

Nebojsa Pavlovic¹

Article info:
Received 22.01.2016
Accepted 10.05.2016

UDC – 332.05
DOI – 10.18421/IJQR10.02-06

ARE AUTHENTIC LEADERS SATISFIED WITH THEIR JOB?

Abstract: *A crisis in management has led to the appearance of Authentic leadership.*

The aim of this work is to determine the characteristics of Authentic leadership in educational institutions and to respond to the question as to whether authentic leaders are satisfied with their job. The third aim is to determine differences among the researched regions. The sample included 227 randomly selected directors from primary and secondary schools in Serbia, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska. The research used an ALQ questionnaire for the estimation of leadership behaviour. Descriptions for the results prediction and multiple linear regressions were used. A multivariate analysis of variance was used to compare the groups. The research results showed that every fourth director is an authentic leader. Authentic leadership has a significant influence on job satisfaction through two aspects: internalised perspective and balanced processing. There are no differences in Authentic leadership in the researched areas. The results could be useful for educational institutions in countries where the research was conducted. Further research could be carried out in other countries while cultural differences should be taken into account. One limiting factor consists of the fact that the analysed data are obtained only from school directors. Leaders of educational institutions should provide management through the development of their own authenticity and the authenticity of their followers. The characteristics of Authentic leadership were reviewed and tested practically in the West-Balkan environment.

Keywords: *Authentic leadership, factors of Authentic leadership, school director, job satisfaction*

1. Introduction

When crises in society are obvious, leaders are usually seen as saviours. However, management can also come under the influence of a crisis. There are many models

of educational leadership and they move in and out of fashion almost as fast as clothes or mobile communication devices (Bush, 2014).

When crises in society are obvious, leaders are usually seen as saviours. However, management can also come under the influence of a crisis. Crises in management develop even when there are numerous

¹ Corresponding author: Nebojsa Pavlovic
email: racapn@gmail.com

ethical problems which are not solved.

Crisis in leadership has led to the development of the concept of Authentic leadership as a part of ethical and transformational leadership (Engelbrecht *et al.*, 2005; Northouse, 2013).

Authentic leadership is based on originality and 'real' managers. Its importance in all working environments has been pointed out by scholars and practitioners in the area of leadership (Avolio *et al.*, 2009; George, 2003). Authentic leadership is a relatively new area of research and has not yet been theoretically developed. Therefore, there are certain difficulties in defining it as it is a complex term (Avolio and Gardner, 2005; Chan, 2005). Out of numerous definitions, Gardner *et al.* (2011) suggested the definition put forward by Walumbwa *et al.*, (2008). This definition described Authentic leadership as a pattern of leadership behaviour that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness and an internalised moral perspective, as well as the balanced processing of information and relationships on the part of leaders working with followers, thus fostering positive self-development.

Authentic leadership should provide regular ethical actions on the part of leaders. These actions would provide job satisfaction for both leaders and employees. As such, Authentic leadership indicates positive feelings for personal jobs which are the result of the ratings of these jobs (Robins and Judge, 2009).

This research deals with the following issue: are Authentic leaders satisfied with their jobs in educational institutions? Avolio *et al.* (2009) claimed that 98% of research on leaders originates from the USA. Authentic leadership has not gained significant attention in Europe (Gardner *et al.*, 2005). Several works have been published in Europe to date, although Authentic leadership in educational institutions has not

yet been researched (Gardner *et al.*, 2011). Bento and Ribeiro (2013) noticed that problems in management do not exclude educational institutions. Therefore, this research on Authentic leadership in educational institutions includes the West Balkan area: Serbia, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska. The main challenge for this research is that this region is different from other regions in terms of culture and sociology. The collectivism which is part of the culture of these areas is not the best basis for the development of Authentic leadership, as there exists dominant individualism in the USA (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005). Previous research used data collected from teachers, i.e. followers of authentic leaders (Gardner, 2011). This research includes only directors of primary and secondary schools. It is considered that a leadership position can be used for a more realistic overview of the problems in Authentic leadership as its construct is based on self-knowledge rather than the judgement of others. In order to achieve the aim of this research, the existence of the relationship between Authentic leadership characteristics and job satisfaction needed to be determined. This work used an ALQ questionnaire (Authentic Leadership Questionnaire) which was a good tool for defining the practice of Authentic leadership (Northouse, 2013).

This research should provide a clearer image of the way in which authentic leaders are to function in educational institutions.

A limitation of this research is in the selection of the samples. Due to this, further research on Authentic leadership in educational institutions should include teachers besides school directors in order to test the differences between the views of both the leaders and followers about the authentic leadership director of an educational institution. The study sample takes only directors that reasonably recommend that followers (teacher-tested educational institutions) and other factors describe the authenticity of their leader-director.

2. Review of the literature

2.1. Authentic leadership

It can be claimed that authenticity is an aspect of our own desire to follow our own ideas, beliefs and values. It is aligned with our thoughts, speech and behaviour. When someone is considered to be authentic it means that this person acts without pretending and that his/her behaviour reflects his/her values, beliefs and principles (George, 2003).

Social psychologist Kernis (2003) claimed that an optimal level of self-confidence is needed to achieve authenticity. When individuals know and accept themselves, including their own strengths and weaknesