasing, salaries are among the most
expensive items in educational budgets. Schlechty and Vance (1983) and
Darling-Hammond (2003) proposed that a low salary is one of the main reasons that the
many academically able people with alternative career options leave the teaching field.
Perhaps better qualified teachers tend to be more dissatisfied than less qualified teachers,
and thus they would be more likely to leave their teaching position (Schlechty & Vance).
This finding may be partially attributable to the fact that teachers with better
qualifications perceive more alternative opportunities.

Demographic factors are also important. Young teachers are more likely to leave
than older teachers (Ingersoll, 2001; Murnane, 1987), though this may only be partly true.
In addition, women have been found to be more satisfied than men (Chapman & Lowther,
1982; Ma & MacMillan, 1999). Numerous researchers have focused on teachers’ reasons
for leaving (Chapman & Green, 1986; Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982; Heyns, 1988;
Marso & Pigge, 1991; Miech & Elder, 1996). Their research shows that the teacher
turnover rate is strongly correlated with the individual characteristics of teachers;
meanwhile, teacher turnover rate is also correlated with ages of teachers.

However, non-salary factors and opportunity costs have been found to be
important determinants of teacher supply, and hence, the quality of teachers (Loeb &
conditions are very important to keep good teachers, there are other key conditions, such as teacher participation in decision making, strong and supportive leadership from principals, and collegial learning opportunities.

Teaching is a profession and job satisfaction in this field is similar to that of other professions. Common factors of job satisfaction influence the job satisfaction of those teaching English to adults in Taiwan; such a profession is similar to those in non-educational organizations or companies. Thus, job satisfaction of such teachers could be studied based upon standards and questionnaires of job satisfaction acknowledged by academic circles.

*Teachers’ Job Satisfaction and Their Reasons for Leaving Teaching*

According to Michaelowa (2002), teachers’ job satisfaction can be decided by the following groups of variables:

1. Variables describing the classroom environment and school facilities, such as class size and structure, students’ initial performance, availability of books, electricity, tables, blackboards and other equipment, and proximity of the next city.

2. Variables describing the teachers’ own characteristics, such as gender, family status, job experience, and qualification.
3. Variables describing the teacher’s contract conditions, such as civil servant or private employee, job perspectives, and additional work apart from teaching.

4. Variables describing the human relations, teacher’s supervision and responsibilities, such as exchange with colleagues, meetings with the director, and control by parents and school inspectors.

Michaelowa (2002) also assumed that, on average, teachers satisfied with their work (a) would choose their profession again, (b) are happy to stay in the same school, and (c) are absent less often than other teachers.

The Survey Instruments

*Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scale*

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) Scale is one instrument. The JDI is used to measure specific facets of job satisfaction and the JIG is used to measure a broader sense of job satisfaction. The exact number of facets of job satisfaction varies across studies, but five facets have consistently emerged (Cross, 1973; Smith et al., 1969). Based on early studies of job satisfaction by Smith et al. (1969), there were at least four facets of job satisfaction distinguished from one another, plus a general satisfaction factor. These four facets were Work on Present Job, Pay and Promotions, Supervision and People on Your Present Job. Smith et al. found that satisfaction with Pay and
Promotion could be very different, therefore the two factors were separated.

Although these five facets of the JDI were provided to identify strong and weak points in the principal areas of job satisfaction, but they did not provide the information needed to access overall satisfaction. Overall satisfaction is distinct from facets of satisfaction in several ways. First, facets of satisfaction omit areas that may be important to an individual when evaluating his or her overall satisfaction (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983). For example, job training or employee benefits may each contribute to different individuals’ overall satisfaction.

Second, facets of satisfaction very often include only descriptive items or have both descriptive and evaluative items. Thus, they may not adequately reflect evaluative items, and may be less valid as predictors of behavior. Third, time perspective may differ between facet and global satisfaction. Some may have to do with long-term consideration of the job or the job as a lifetime vocation. On the other hand, some questions may concern the day-to-day operations of the worker on the job. In summary, the JIG was constructed to reflect a more global, evaluative perspective that uses a longer time frame.

*Satisfaction with Present Work*

This facet is concerned with the employee’s satisfaction with the work itself. Some researches indicated that work may be related to job satisfaction, including
opportunities for creativity in general and task creativity in particular, allowing an
individual to increase his or her knowledge, and experience changes in responsibility,
amount of work, autonomy, job enrichment, and job complexity (Ronan, 1970; Smith et al., 1969).

*Satisfaction with Pay*

Satisfaction with Pay addresses attitude toward pay and is based on the perceived
difference between actual pay and expected pay. This facet is influenced by the
employee’s personal financial situation, the economy, and the amount of pay an
employee has received previously (Ronan, 1970; Smith et al., 1969; Warr & Routledge, 1969).

*Satisfaction with Promotions*

Satisfaction with Promotions measures the employee’s satisfaction with the
company’s promotion policy and the administration of that policy. This facet is a function
of the frequency of promotions, the importance of promotions, and the desirability of
promotions (Locke, 1976; Porter, 1961; Smith et al., 1969).

*Satisfaction with Supervision*

The supervision facet reflects an employee’s satisfaction with his or her
supervisor(s). In general, the more considerate and employee-centered supervisors are,
the greater the levels of employee satisfaction with supervisors (Smith et al. 1969; Vroom, 1964). Moreover, the greater the supervisor’s perceived competence on the job, the greater the levels of satisfaction with supervision.

*Satisfaction with People on the Present Job*

This facet is often referred as the coworker facet. The degree of satisfaction with coworkers is thought to be determined by the work-related interaction among coworkers and the mutual liking or admiration of fellow employees (Alderfer, 1967, Locke, 1976; Smith et al., 1969).

*Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X Short)*

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is the tool developed by Avolio and Bass. The newly revised version of the MLQ consists of 45 statements (Avolio & Bass, 2000). The MLQ has been translated into many languages so that it can be applied to evaluate leadership styles in different countries. It measures a broad range of leadership types from passive leaders, transformational leaders, and transactional leaders (*The Fourteenth Mental Measurements Yearbook*, 2001).

Hypotheses of the Research

Many studies about leadership style and job satisfaction can be found in educational settings, and results from these studies support the relationship between
leidership style and job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001, 2002; Heller, 1993; McKee, 1991; Timothy & Ronald, 2004; Walumbwa et al., 2005; Yan, 1989). According to Bogler (2001), teachers experience greater job satisfaction when working with a principal who is a transformational leader, showing personal attention to the interests and needs of the teachers. Bogler (2002) also indicated that the groups could be distinguished by teachers’ perceptions of the teaching occupation and their principals’ transformational and transactional leadership styles, as well as by several demographic characteristics.

In these studies, the leader’s leadership style is positively related to teachers’ job satisfaction. Bass (1985) studied 55 leaders and discovered that transformational leaders had significant relationship with job satisfaction and job performance. Ke (1989) studied 39 contractors and discovered that leadership styles had significant relationship to satisfaction with the job itself, coworkers, salary, and overall job satisfaction. By the same token, there is research showing that laissez-faire leadership has negatively related to subordinates’ job satisfaction (Timothy & Ronald, 2004).

Research Questions

The research questions answered by this study were:

1. What is the relationship between transformational leadership style and overall job satisfaction?
2. What is the relationship between transactional leadership style and overall job satisfaction?

3. What is the relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and overall job satisfaction?

4. Are there differences in job satisfaction among demographic variables?

5. How do foreign teachers in an English cram school in Taiwan describe their school leadership style and job satisfaction?

Summary

In this chapter, different leadership theories were reviewed, including trait theories of leadership, behavioral theory, contingency theory and transformational leadership theory of new leadership theory; in addition, different leadership styles and factors of transformational leadership theory have been explained. Meanwhile, theories and factors of job satisfaction have also been studied and factors affecting job satisfaction have been presented. Teaching is a profession and job satisfaction in teaching is similar to that of other professions.

status, gender, age, salary, level of education, and participation in administrative duties are demographic variables that influence teachers’ job satisfaction. This study investigated the relationship between leadership style, demographic variables, and job satisfaction of foreign English teachers in adult English cram schools in Taipei and Kaohsiung City in Taiwan. The research methodology will be explained in chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study investigated the possible relationship between school leaders’ leadership style, demographic variables, and foreign teachers’ job satisfaction in 20 randomly selected adult English cram schools in Taipei and Kaohsiung City, Taiwan. Twenty school leaders and 300 foreign teachers participated in this study. The leadership styles were measured using the MLQ–5X, including the leader and follower forms. Job satisfaction was evaluated using the JDI and JIG. This chapter includes information regarding the research design, participants, protection of human subjects, instruments, data collection, and data analysis techniques.

Research Design

This study attempted to determine whether there is a relationship between school leaders’ leadership styles and foreign teachers’ job satisfaction in adult English cram schools. Demographic variables were included in the study of the relationship.

School leaders’ leadership styles, was measured using the MLQ–5X (Avolio & Bass, 2000); both leaders and teachers were required to complete either the leader or follower form. School leaders were surveyed with the Chinese version of the MLQ, and English teachers were surveyed with the English version of the MLQ.
Foreign teachers’ job satisfaction was measured using the English version of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General Scale by Smith et al. (1969). The survey was completed conducted with English-speaking teachers only.

The researcher first used a quantitative method to determine the correlation between leadership styles and job satisfaction. First, reliability analysis was used to indicate the reliability and stability of the instrument. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to show whether or not the leadership style of a cram school leader had impact on its foreign English teachers. Second, correlation analyses were conducted to measure the relationship between two multidimensional variables. Correlation coefficients between three leadership styles and six JDI facets showed the direction and the degree of correlation and between leadership styles and job satisfaction. Finally, regression models were used to see the impacts of the three leadership styles on the job satisfaction.

To answer research question 4, the descriptive statistics analysis techniques of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-tests were used to describe the differences in job satisfaction among demographic variables.

In addition to the correlations between leadership styles and job satisfaction, a special qualitative analysis, deep interview, was introduced in this research. An interview method was executed in the following steps. First, one cram school was chosen from the
18 in the sample; the school had characteristics similar to the whole sample pool. Second, the researcher acquired the permission of the school leader to conduct deep interviews with its foreign English teachers face to face. Third, the researcher carried out the deep interviews with all foreign English teachers and recorded their opinions about the leadership styles and the job satisfaction.

The three main questions in the interviews are:

1. What do you think about your school leader’s leadership style? Do you like it or dislike it? Do you think that his or her leadership style is helpful to you and your coworkers?

2. Do you feel satisfied with your present job? Which among the six facets of your job satisfaction—People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Opportunities for Promotion, Pay, and Supervision—wins your highest satisfaction?

3. If there is anything with which you do not feel satisfied about your present job, what is it? Is there anything in your opinion that should be improved by your school leader?

Finally, the researcher studied the relationship between the three leadership styles and job satisfaction from the deep interview records to get conclusions.
**Research Procedure**

1. Define topic and research questions
2. Identify population
3. Confirmation of subject of the research
   - Randomly selected 20 cram schools from population as clusters
4. Survey on leaders and all foreign teachers in each cluster
5. Related theories collection
6. Flowchart of the study complete
7. Distribution of questionnaire
8. Data collection and sorting out
9. Data analysis
10. Further deep interviews
11. Recommendation, discussion and conclusion
12. Final draft

*Figure 2. Flowchart of the study.*
Survey Participants

This research randomly selected 20 adult English language schools in Taipei and Kaohsiung City in Taiwan as survey subjects, in a random cluster design. From these schools, 18 school leaders and 217 foreign teachers (on average one leader and 15 teachers from each school) were surveyed. The school leaders received only the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire while the foreign English teachers received the Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scale in addition to the MLQ.

Protection of Human Subjects

This study followed the requirements of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of the Incarnate Word. The research plan was sent to the IRB for approval before data collection.

All participants received an introductory letter and a consent agreement; the introductory letter included content explaining the purpose of the study and the consent agreement indicated that the participants had the choice of whether or not to participate in the study. All participants were surveyed anonymously, and all the responses were kept confidential. The researcher ascertained that no participants would be punished for completing the survey. Only the researcher and the committee members of this study had access to the data.
Instruments

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ–5X Short)

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Fifth Edition, Short Form (MLQ–5X Short; Bass & Avolio, 2000) has been translated into various languages so that it can be used to evaluate leadership styles in different countries. The MLQ measures a broad range of leadership types from passive leaders to contingent-reward leaders to transformational leaders (The Fourteenth Mental Measurements Yearbook, 2001). School leaders received both English and Chinese versions of the Leader Form of the MLQ–5X Short and chose whether to complete the survey in English or Chinese. Foreign teachers used the English version of the Rater Form of the MLQ–5X Short.

The MLQ–5X Short includes 45 questions involving sub-aspects of three leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) and three types of leadership effectiveness. The nine leadership factors are attributed charisma, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and laissez-faire behaviors.

The statements are rated on a 5-point Likert scale representing the relative frequency of each behavior: 0 (not at all), 1 (once in a while), 2 (sometimes), 3 (fairly
often), and 4 (frequently, if not always). The reliability of MLQ factors range between .74 to .91 (Bass & Avolio, 2000). Tables 2 and 3 present sample questionnaires from the MLQ Leader and Rater forms (see Appendixes I and J for permission agreements). The Leader Form was in both English and Chinese; the Rater Form was in English only.

Table 2

**Sample Items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ–5X) (Leader Form)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Statement (English)</th>
<th>Item Statement (Chinese)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts.</td>
<td>我提供給部屬幫助以換取他們的努力工作。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.</td>
<td>我反覆檢查各種關鍵性的設想, 看其中是否妥當。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fail to interfere until problems become serious.</td>
<td>在問題惡化之前, 我不會進行干涉。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.</td>
<td>我把注意力集中在違規、錯誤、例外及偏離行為上。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid getting involved when important issues arise.</td>
<td>我避免介入以產生的重大議題。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

**Sample Items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ–5X) (Rater Form)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person I am rating provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person I am rating re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person I am rating fails to interfere until problems become serious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person I am rating focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person I am rating avoids getting involved when important issues arise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Descriptive Index (JDI, 1997 revised) and the Job in General (JIG) Scale

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) Scale (Smith et al., 1969) measure facets of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction, respectively. The JDI can be used to monitor changes in a job situation, diagnose problems, and evaluate the effects of a job improvement program (as cited in The Twelfth Mental Measurements Yearbook, 1995). The JDI and JIG questionnaires were answered only by foreign teachers.

Each of the five JDI facets and the JIG are scored separately. Facet scores are not added together but are scored by assigning numerical values. Respondents marked Y for Yes, N for No, or ? for Cannot Decide for each item. About half of the items are worded favorably (e.g., creative) so that Y indicates satisfaction and receives 3 points, N receives 0 points, and a ? receives 1 point. The remaining items are worded unfavorably (e.g., boring), so that Y indicates dissatisfaction and receives 0 points, N receives 3 points, and a ? receives 1 point.

The JDI uses 72 items to measure five discriminating facets of job satisfaction. Of these, 18 items focus on an employee’s satisfaction with the job itself (Work on Present Job); 9 items focus on an employee’s satisfaction with salary (Pay); 9 items measure satisfaction with the company’s promotion policy and the way that policy is administrated...
(Opportunities for Promotion); 18 items reflect satisfaction with the supervisor (Supervision); and 18 items assess satisfaction with coworkers (People on Your Present Job). The JIG uses 18 items to assess overall satisfaction; these items consist of a list of short phrases and adjectives of five or less words of low reading difficulty.

Points for the JIG and for the Work, Supervision, and Coworkers facets are summed to derive the score for each facet. Points for the Pay and Promotion facets are summed as well but must doubled to create the score because they include only half as many items as the other facets.

The reliability on JDI ranges from .86 to .91; this was determined by using the data from approximately 1,600 respondents in 1997. The validity relies strongly on data collected in the earlier 1985 version. “A variety of techniques were operated with 795 employees, and the evidence strongly showed that the JDI is correlated with other job satisfaction and with various job attitudes and behavior” (*The Twelfth Mental Measurements Yearbook*, 1995, p. 491).

The JIG shows high reliability via coefficient alpha (.91) and small standard errors of measurement; the validity of JIG as reported by Ironson et al. (1989) indicated that “the JIG has been shown to correlate with other job satisfaction and with various job attitudes and behavior” (*The Twelfth Mental Measurements Yearbook*, 1995, p. 491).
Table 4

**Number of Items on the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Number of Items</th>
<th>Favorable Items</th>
<th>Unfavorable Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

**Sample Items of the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job in General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of time</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People on Your Present Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask my advice</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to please</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impolite</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise good work</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful</td>
<td>Y N ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection Procedures

The researcher randomly selected 217 teachers and 18 school leaders to be surveyed. The teachers gave their perception of the leadership behaviors of their school leaders, then sealed the questionnaires. Surveyors collected the questionnaires themselves.

The researcher began the survey procedure by handing out questionnaires to relevant persons in schools and inquiring whether they were willing to participate in the
survey. Meanwhile, school leaders were invited to contact the researcher for further information.

Second, relevant contact persons were interviewed and kept informed about survey background and purpose of research. This person was the school leader or someone who handled daily school matters beside teachers. The level of research and expected results were explained orally or in written form.

Third, prepared questionnaires were delivered to contact persons who handed out questionnaires to the teaching staff and school leaders. Teachers and school leaders chose to answer the survey questionnaire in school or at home.

Fourth, contact persons were regularly reached by e-mail or telephone to see if there were any problems. In addition to the data on the surveys, the researcher collected useful information on the surveyed schools, including unit names, staff numbers, and nature of work.

Fifth, the researcher arranged for a final, short face-to-face interview in one specific cram school. First the researcher received permission from the school leader and then made an appointment to interview each foreign English teacher individually.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data from this study was analyzed using the Statistical Package
for the Social Sciences 13.0 (SPSS13.0). The alpha was set at .05 ($\alpha = .05$), and the confidence level was 95%. Means, frequencies, percentages, standard deviations, and coefficient were produced after the components went through descriptive analysis. In this manner, the cram school leadership styles and foreign teachers’ job satisfaction of Taipei and Kaohsiung City, Taiwan were analyzed. Figure 3 presents a graphical view of the research design for data analysis.

![Research Design Diagram]

**Figure 3.** Research design for quantitative data analysis.

**Summary**

This chapter described the research design, participants, protection of human subjects, instrumentation, data collecting procedures, and data analysis. This research was conducted using a quantitative approach. The research hypothesis focused on how various factors may affect foreign teachers’ job satisfaction. By random sampling, 20
schools were selected for inclusion and 18 participated (90% return rate). Of that sample, the researcher received responses from 18 school leaders and 217 foreign teachers (100% return rate of English teachers). The instruments used were the MLQ–5X Short and the JDI and JIG; both instruments have demonstrated high reliability and validity. Additionally, teachers’ demographic information was gathered.

Cronbach’s alpha, descriptive statistics analysis, t-test, and one-way ANOVAs were computed using SPSS 13.0 for Windows with significance level of 0.05. Chapter 4 provides the research results, and chapter 5 presents suggestions, conclusions, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

This study explored the possible relationship between the perceived leadership styles of the school leaders and foreign English teachers’ job satisfaction in adult English cram schools in Northern and Southern Taiwan. The relationship was examined by using the variables of school leaders’ leadership styles, teachers’ demographic variables, and teachers’ job satisfaction. Data for analysis were collected via survey from foreign teachers in 18 cram schools and interviews in one of those 18 schools.

Survey instruments were distributed to 20 school leaders. Eighteen of these were returned along with 217 surveys from foreign teachers. In this research, the results were analyzed using Cronbach’s alpha, correlation analysis, descriptive statistics analysis, t-test, and one-way ANOVA computed with a significance level of 0.05.

Sample

The target of this research was foreign teachers of adult English cram schools in Taipei and Kaohsiung city. During the survey, teachers gave their perceptions of the leadership behaviors of their school leaders. Because of the sensitivity of this topic, teachers sealed questionnaires for collection by surveyors. School leaders chose whether to answer the English or Chinese version of the MLQ; foreign teachers used the English
version of both the MLQ and JDI/JIG.

Female teachers made up the majority of respondents by 10.6%, and most
teachers were between 30 and 39 years old (53.9%). Almost none of the English teachers
participate in administration duty (98.6%) and most have a bachelor’s degree (70.5 %).
For years in teaching at the institution, the highest percentage was for those who had
taught 6 months to 1 year (31.1%), and the second highest was 2 or more years. As for
the country of origin, most English teachers were from United States (30.9%), Canada
(21.2%), England (17.5%), and Australia (16.6%).

Half of the 18 school leaders were men and only one was younger than 30 years
old. Ten were between 30 and 39 years old, and the other seven were older than age 40.
As to working experience, nine had worked in the present institution for more than 6
years and 8 (44.4%) had worked in the present institution for 1–5 years. Only one had
worked more than 10 years in the present cram school. Eight of the school leaders (44.4%)
had a bachelor’s degree, while 27.7 % of the other school leaders had some level of
college degree.

Tables 6 and 7 present the demographics for the foreign English teachers and the
school leaders, respectively.
Table 6

Demographics for Foreign Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of people (N)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 29 years old</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39 years old</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 40 years old</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Teaching at the Institute</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0.5 year</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5–1 year</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–1.5 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5–2 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–2.5 years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation in Administrative Duty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Demographics of School Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of people (N)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of people (N)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 29 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 40 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching at the Institute</th>
<th>Number of people (N)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–10 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Number of people (N)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability of Instruments

This research adopted the standard carried out by Nunnally (1978) to test the reliability of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Job Descriptive Index and Job in General (JDI and JIG). If one of the facets has a value very close to 0, this may indicate that those surveyed had very different expectations and attitudes toward the questionnaire.

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001), internal consistency is the most
popular form of reliability estimates, and Cronbach’s alpha is a common type of estimation for internal consistency. The reliability coefficient shows the degree of reliability; the higher the coefficient, the better the reliability. According to Nunnally (1994), a correlation coefficient greater than 0.7 indicates satisfactory reliability, and 0.9 is regarded as very high reliability. If deleting a question from the instrument increases the inner unity, then that question is deleted. All facets of these two instruments were retained when the value of Cronbach’s alpha was greater than 0.7 and deleted when they were lower than 0.7.

Table 8 presents the reliability of the MLQ as completed by the foreign English teachers. Factors under transformational leadership style all had Cronbach’s alphas greater than 0.7; two factors under passive avoidant (Passive Management-by-Exception and Laissez-faire) were combined to increase the reliability. The transactional leadership style, however, was deleted because both factors under it were lower than 0.6 even after some items were deleted.
Table 8

*Reliability of MLQ of Foreign English Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q10, Q18, Q21, Q25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q6, Q14, Q23, Q34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q9, Q13, Q26, Q36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q2, Q8, Q30, Q32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q15, Q19, Q29, Q31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q3, Q5, Q7, Q12, Q17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive avoidant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q20, Q28, Q33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* AC = Attributed Charisma; II = Idealized Influence; IM = Inspirational Motivation; IS = Intellectual Stimulation; IC = Individual Consideration.

The results for the MLQ for school leaders were not reliable because all of the factors under transformational and transactional leadership had to be combined to have a Cronbach’s alpha greater than 0.7. Laissez-faire leadership was deleted because the reliability was too low even after deleting or combining questions. Thus the leader’s reliability was not used in this research.

Table 9 presents the results of the reliability analysis for the JDI. Two items were deleted from the Pay facet (Income Provides Luxuries and Insecure) and one item was deleted from the Opportunities for Promotion (Unfair Promotion Policy) facet to make the reliability greater than 0.7. Table 10 presents the mean and standard deviation of each facet for the JDI.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to quantify job satisfaction, JDI scores were engaged. First, the researcher computed the average of all questions in each JDI facet for each foreign English teacher. Then the researcher calculated the sample mean of the average scores of all foreign teachers for the six JDI facets. The results are presented in Table 11.
### Table 11

**Average Scores of JDI Facets of 18 Cram Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cram School Sample</th>
<th>People on Your Present Job</th>
<th>Job in General</th>
<th>Work on Present Job Pay</th>
<th>Opportunities for Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Sample = Number of foreign English teachers*

### Results of Research Questions Analysis

After collecting the statistics, the researcher again examined the research questions. Question 2 regarding the relationship between transactional leadership style and job satisfaction could not be answered due to the low reliability of the instrument.
Similarly, the relationship between the items of Laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction could not be answered. It should be noted that the scores for Laissez-faire leadership style in the following analyses are the combined scores.

Second, to answer Questions 1 and 3, the researcher conducted a correlation analysis to determine the relationship between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction and between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction. The correlation analysis was also used to determine the correlation between MLQ transformational leadership factors and job satisfaction.

Finally, a regression analysis was used to test the effects of the three leadership styles on each JDI job satisfaction facet to see which facet was affected the most by the three leadership styles.

The correlation coefficient of two items is between -1.0 and 1.0. If the correlation coefficient of two items is positive, it can be said that they are positively correlated. Otherwise, they are negatively correlated. There is a marked degree of correlation between two items if the absolute value of the correlation coefficient is between 0.7 and 1.0. If the absolute value of the correlation coefficient is between 0.3 and 0.7, there is a moderate degree of correlation. Otherwise, it is said that there is a negligible correlation. Table 12 shows the correlation coefficients between leadership styles and JDI facets, and
Table 13 shows the correlation coefficients between the JDI facets and the transformational leadership style factors.

Transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership are both negatively correlated with pay with a moderate degree of correlation (-0.53 and -0.48, respectively).

This result shows that in the opinions of foreign English teachers in this research, the higher tendencies of their school leader’s leadership styles to be transformational leadership or laissez-faire leadership, the less satisfied they are about pay.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Leadership Facets</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Laissez-faire Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-0.53**</td>
<td>-0.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ** p < 0.01*

Table 13 shows the five MLQ transformational leadership factors that cause the moderate degree of correlations mentioned previously. Inspirational motivation and idealized influence are two main factors that influence the correlation between transformational leadership and Pay.
Table 13

**Correlations between Factors of Leadership Styles Facets and JDI Facets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Leadership Facets</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.53**</td>
<td>-0.59**</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AC = Attributed charisma; II = Idealized Influence; IM = Inspirational Motivation; IS = Intellectual Stimulation; IC = Individual Consideration;

** p < 0.01

A regression analysis was necessary to test the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction. In this analysis, the dependent variables were the six JDI facets and the independent variables were the three leadership styles and their nine factors. Regression models were designed from the correlations between nine factors, three leadership styles, and six JDI facets. Tables 14, 15, and 16 present the results.

Table 14 demonstrates that there is a marked degree of correlation between the within-group factors. First, the correlation coefficients between factors of transformational leadership, such as Attributed Charisma, Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration, are between 0.69 and 0.81. Most of the factors of transformational leadership are highly
correlated with each other (that is, the correlation coefficients are between 0.7 and 1.0).

Table 14 shows that there is a negligible or moderate degree of correlation between between-group (without-group) factors. For example, the absolute value of correlation coefficients between factors of transformational leadership and factors of passive avoidant leadership are between 0.02 and 0.33.

Table 14

*Regression Correlation between Factors of Three Leadership Styles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Passive Avoidant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.81*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>0.80*</td>
<td>0.81*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>0.71*</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.80*</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. AC= Attributed charisma; II= Idealized Influence; IM=Inspirational Motivation; IS=Intellectual Stimulation; IC=Individual Consideration.

*p < 0.05

Almost all factors of the three leadership styles are highly correlated with the within-group factors and the between-group correlations are low; it is clear that the three leadership styles, instead of the nine factors, are good enough to be the explanatory, or independent, variables.

Table 15 shows that there is negligible degree of correlation between leadership
styles. The correlation coefficient between transformational leadership, the correlation coefficient between transformational leadership and passive avoidant leadership is 0.21, and the correlation coefficient between passive avoidant leadership is -0.21.

Table 15

*Regression Correlation between Leadership Styles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Passive Avoidant Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that there are negligible or moderate correlations between the six JDI facets. The absolute values of correlation coefficients are all between 0.02 and 0.54.

Table 16

*Regression Correlation between JDI Facets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>People on Your Present Job</th>
<th>Job in General</th>
<th>Work on Present Job</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Opportunities for Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People on Your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Job</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction Analysis

Research Question 4 was: Are there differences in job satisfaction among demographic variables? The results are as follows.

Foreign English Teacher Job Satisfaction

Data for teacher job satisfaction were collected using the Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scale. The JDI is divided into six facets: People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision.

Table 17 presents the mean scores of total teacher job satisfaction and each facet of teacher job satisfaction as a function of different teachers’ demographics.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Job in general</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.59</td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>36.86</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>37.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.15</td>
<td>43.06</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>33.29</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>34.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Job in general</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 29 years old</td>
<td>38.84</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>37.94</td>
<td>26.05</td>
<td>36.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39 years old</td>
<td>38.81</td>
<td>41.68</td>
<td>37.45</td>
<td>33.82</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>36.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 40 years old</td>
<td>38.84</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Teaching at Institutes</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Job in general</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0.5 year</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>43.41</td>
<td>35.97</td>
<td>35.17</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>38.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5–1 year</td>
<td>36.82</td>
<td>43.41</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>34.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–1.5 years</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>41.15</td>
<td>37.32</td>
<td>30.45</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>34.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5–2 years</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>43.69</td>
<td>38.06</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>38.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–2.5 years</td>
<td>40.22</td>
<td>42.924</td>
<td>37.38</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>36.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>40.36</th>
<th>36.08</th>
<th>33.57</th>
<th>28.88</th>
<th>33.42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>36.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>36.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in Administrative Duty</th>
<th>40.11</th>
<th>36.00</th>
<th>28.00</th>
<th>36.55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39.22</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>37.40</td>
<td>35.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>32.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>35.00</th>
<th>28.21</th>
<th>36.44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>38.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>39.02</td>
<td>39.02</td>
<td>39.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>38.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>42.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>46.16</td>
<td>46.16</td>
<td>46.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>34.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>36.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>40.71</td>
<td>40.71</td>
<td>40.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>38.92</td>
<td>38.92</td>
<td>38.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 217$

Table 18 presents the means and standard deviations of job satisfaction between genders. There were significant differences in job satisfaction with the job in general between genders and in job satisfaction with supervision between genders because the $p$ values are smaller than 0.05. The results also show that male teachers were more satisfied than female teachers but female teachers were more concerned about supervision than male teachers.
Table 18

\textit{t-test of English Teachers’ Job satisfaction and Gender}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>( t )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>Var.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>39.59</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.86</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>27.36</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.83</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n = 217 \)

** \( p < 0.01 \)

Table 19 shows that there was no significant difference in the satisfaction with People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision among ages levels. But there was significant difference in the satisfaction with the Pay among age levels (\( F = 3.639; p = 0.028 < 0.05 \)). However, the results of the post-hoc analysis shown in Table 20 do not show significant differences in the satisfaction with Pay among different age groups.
Table 19

One-way ANOVA Test of Difference in English Teachers’ Job Satisfaction Among Age Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>68.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>24556.19</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24624.44</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>114.75</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>203.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15469.70</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>101.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15673.08</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>72.29</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25949.39</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25969.85</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>121.26</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1411.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>41516.65</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>705.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42928.58</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>194.00</td>
<td>3.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1411.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>41516.65</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42928.58</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>210.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>121.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>45015.06</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45136.41</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>121.34</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 217

People = People on Your Present Job; JIG = Job in General; Work = Work on Present Job; Promotion = Opportunities for Promotion.

*p < 0.05
Table 20

*Multiple Comparison of English Teachers’ Job Satisfaction on Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>(I) Age</th>
<th>(J) Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30–39-year-old</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 29 years old</td>
<td>&gt; 40-year-old</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39 years old</td>
<td>&lt; 29-year-old</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.12</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 29-year-old</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 29-year-old</td>
<td></td>
<td>-9.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>&gt; 40 years old</td>
<td>30–39-year-old</td>
<td>-5.80</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 217*

Table 21 shows that there was no significant difference in the satisfaction with People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision among years of teaching at the institute. But there was a significant difference in the satisfaction with Pay among years of teaching at the institute ($p = 0.026 < 0.05$). In addition, Table 22 demonstrates that teachers who had taught more than 2 years were more concerned about the pay than those teachers who had taught at the institute between 6 months and 1 year.
Table 21

One-way ANOVA of English Teachers' Job Satisfaction Among Years of Teaching at the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>460.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>24163.74</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>115.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24624.44</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>113.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>316.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15356.75</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>79.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15673.08</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>72.44</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25883.85</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25969.85</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>122.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1359.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>43776.77</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>339.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42928.58</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>192.23</td>
<td>2.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>45136.410</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>206.49</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25509.614</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>123.576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26003.917</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>120.328</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n = 217 \)

People = People on Your Present Job; JIG = Job in General; Work = Work on Present Job; Promotion = Opportunities for Promotion.

* \( p < 0.05 \)
Table 22

*Multiple Comparison of English Teachers’ Satisfaction with Pay by Years of Teaching at the Institute*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>(I) Years</th>
<th>(J) Years</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.5 year</td>
<td>0.5–1 year</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1–1.5 year</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5–2 year</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 2 years</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5–1 year</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5 year</td>
<td>-2.91</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1–1.5 year</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5–2 year</td>
<td>-4.58</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 2 years</td>
<td>-7.38*</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–1.5 years</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5 year</td>
<td>-4.72</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5–1 year</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5–2 year</td>
<td>-6.39</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 2 years</td>
<td>-9.19</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5–2 years</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5 year</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5–1 year</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1–1.5 year</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 2 years</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2 years</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5 year</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5–1 year</td>
<td>7.38*</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1–1.5 year</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5–2 year</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 217*

*p < 0.05*

The results presented in Table 23 show that there was no significant difference between level of education and People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision, and the p values are all greater than 0.05.
Table 23

One-way ANOVA Test of Difference in English Teachers’ Job Satisfaction Among Levels of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>515.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>24108.87</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>257.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24624.44</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>112.66</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>291.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15381.13</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>145.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15673.08</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>71.87</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>497.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25472.30</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>248.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25969.85</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>119.03</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>144.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>42783.75</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>72.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42928.58</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>199.92</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>220.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>44915.72</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>110.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45136.41</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>209.89</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>406.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25596.97</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>203.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26003.92</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>119.61</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 217

People = People on Your Present Job; JIG = Job in General; Work = Work on Present Job; Promotion = Opportunities for Promotion.

Table 24 shows that there was a significant difference in satisfaction with the Opportunities for Promotion between the participation on administrative duties. However, there was no significant difference in satisfaction with People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Pay, and Supervision between the participation on
administrative duties. These results indicate that teachers who do not participate in administrative duties care more about the opportunities for promotion than those who participate in administrative duties.

Table 24

\textit{t-test Results of English Teachers’ Job Satisfaction by Participation in Administrative Duties}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Participation in Admin. Duty</th>
<th>No Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>39.23</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>37.40</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Note.} \(n = 217\)

\(*p < 0.05\)

Table 25 shows that there was no significant difference in the job satisfaction with People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities For Promotion, and Supervision among countries of origin; the \(p\) values are all greater than 0.05.
Table 25

One-way ANOVA Test of Difference between Countries of Origin and English Teachers’ Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>510.49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>24113.96</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>56.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24624.44</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>116.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>426.57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15246.51</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15673.08</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>73.66</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>814.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25155.52</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>90.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25969.85</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>121.52</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>42928.58</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>204.75</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>43382.78</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>194.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1397.30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>24606.62</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>155.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26003.92</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>118.87</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 217

People = People on Your Present Job; JIG = Job in General; Work = Work on Present Job; Promotion = Opportunities for Promotion.

Deep Interviews Analysis

Research question five is: How do foreign teachers in an English cram school in Taiwan describe their school leadership style and job satisfaction?

Because there was no significant relationship between leadership styles and job
satisfactions except for the satisfaction of Pay, further research was necessary in order to
answer research question 5. Deep interview was one method available for further
research. This research study relied mainly on respondents’ answers to the surveys, thus
analysis may have been limited. Choosing a cram school as the subject of deep interviews
could remedy this. A subject cram school for deep interviews was chosen after examining
the schools sampled. Tables 26 and 27 present the average scores of the three leadership
styles for foreign English teachers and school leaders of 18 cram schools, respectively.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cram School</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Laissez-faire Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 (continued)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (Total = 217)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sample=Number of foreign English teachers

Table 27

Average Score of Leaderships from School Leaders of 18 Cram Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cram School</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Laissez-fare Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 presents the foreign English teachers’ average score for the factors of three leadership styles for each cram school. The average scores of the factors of the three
leadership styles for each school leader were calculated in the same way. Table 29 lists the sample mean of all school leaders’ average scores. For each leadership style, the average scores of leadership were the sample means of its factors. For example, the average score of transformational leadership for a school leader was the average of that leader’s scores for Attributed Charisma, Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration.

Table 28

*Average Scores of Scales of Three Leadership Styles (Foreign English Teachers)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cram School</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cram School</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>MBEA</th>
<th>MBEP</th>
<th>LF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. AC = Attributed Charisma; II = Idealized Influence; IM = Inspirational Motivation; IS = Intellectual Stimulation; IC = Individual Consideration*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cram School</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29

*Average Scores of Scales of Three Leadership Styles (School Leaders)*
Table 29 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cram School</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Laissez-faire Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AC = Attributed Charisma; II = Idealized Influence; IM = Inspirational Motivation; IS = Intellectual Stimulation; IC = Individual Consideration

From Tables 26 and 27, the data on the school leaders’ self-rating and the foreign English teachers’ ratings of three MLQ leadership styles, it can be seen that most of school leaders over-estimated their performance of transformational leadership relative to the ratings of their employees. However, when transactional leadership is taken into consideration, the relationship between school leaders’ ratings and teachers’ ratings is not distinguishable. Some of the school leaders over-estimated their performance, and others
under-estimated their performance. There was a significant difference in the school 
leaders’ ratings and teachers’ ratings of laissez-faire leadership. In other words, the 
estimates of transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership of school leaders and 
foreign English teachers were quite inconsistent. However, the appraisals of transactional 
leadership of school leaders and foreign English teachers were consistent in general.

Among 18 cram schools, the 12th cram school has 18 samples, which was more 
than all other cram schools except for the 14th cram school. Furthermore, it had a 
characteristic similar to one in the whole sample pool: the school leader of the 12th cram 
school over-estimated her performance of transformational leadership and laissez-faire 
leadership and her self-rating of transactional leadership is almost the same with the 
estimates from foreign English teachers in that cram school. Therefore, this school was 
used to look more closely at the relationship between leadership and satisfaction. The 
school leader gave permission for their foreign English teachers to be interviewed.

The demographic variables of school leader and foreign English leaders of the 
12th cram school are shown in Tables 30 and 31. The school leader was a 36-year-old 
woman who had worked in the present institution for 7 years. Her education level is 
college.

Eighteen foreign English teachers in this cram school agreed to be interviewed.
Among them, 8 were women and 10 were men. Their ages were between 25 and 36 years. This means the cram school is composed of young foreign English teachers as compared to their school leader. Most of the foreign English teachers reported their education level was a bachelor’s degree; only two of them reported a college education without a degree. The 18 foreign English teachers came from Australia, the United States of America, Canada, England, and South Africa. Most of them were from Australia and the United States. The length of the teachers’ working experience in the present institution was mainly between 0.5 and 2 years. This cram school has a very high turnover because the average working experience is not long.

Table 30

Demographic Variables of School Leader of the 12th Cram School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at the Institute</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31

Demographic Variables of Foreign English Teachers of the 12th Cram School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0.5yr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5–1yr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–1.5yr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5–2yr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–2.5yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5–3yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at the Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To understand the relationship between the job satisfaction of foreign English teachers and the three leadership styles they recognized in their cram school, the 18 teachers were divided into two groups, identifiers and dissenters, for each kind of leadership. That is, there were six groups in the analysis: dissenters of transformational leadership, identifiers of transformational leadership, dissenters of transactional leadership, identifiers of transactional leadership, dissenters of laissez-faire leadership, and identifiers of laissez-faire leadership. The benchmark was the school leader’s self-rating of the three kinds of leadership.

A foreign English teacher was classified into the group of dissenters if he or she had a lower rating toward the leadership as compared with the school leader’s
corresponding rating. Otherwise, he or she was classified in the group of identifiers.

Table 32 shows that there were 11, 9, and 16 dissenters toward transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership, respectively. That means there were 7, 9, and 2 identifiers of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership, respectively.

Table 33 lists the average scores of the six JDI facets for the other five groups.

The difference between the dissenters and the identifiers was defined as the average score of each JDI facet of the identifiers minus the corresponding average score of the dissenters.

When transformational leadership is taken into consideration, the maximum of difference was 0.396 for the JDI facet of Opportunities for Promotion and the minimum was -0.719 for the JDI facet Pay. That is, for the group of identifiers, opportunities for promotion is the most effective way for them to obtain job satisfaction. In other words, the main reason they give the school leader a higher rating for transformational leadership is that she offers better opportunities for promotion. On the other hand, for the group of dissenters, pay is the most effective way to obtain job satisfaction. That is, the main reason the dissenters stay in their present job is the satisfying pay the school leader offers.
For transactional leadership, the results were the same as with transformational leadership. However, regarding laissez-faire leadership, the maximum was 0.753 for People on Your Present Job. That is, for the group of identifiers, the nice interpersonal relationship on the present job is the most effective way for them to obtain job satisfaction. In other words, the main reason they give the school leader a higher rating for laissez-faire leadership is that she maintains great surroundings for interpersonal relationship.

Table 32

*JDI Facet Scores of Dissenters and Identifiers of Three Leadership Styles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Laissez-faire Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Dissenters</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>1.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>2.235</td>
<td>2.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>1.899</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td>1.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>2.242</td>
<td>2.272</td>
<td>1.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>1.943</td>
<td>1.917</td>
<td>2.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of JDI Supervision</td>
<td>2.076</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>1.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Identifiers</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>1.852</td>
<td>2.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td>2.358</td>
<td>2.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>2.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>1.654</td>
<td>2.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>2.339</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td>2.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of JDI Supervision</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>1.932</td>
<td>2.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-0.255</td>
<td>-0.290</td>
<td>0.753**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>-0.719*</td>
<td>-0.617*</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>0.396**</td>
<td>0.360**</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>-0.219</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * Minimum ratings, ** Maximum ratings
Tables 33 and 34 show the difference between dissenters and identifiers toward the nine factors of the three leadership styles. Table 33 presents the ratings according the five factors of transformational leadership. It is clear that all maximums appear for the Opportunities for Promotion facet and all minimums appear for the Pay facet. These results confirm the results for transformational leadership.

Table 34, however, shows different results. According to contingent reward (CR), the maximum appears for the job in general facet, not the Opportunities for Promotion facet, as in transactional leadership even though contingent reward is one type of transactional leadership. Therefore, job in general may be the second reason why identifiers’ give higher ratings for their school leader toward transactional leadership.

Similarly, the maximum of management-by-exception (passive) (MBEP) appears for the JDI facet Opportunities for Promotion, not the JDI facet People on Your Present Job, as in laissez-faire leadership even though MBEP is a type of laissez-faire leadership. This result also suggests that opportunities for promotion may be the second reason why identifiers’ give higher ratings for their school leader in laissez-faire leadership.
Table 33

*JDI Facet Scores of Dissenters and Identifiers of Transformational Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Dissenters</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>2.044</td>
<td>2.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>2.256</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>2.189</td>
<td>2.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>1.883</td>
<td>1.899</td>
<td>1.899</td>
<td>1.806</td>
<td>1.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>2.289</td>
<td>2.242</td>
<td>2.242</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>2.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of JDI Supervision</td>
<td>1.948</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>1.932</td>
<td>1.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of JDI Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.076</td>
<td>2.076</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Identifiers</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>1.924</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>1.938</td>
<td>1.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>2.347</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td>2.431</td>
<td>2.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>2.208</td>
<td>2.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of JDI Supervision</td>
<td>2.226</td>
<td>2.239</td>
<td>2.239</td>
<td>2.246</td>
<td>2.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of JDI Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>1.979</td>
<td>1.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>-0.255</td>
<td>-0.255</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-0.733*</td>
<td>-0.719*</td>
<td>-0.719*</td>
<td>-0.533*</td>
<td>-0.778*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of JDI Supervision</td>
<td>0.278**</td>
<td>0.275**</td>
<td>0.275**</td>
<td>0.314**</td>
<td>0.263**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of JDI Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>-0.219</td>
<td>-0.219</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * Minimum ratings, **Maximum ratings.

AC = Attributed Charisma, II =Idealized Influence, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS = Intellectual Stimulation, IC = Individual Consideration.
Table 34

*JDI Facet Scores of Dissenters and Identifiers of Transactional Leadership and Laissez-faire Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>MBEA</th>
<th>MBEP</th>
<th>LF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dissatisfied Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>1.968</td>
<td>1.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>2.245</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>2.238</td>
<td>2.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>1.963</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>1.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>2.204</td>
<td>2.356</td>
<td>2.238</td>
<td>1.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>2.034</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>2.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of JDI Supervision</td>
<td>1.995</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>2.159</td>
<td>1.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Satisfied Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>1.824</td>
<td>1.910</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>2.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>2.398</td>
<td>2.291</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>2.028</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>2.086</td>
<td>2.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>1.812</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>2.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>2.146</td>
<td>2.120</td>
<td>2.201</td>
<td>2.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of JDI Supervision</td>
<td>1.981</td>
<td>1.872</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>2.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>-0.259</td>
<td>-0.312</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.753**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>0.153**</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-0.722*</td>
<td>-0.544*</td>
<td>-0.450*</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.176**</td>
<td>0.334**</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference Supervision</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-0.428</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * Minimum ratings, ** Maximum ratings.

CR = Contingent Reward, MBEA = Management-by-Exception (Passive), MBEP = Management-by-Exception (Active), LF = Laissez-faire Leadership.

There are explanations for all of these results. The 12th cram school is staffed by young foreign English teachers (ages 25–36). For these young teachers, opportunities for promotion is the first concern when they think about their career future because a good opportunity for promotion may lead along a bright road to advancement and high pay.

Therefore, if a school leader can offer a good opportunity for promotion, he or she can
easily win the loyalty of these young teachers. That is why, regarding transformational leadership and transactional leadership, the identifiers gave higher scores for Opportunities for Promotion relative to the dissenters. Similarly, interpersonal relationships is of great concern when these young foreign English teachers think about their career because young people have limited tolerance for unpleasant coworkers. Hence, for those identifiers who rated the leader as tending toward laissez-faire leadership, the JDI facet People on Your Present Job gave higher scores relative to the dissenters.

On the other hand, the high turnover rate of the 12th cram school can also be explained. Almost all dissenters of the three leadership styles give the JDI facet Pay higher scores relative to the corresponding identifiers. This means that the main reason those dissenters stay in the present job is the satisfying payment the school leader offers. Thus, one can suppose that when a foreign English teacher among these dissenters is offered a job opportunity with a better salary, there is a high probability that he or she will change jobs. This situation then leads to the high turnover rate at this cram school.

Based on the self-rating records, the school leader of the 12th cram school tended to classify herself as a transactional leader because the average MLQ score of transactional leadership is 3.5 points, which is higher than the other two leadership styles
(see Table 35). This is only slightly different from the opinions of foreign English teachers of that cram school.

For a deeper understanding of this, the first step is to see the MLQ average scores of each individual of the 12th cram school. Table 36 displays the ranking of the three leadership styles given by each foreign English teacher and school leader. If the average MLQ score of one leadership style is highest among the three for one person, the order this leadership style gets is 3. Similarly, the leadership style with lowest average MLQ score gets an order of 1. The sequences help in understanding the relationship of the three leadership styles. Table 37 presents the average scores for the six JDI facets for each foreign English teacher at this cram school.

According the MLQ records of the 18 foreign teachers at this cram school, the average score for transformational leadership earned the highest score, 2.66 points, among three leadership styles (see Table 35). This means that foreign English teachers think that their school leader is a transformational leader on average. However, the average score for transactional leadership is 2.39 points, which is close to the average score for transformational leadership. Thus, deep interviews were necessary to reveal the details about the connection between leadership styles and foreign English teachers’ job satisfaction.
Table 35

*MLQ Average Scores of the Foreign English Teachers of the 12th Cram School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Laissez-faire Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leader</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 36

**MLQ Score Sequence of the Foreign English Teachers of the 12th Cram School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Laissez-fare Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* In the sequences order, 3 is the leadership style that earned the highest MLQ average score and 1 earned the lowest scores.
Table 37

*JDI Facet Scores of the Foreign English Teachers of the 12th Cram School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>People on Your Present Job</th>
<th>Job in General</th>
<th>Work on Present Job</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Opportunities for Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interviews involved having a short, face-to-face conversation with every foreign English teacher. There were three main topics discussed:

1. What do you think about your school leader’s leadership style? Do you like it or dislike it? Do you think that her leadership style is helpful for you and your coworkers?

2. Do you feel satisfied with your present job? Which among the six facets of your job satisfaction—People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on
Present Job, Opportunities for Promotion, Pay, and Supervision—wins your highest satisfaction?

3. If there is anything with which you do not feel satisfied in your present job, what is it? Is there anything, in your opinion, that should be improved by your school leader?

Following are summaries of the deep interviews for each foreign English teacher from the 12th cram school.

*Foreign English Teacher Number 1*

1. When I face any problem in my teaching, the school leader helps me to look at problems from many different angles. (transactional)

2. When I meet the school leader’s expectation, she always shows her satisfaction and encourages me to keep working hard. (transactional)

3. The school leader often provides us the opportunity for promotion so that we can show our viewpoints toward administrative duties and teaching methods.

4. I feel satisfied with my job in general because the teaching surroundings the cram school provides is excellent.
Foreign English Teacher Number 2

1. The school leader shows her ability to deal with complaints of foreign English teachers, administrative staffs, and students. (transactional)

2. In the beginning of my teaching in this cram school, the school leader spent a lot of time coaching me in the teaching skill. (transformational)

3. The opportunity for promotion in this cram school is not limited. The school displays a good sense of adopting different suggestions.

Foreign English Teacher Number 3

1. The school leader usually discusses with us what are our responsibilities for achieving performance targets and she also let us to know what we can receive when the goals are achieved. (transactional)

2. I feel satisfied with my job in general because I have learned how to avoid wasting time in my teaching duties in this cram school because the school leader always gives us very specific targets.

3. If there were more good opportunities for promotion offered to me, I would feel more satisfied about the present teaching circumstances.
Foreign English Teacher Number 4

1. In this cram school, the school leader treats every foreign English teacher as an individual rather than simply a member of this cram school. This attitude let us feel that we are considered. (transformational)

2. The school leader usually provides foreign English teachers with assistance when she sets a goal we need to achieve. This is really helpful! (transactional)

3. In my opinion, the supervision in this cram school is appropriate because the school leader always praises good work.

Foreign English Teacher Number 5

1. The school leader likes to talk about her beliefs and what’s the most vital thing that needs to be accomplished. And when she talks about the future of this cram school, she always shows an optimistic attitude. (transformational)

2. Compared with my previous job experience, my job in general in this cram school is better than most because I have more decision-making power here.

3. Sometimes, I feel that the school leader is too over-optimistic. This is what I think she can do better.
**Foreign English Teacher Number 6**

1. I have respect for the school leader since she always displays confidence and a sense of power. (transformational)

2. The school leader likes to set targets for cram school members. And she expresses strong confidence that her goals will be accomplished. I like her optimistic attitude very much. (transformational)

3. I love people in our cram school because the members are all young and we work in a cordial atmosphere usually.

**Foreign English Teacher Number 7**

1. The most important thing I care about my job is the respect the school leader has for me. The school leader of the present cram school does a very good job in this area. (transformational)

2. I feel satisfied with my work in present job because it gives me a sense of accomplishment and the pay is fair.

3. In summary, the overall factors of this cram school, such as opportunity for promotion, supervision, and people in the cram school, are fascinating for me.
**Foreign English Teacher Number 8**

1. Our school leader is an expert at troubleshooting. When the school leader discusses with me the teaching duties, she likes to let me know how to avoid failing in meeting her standards. I think this helps me a lot not to waste time. (transactional)

2. Since my job is not complicated and the work environment is pleasant, I feel satisfied with my job in general.

3. The only thing I need in the present job is a good opportunity for promotion because I want to participate in administrative duties of a cram school in the future.

**Foreign English Teacher Number 9**

1. The school leader likes to show her satisfaction when we meet her expectations by giving us the promise of a bonus pay rise. (transactional)

2. The confidence the school leader displays usually makes foreign English teachers in our cram school feel proud to be associated with her. This is her very best characteristic. (transformational)

3. I love my job in general because the cram school really offers us good teaching environment. However, pay could be raised.
Foreign English Teacher Number 10

1. The school leader always emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission. I think this is helpful for all staff members to pull together.

   (transformational)

2. I can feel that the school leader tries hard to give us the most congenial supervision. She always pays attention to our demands.

3. However, I think she seldom provides us opportunities for promotion because she likes to make decisions by herself.

Foreign English Teacher Number 11

1. I think our school leader loves our cram school very much. You can always hear her talking about the bright future of the school. This makes every staff in our school work actively. (transformational)

2. Based on the school leader’s good supervision, I think my work in my present job is simple and satisfying.

3. In fact, there is nothing in which I do not feel satisfied. Of course, if the pay could be raised, I’ll be glad.
Foreign English Teacher Number 12

1. The school leader usually acts in ways that build my respect. I feel pride for being associated with her. (transformational)

2. When I meet the school leader’s expectations, she always shows her satisfaction. In think it is very helpful. (transactional)

3. I think my present job uses my abilities and I’d like to stay in the teaching career as long as possible.

4. I feel satisfied with the school leader’s supervision because of the way she likes to work makes our duties easier to accomplish.

Foreign English Teacher Number 13

1. In our cram school, you can always hear the school leaders talk about her beliefs. She likes to give you a beautiful picture about the future of our school. (transformational)

2. To tell the truth, I don’t like others to talk too optimistically. And I think the supervision is sometimes not that appropriate.

3. I do love my job because I love teaching. I think the teaching environment here is not bad and foreign English teachers in our school are all well paid.
Foreign English Teacher Number 14

1. The first time I met the school leader, she gave me great advice for my teaching job. I really appreciate it because I think her suggestions helped me to develop my strengths. (transformational)

2. Up to now, my teaching career in Taiwan is pleasant. Although some people say that teaching English is boring, I think there are challenges in my teaching everyday.

3. I respect our school leader and I think she provides very good supervision.

Foreign English Teacher Number 15

1. The school leader likes to emphasize that everyone should support the interests that promote the good of the group. Actually, I do not entirely of approve this opinion. (transformational)

2. Due to the leadership of our school leader, I think there are few opportunities for promotion in this cram school. She likes people who always agree with her opinion.

3. I really like my coworkers in this school. And I love my students here, too.

People in Taiwan are all smart and obliging.
Foreign English Teacher Number 16

1. The school leader shows that problems must become chronic before taking action. This causes the problems to become worse sometimes. (laissez-faire)

2. People in my present job are all responsible and stimulating. That’s why I’d love to stay in this cram school.

3. I cannot deny that if there’s a better job that can offer me higher pay or a higher position, I will think over about accepting it.

Foreign English Teacher Number 17

1. The school leader likes to articulate a compelling vision of the future. I think she is an active and enthusiastic woman who can lead all the staff to success. (transformational)

2. I feel satisfied with my job in general because the teaching environment the cram school provides is good and my coworkers are all easy-going.

3. If there’s anything I can complain about, I think our salary and reward levels are lower than standard.
Foreign English Teacher Number 18

1. The school leader often says that she considers every foreign English teacher and staff member as having different aspirations, abilities, and needs from others. I think she does a good job. (transformational)

2. In this cram school, everyone can expect what he deserves if he tries hard to achieve the goals the school leader assigns. (transactional)

3. In my opinion, our school leader really gives excellent supervision. She helps us to surpass all the difficulties we face in teaching.

4. However, the pay of this cram school is not satisfying. Foreign English teachers can barely live on this income in Taiwan since the consumption level is very high.

In the interviews, most of the 18 teachers showed their satisfaction toward their school leader. Only two gave negative evaluations, and only one tended to think that the school leader is a laissez-faire leader.

The interviews, which complemented the MLQ survey findings, provided more information regarding the leadership style of the school leader. Among the 18 foreign English teachers of the 12th cram school, half of them thought their school leader displays transformational leadership. Six others tended to categorize the leadership of
their school leader as a composite of transformational leadership and transactional leadership. Moreover, only two foreign English teachers classified their school leader as a transactional leader, and one as a laissez-faire leader.

The interviews also provided information regarding the satisfaction of the 18 teachers. Generally speaking, these teachers felt satisfied with their job. Most of them thought that the teaching environment of the cram school was good, and many of the 18 teachers liked their coworkers. It is clear that good teaching environment and easy-going colleagues are two important factors for the job satisfaction of foreign English teachers in this cram school.

Based on the JDI scores, many of the foreign English teachers thought there were few opportunities for promotion because that JDI facet got the lowest average score, 1.5 points, among all JDI facets (see Table 40). However, some of the teachers gave different opinions in the interviews. They thought the school leader provided them with good opportunities for promotion. On the other hand, seven foreign English teachers did not feel satisfied with the salary (less than 1 point) and only four teachers thought the pay was fair (more than 2 points) according to the JDI score records. In the interviews, only a few of the foreign English teachers talked about their satisfaction about pay. This situation is probably caused by the tax issues in Taiwan, with many refusing to talk about
As to the comments about supervision, there is a huge gap between the positive and negative comments. Some of the 18 teachers approved of the supervision provided by the school leader while others showed their disapproval. The JDI facet Supervision had an average score of 1.99, which is the third highest score among the six facets. This reveals that the school leader’s supervision is not bad but there are some things on which she can improve. For example, she could give some options when she assigns duties to foreign English teachers instead of giving them a single order. She also could try to provide different pictures about the future of the cram school instead of talking too optimistically all the time.

Nine foreign English teachers classified their school leader as a transformational leader and gave higher satisfaction scores in every area of their present job compared with other teachers, especially in Supervision. On average, six teachers classified their school leader’s leadership style as a combination of transformational and transactional leadership and felt more satisfied with the opportunities for promotion than the other teachers. Three teachers thought their school leader was a transactional leader or a laissez-faire leader and gave a high satisfaction score to their jobs in general but felt dissatisfied with their salary.
The results of the interviews were quite interesting and provided information that differed from the data. Clearly, it would be helpful if all cram schools in the research could be interviewed. However, due to the difficulties of contacting every foreign English teacher and getting the permission of every school leader to interview all foreign English teachers, it is almost impossible at this moment to get all the information about the connections between leadership styles of cram school leaders and foreign English teachers’ job satisfaction. This may be a very interesting issue for future research.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND FUTURE SUGGESTIONS

Introduction

Chapter 5 contains the summaries of all analysis results and conclusions based on those analyses. At the end of this chapter, some suggestions based on those results are presented for the Taiwan After-School Education Industries. Also included are discussions of the research limitations, shortcomings, and guides for further study.

As for academic contributions, this research has combined management and organizational behavior concepts in order to research and analyze the organizational behavior of foreign teachers in Taiwan. This research is the first study to discuss the relationship between school leaders’ leadership style and the job satisfactions of foreign English teachers in language cram schools.

Furthermore, this research establishes a method of deep interviews that would be helpful in providing researchers and cram school leaders more information about the relationship between the leadership styles of the school leader and the job satisfaction of foreign teachers. Moreover, the deep interviews provide some observations that would be helpful for cram school leaders to learn about the job satisfaction of foreign English teachers.
Conclusions from the Analysis

Answers for Research Questions

Based on the results of Cronbach’s alpha analyses and the correlation analyses, the first three research questions were answered. The fourth research question was answered according to the results of the demographic variable and job satisfaction analyses. Following is a brief summary of these answers.

Research Question One: What is the relationship between transformational leadership style and overall job satisfaction?

Transformational leadership style has no significant relationship with the satisfaction with People on Your Present Job, Work On Present Job, Supervision, and Job in General and Opportunities for Promotion. Satisfaction with Pay is correlated with transformational leadership, which shows a negatively moderate degree of correlation (correlation coefficient = -0.53, p < 0.01). Furthermore, Inspirational Motivation and Idealized Influence were the two main factors that showed a moderate degree of correlation between transformational leadership and Pay.

Research Question Two: What is the relationship between transactional leadership style and overall job satisfaction?

Based on the Cronbach’s alpha analysis, the relationship between transactional
leadership style and job satisfaction could not be answered in this research due to the low reliability of the instrument.

*Research Question Three: What is the relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and overall job satisfaction?*

Only the combined scores of laissez-faire leadership style were used in the analyses because the reliability of the separate facets were low. Laissez-faire leadership style had no significant correlation to satisfaction with the Job in general, Work on Present Job, Supervision, People on Your Present job and Opportunities for Promotion. Satisfaction with Pay was correlated with laissez-faire leadership (correlation coefficient = -0.48, \( p < 0.01 \)).

*Research Question Four: Are there differences in job satisfaction among demographic variables?*

Based on analyses of the demographic variables and job satisfaction, there was no significant difference between level of education and People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision or between country of origin and People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision.

The results show a significant difference in satisfaction with Job in General and
Supervision between genders with the $p$ values being lower than 0.05. The results show that male teachers were more satisfied than female teachers but female teachers were more satisfied with Supervision than male teachers.

There was no significant difference in satisfaction with the People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision among age level. Years of teaching at the institute did not differentiate satisfaction with People on Your Present Job, Job in General, Work on Present Job, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision. However, there was a significant difference in satisfaction with Pay among levels of age and years of teaching. The results also demonstrate significant difference in satisfaction with Opportunities for Promotion between those who do or do not participate in administration. In other words, teachers who do not participate in administrative duties are more satisfied with Opportunities for Promotion.

Research Question Five: How do foreign teachers in an English cram school in Taiwan describe their school leadership style and job satisfaction?

The results of interviews of the 12th cram school provide information that differed from the quantitative data. In the interviews, most of the 18 foreign English teachers of the 12th cram school expressed their satisfaction with their school leader. Half
of them said their school leader displays transformational leadership. Six tended to
categorize the leadership of their school leader as a composite of transformational and
transactional leadership. Very few of them classified their school leader as either a
transactional leader or a laissez-faire leader.

Generally speaking, the foreign English teachers in the 12th cram school were
satisfied with their job in general. Most of them said that the teaching environment
offered by the cram school and the school leader was good. Many of the 18 teachers liked
their coworkers and staff. It is clear that a good teaching environment and easy-going
coworkers are important factors in producing satisfaction among foreign English teachers
in this cram school.

There were many foreign English teachers, however, who thought there were few
opportunities for promotion, and some thought the school leader provided them with
good opportunities for promotion. On the other hand, only a few of the teachers
expressed their satisfaction with pay. This situation is probably caused by the tax system
in Taiwan and people not wanting to talk about salary details. As for comments about
supervision, there was a huge gap between the positive comments and negative criticisms.
Some of the 18 teachers approved of the supervision provided by the school leader while
others expressed their disapproval.
The nine foreign English teachers who classified their school leader as a transformational leader showed higher satisfaction in every area, especially in the supervision of their present job compared with other teachers. On average, the six foreign English teachers who classified their school leader’s leadership style as a combination of transformational and transactional leadership felt more satisfied with the opportunities for promotion than the others. The three foreign English teachers who said their school leader was a transactional or laissez-faire leader expressed higher satisfaction toward their jobs in general but felt more dissatisfied with their salary.

*Transformational Leadership and Laissez-faire Leadership Are Both Negatively Correlated with Pay*

The correlation analyses showed that most JDI facets were not significantly correlated with leadership styles. However, transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership were both negatively correlated with Pay with a moderate degree of correlation. This demonstrates that, in the opinions of foreign English teachers in this research, the higher tendencies of their school leader’s leadership styles to transformational leadership or to laissez-faire leadership, the lower satisfaction teachers have about pay. Moreover, transformational leadership style had a higher correlation with Pay than laissez-faire leadership style had with Pay.
Correlation analyses also showed that Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation were two main causes of the moderate degree of correlation between transformational leadership and Pay. Laissez-faire is the main cause of the moderate degree of correlation between laissez-faire leadership and Pay.

_Causes of Job Satisfaction are Complex_

Between transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership, the effects on job satisfaction were greater for transformational leadership than for laissez-faire leadership. When the researcher tested whether demographic variables affected job satisfaction, the results showed that gender had significant effect on the satisfaction with the Job in General and Supervision. Male teachers showed greater satisfaction overall with their jobs than female teachers, and female teachers were more satisfied with the Supervision than male teachers.

Age affected satisfaction with Pay significantly, but no specific age group stood out in its satisfaction with Pay. Years of teaching at the institution influenced the satisfaction with Pay as well, especially for those teachers who had taught in that school for more than 2 years. Participation in administrative duties influenced the satisfaction with Opportunities for Promotion; those teachers who did not participate in administrative duties were more satisfied with regard to promotions.
Research Limitations

This research was limited to 18 randomly selected adult English cram schools in Taipei City (North) and Kaohsiung City (South) in Taiwan. The population of this research consisted of 18 supervisors and 217 foreign English teachers in the same 18 randomly selected adult English cram schools. However, many problems arose in the process of collecting data. For example, some cram school leaders declined to participate in the research because they felt some questions were too closely connected with their operating strategies. Similarly, some English teachers refused to be interviewed because they thought the results might reveal their feelings about their school leader and have a negative influence on their relationships with the leader. These problems had some impact on the data collection and reduced the sample size.

The results of deep interviews were interesting and provided information that differed from the data. Clearly, it would have been helpful if all cram schools had agreed to deep interviews. However, due to the logistical difficulties of contacting every foreign English teacher and getting the permission of every school leader to interview all foreign English teachers, it was impossible to get more information about the connections between the leadership styles of all the cram school leaders and all foreign English teachers’ job satisfaction. Expanding this research may yield new interesting results.
The reliability of the survey instruments presented another limitation. This research relied mainly on cram school leaders and foreign English teachers’ recognition, willingness, and explanations to answer the questionnaire. The results may not be suitable for other kinds of private enterprises or organizations.

Suggestions

*Searching for School Leaders with Leadership Characteristics*

For a cram school, looking for a school leader with appropriate leadership characteristics could help increase foreign English teachers’ job performance and develop and improve their creative abilities. The correlations between the results of the MLQ and JDI and JIG could aid a search for a school leader with appropriate leadership characteristics. For example, the satisfaction on Job in General had a positive relationship with all facets of transformational leadership style: Intellectual Stimulation, Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Attributed Charisma, and Individual Consideration.

These results might help a school leader improve the teachers’ job satisfaction. If a school leader could increase his or her performance rating on the five factors, the teachers’ job satisfaction might improve. It also would be beneficial for a cram school to search for a school leader with high ratings in the five factors of transformational leadership to improve the satisfaction on job in general of its foreign English teachers.
Complete Payroll System Can Increase Foreign English Teachers’ Job Performance

The results of this research indicate that a leader should not only have good leadership and behavior but also pay attention to the rationality of the payroll system and to feedback from foreign English teachers. The payroll system played an important part in increasing job performance. Thus, if an enterprise wants to improve its foreign English teachers’ job performance, it should focus on its payroll system design. The foreign English teachers’ payroll system cognition will affect the teachers’ loyalty, fidelity, and work performance.

Recommendations for Future Research

Research Sampling

This research focused only on Taiwan foreign teachers in Taipei and Kaohsiung cities due to insufficient manpower, objective factors, and time limitations. The researcher used random sampling methods to conduct the research and sent questionnaires to private companies through personal relationships. The researcher did not conduct general investigations of the after school education industries. As a result, the questionnaire results are only representative of certain companies. Future researchers should increase the number of questionnaires and investigation targets to achieve results that are representative a wider population.
In addition, this research used a quantitative approach and interviews from one school. If more schools were surveyed and more teachers were interviewed, the results of this research would be more objective and complete.

*Research Design*

This research was a cross section research in the present because of the lack of resources to conduct research over time. Therefore, the collected information can help researchers understand only the influences of variance in a certain period and does not aid in understanding the effects of various factors over a longer period of time. Follow-up studies should use a historical research method and data to determine the variance tendency and to understand and authenticate the cause-effect relationship among variances.

*Future Research Direction*

Future researchers should refer to the managerial characteristics of the transformational leadership style proposed by Popper, Mayseless, and Castelnovo (2000). Even though many research endeavors have shown that the “secure style” characteristic is related to transformational leadership style, it does not indicate that a person with a secure style will be a transformational leader or that a transformational leader will be secure. “How to find a perfect candidate who can make employees accept and agree on
the manager’s leadership style under a non transactional condition” could be a good direction for future research.
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APPENDIX A

Letter to Potential Subjects for a Study of School Leaders’ Leadership Styles and Foreign Teachers’ Job Satisfaction in Adult English Cram Schools of Taiwan

University of the Incarnate Word

Dear Sir,

My name is Fang-Yi (Fanny) Wu. I am a graduate student at the University of the Incarnate Word working towards a doctoral degree in Education with a concentration in Organizational Leadership. My dissertation topic is the relationship between the leadership styles of school leaders and the job satisfaction of foreign teachers in adult English Cram Schools in Taiwan.

You are hereby invited to participate in this research project. If you agree to participate, please distribute the research package to your foreign English teachers. The research package includes the research subject consent agreement and one set of the questionnaire. Please maintain the confidentiality of the teachers’ responses by asking one of the teachers to collect the responses and place them in the envelope that I am enclosing. The teacher who collects the responses should seal the envelope, which I will collect from you after all the teachers have completed the survey.

The teachers’ responses and any information that may identify them or your school will
be kept confidential. Please be assured that, if I publish the results of this study, neither
the teachers nor the school will be identified in any way.

Please assure the teachers that their participation is completely voluntary. Also, please
assure the teachers that they may choose not to complete the survey at any time.

Additionally, the teachers should be assured that their future with the school will not be
affected if they choose not to participate or if they choose not to complete the survey.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. My email and telephone
number are: yiyi6622@yahoo.com.tw and 07-776-3296 (Taiwan).

The UIW committee that reviews research on human subjects, the Institutional Review
Board, can answer any questions about the rights of research subjects. For more
information, you may contact Dr. Michael Mulnix, Dean, School of Graduate Studies and
Research, at Mulnix@universe.uiwtx.edu or 210- 829-3157.

The success of this study depends on your cooperation and help. I would appreciate it
greatly if you could please ask the teachers in your school to take a few minutes to
complete the subject consent form and the questionnaire. Your assistance would be a
great help to me. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Fang-Yi (Fanny) Wu
APPENDIX B

Letter to Potential Subjects for a Study of School Leaders’ Leadership Styles and Foreign Teachers’ Job Satisfaction in Adult English Cram Schools of Taiwan

University of the Incarnate Word

Dear English Teacher,

My name is Fang-Yi (Fanny) Wu. I am a graduate student at the University of the Incarnate Word working towards a doctoral degree in Education with a concentration in Organizational Leadership.

My dissertation topic is the relationship between the leadership styles of school leaders and the job satisfaction of foreign teachers in adult English Cram Schools in Taiwan.

I am hereby inviting you to participate in this research project. If you decide to participate, you will receive a research package from your school leader. The research package contains a subject consent form and one set of the questionnaire.

When you complete the questionnaire, it will be collected by one of your fellow teachers, who will place it in an envelope and seal it in order to maintain the confidentiality. I will then collect the sealed envelope from your school.

Please be assured that you cannot be identified personally and your school cannot be identified. Please be assured that, if I publish the results of this study, neither the teachers...
nor the school will be identified in any way.

Please be assured that your participation is completely voluntary. You may choose not to complete the survey at any time. Additionally, your future with the school will not be affected if you choose not to participate or if you choose not to complete the survey.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. My email and telephone number are: yiyi6622@yahoo.com.tw and 07-776-3296 (Taiwan).

The UIW committee that reviews research on human subjects, the Institutional Review Board, can answer any questions about the rights of research subjects. For more information, you may contact Dr. Michael Mulnix, Dean, School of Graduate Studies and Research, at Mulnix@universe.uiwtx.edu or 210-829-3157.

The success of this study depends on your cooperation and help. I would appreciate it greatly if you could take a few minutes to complete the subject consent form and the questionnaire. Your assistance would be a great help to me. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Fang-Yi (Fanny) Wu
APPENDIX C

Subject Consent to Take Part in a Study of School Leaders’ Leadership Styles and
Foreign Teachers’ Job Satisfaction in Adult English Cram Schools of Taiwan

University of the Incarnate Word

Dear Prospective Survey Participant:

Dear English Teacher,

My name is Fang-Yi (Fanny) Wu. I am a graduate student at the University of the
Incarnate Word working towards a doctoral degree in Education with a concentration in
Organizational Leadership. My dissertation topic is the relationship between the
leadership styles of school leaders and the job satisfaction of foreign teachers in adult
English Cram Schools in Taiwan.

If you decide to participate, it will take you approximately 30 minutes to complete the
enclosed questionnaire. Please be assured that you cannot be identified personally and
your school cannot be identified.

Please be assured that your participation is completely voluntary. You may choose not to
complete the survey at any time. Additionally, your future with the school will not be
affected if you choose not to participate or if you choose not to complete the survey.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. My email and telephone
number are: yiyi6622@yahoo.com.tw and 07-776-3296 (Taiwan).

The UIW committee that reviews research on human subjects, the Institutional Review Board, can answer any questions about the rights of research subjects. For more information, you may contact Dr. Michael Mulnix, Dean, School of Graduate Studies and Research, at Mulnix@universe.uiwtx.edu or 210- 829-3157.

YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT YOU CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY AND THAT YOU HAVE READ AND UNDERSTAND THE INFORMATION GIVEN AND EXPLAINED TO YOU.

_______________________________  _______________/__________
Signature of Subject              Date/Time

_______________________________
Telephone Number

_______________________________
E-mail Address
APPENDIX D

(Chinese version)

問卷調查參與受試者需知與同意函

Subject Consent to Take Part in a Study of School Leaders’ Leadership Styles and Foreign Teachers’ Job Satisfaction in Adult English Cram Schools of Taiwan

University of the Incarnate Word

問卷受試者需知同意書

敬愛的問卷調查參與者您好:

後學 吳芳宜現在是美國德州 University of the Incarnate Word 的研究生,主修組織領導。目前正進行博士論文的相關研究，論文題目是「補習班領導人與外籍英文教師工作滿意度的關係」。本研究目的是為了解決台灣北部地區成人英文補習班的外籍教師的流動率一直居高不下的原因何在,期望經由本研究提供補習班領導人了解外籍老師的需求與想法,還有幫助領導人如何增進與外籍老師的互動以及如何招募外籍的師資並幫助領導人如何有效的領導與管理外籍老師。

如果您願意參與此項研究調查,您將在受試者需知同意書上簽名,並花費大約 30 分鐘的時間完成問卷的填寫,您將是自願參與本研究,不受外力因素所影響。任何您的資料或所填寫的資訊，除提供研究者作爲學術研究外,均受匿名與保密，不作其他用途之用。
在整个研究調查中，您也可以隨時取消參與本研究，而不會對您的職務或工作有任何影響。

如果您有任何受試者權利上的問題，本校的 Institutional Review Board 將回答您的相關受試者權利問題，聯絡電話如下，研究所所長  012-1-210-829-2757(美國)；或者也可以直接與我連繫，聯絡方式如下: 吳芳宜/yiyi6622@yahoo.com.tw/011-886-7-7763296(台灣)

**您已了解上述說明，並且願意在受試者權利保護下簽名參與本研究的問卷調查**

_________________________________  _______________/________________
受訪者簽名  日期 時間

_________________________________  _______________/________________
連絡電話  電子郵件信箱(E-mail)
APPENDIX E

Survey Instrument (English and Chinese)

Survey on the Relationship Between School Leaders’ Leadership Style and Foreign English Teachers’ Job Satisfaction of Taiwan

補習班領導人與外籍教師工作滿意調查問題

(School Leaders Use Only)

Please answer the following questions (請依個人狀況回答以下問題):

Gender (性別):

Age (年齡):

Marital Status (婚姻狀況):

Level of Education (教育程度):

Years of teaching at the institute (補習班服務年資):
APPENDIX F

Survey Instrument (English)

Survey on the Relationship Between School Leaders’ Leadership Style and Foreign English Teachers’ Job Satisfaction of Taiwan

(Foreign Teachers Use Only)

Please answer the following questions

Gender:

Age:

Participation in administrative duty

Country of origin:

Years of teaching at the institute:

Level of Education:
Permission Request for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ, Form 5X)

Dear Sir,

My name is Fang-Yi (Fanny) Wu. I am a graduate student at the University of the Incarnate Word working towards a doctoral degree in Education with a concentration in Organizational Leadership.

My dissertation topic is the relationship between the leadership styles of school leaders and the job satisfaction of foreign teachers in adult English Cram Schools in Taiwan. It is expected that the findings will assist school leaders to understand better what foreign teachers need to perform with greater job satisfaction and will assist school leaders to reduce the currently high foreign teacher turnover rates.

To carry out this research project, I need your permission to use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ, Form 5X) and/or the translation into Chinese of this questionnaire. Both the original and the translation will be included in the appendices of my dissertation. If this meets your approval, please reply by email to me.

Thank you for your kind assistance on my research.
Sincerely,

Fang-Yi (Fanny) Wu

011-886-7-776-3296 (Taiwan); yiyi6622@yahoo.com.tw

No. 280 Wen-Heng Rd.

Fong-Shan City, Kaohsiung County

Taiwan, R.O.C.
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Permission Request for the Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scale

Dear Sir,

My name is Fang-Yi (Fanny) Wu. I am a graduate student at the University of the Incarnate Word working towards a doctoral degree in Education with a concentration in Organizational Leadership.

My dissertation topic is the relationship between the leadership styles of school leaders and the job satisfaction of foreign teachers in adult English Cram Schools in Taiwan. It is expected that the findings will assist school leaders to understand better what foreign teachers need to perform with greater job satisfaction and will assist school leaders to reduce the currently high foreign teacher turnover rates.

To carry out this research, I would like your permission to administer questionnaires that are scored on the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) Scale by Smith et al.(1969). I am requesting permission to use these questionnaires in English and their translations into Chinese.

I am enclosing a sample questionnaire. If you agree to my request, please send me a completed questionnaire.
Also, if you are willing to participate in this study, please reply to me by email.

Thank you for your kind assistance and cooperation in my research study.

Yours truly,

Fang-Yi (Fanny) Wu

011-886-7-776-3296 (Taiwan); yiyi6622@yahoo.com.tw

No. 280 Wen-Heng Rd.

Fong-Shan City, Kaohsiung County

Taiwan, R.O.C.
APPENDIX I

Permission for Use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

MLQ  Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Permission Set

Leader Form, Rater Form, and Scoring
Key for MLQ Form 5x-Short

Permission for Fang-Yi Wu to reproduce either leader or rater forms for up to 150 copies in one year from date of purchase:

December 17, 2004

by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio

Distributed by MIND GARDEN
1690 Woodside Road Suite 202, Redwood City California 94061 USA
Phone: (650) 261-3500 Fax: (650) 261-3505
info@mindgarden.com
www.mindgarden.com

Copyright © 1995 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio. All rights reserved.
It is your legal responsibility to compensate the copyright holder of this work for any reproduction in any medium. If any part of this Work (e.g., scoring items, etc.) is put on an electronic or other media, you agree to remove this Work from that media at the end of this license. The copyright holder has agreed to grant permission to reproduce the above number of copies of this work for one year from the date of purchase for non-commercial use only. Non-commercial use means that you will not receive payment for distributing this document. If you need to make additional copies than the above stated, please contact MIND GARDEN.
APPENDIX J

Permission for Duplicating the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

MLQ  Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Duplication Set
(Leader and Rater Forms, and scoring for MLQ 5x-Short)

Permission to reproduce either leader or rater forms for up to 150 copies in one year from date of purchase: December 17, 2004

by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio

Distributed by MIND GARDEN
1690 Woodside Road Suite 202, Redwood City California 94061 USA
Phone: (650) 261-3500 Fax: (650) 261-3505
mindgarden@msn.com
www.mindgarden.com

Copyright © 1995 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio. All rights reserved.
It is your legal responsibility to compensate the copyright holder of this work for any reproduction in any medium. If any part of this Work (e.g., scoring, items, etc.) is put on an electronic or other media, you agree to remove this Work from that media at the end of this license. The copyright holder has agreed to grant permission to reproduce the above number of copies of this work for one year from the date of purchase for non-commercial use only. Non-commercial use means that you will not receive payment for distributing this document. If you need to make additional copies than the above stated, please contact MIND GARDEN.
APPENDIX K

Permission for the Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scale
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) is copyrighted by Bowling Green State University. The Job in General (JIG) Scale is a sub-scale of the Job Descriptive Index and is also copyrighted by Bowling Green State University. The purchaser is granted permission to reproduce the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General Scale. The number of copies that the purchaser can make is listed below. The rights to reproduce additional copies must be purchased through Bowling Green State University (see below).

The notation "Copyright Bowling Green State University, 1982, 1985, 1997" must be included on each copy of the JDI and JIG.

Date: 12/17/2004

Purchaser: Fang-Yi Wu

Address: University of the Incarnate Word

Permission to reproduce: 350 copies of Job Descriptive Index (1997) and Job in General (1997)

Michael A. Gillespie
JDI Research Assistant

To obtain copyright information for the JDI and JIG, contact:

The JDI Research Group
Department of Psychology
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403
(419) 372-8247
jdi_ra@bgsnet.bgsu.edu
http://www.bgsu.edu/departments/psych/JDI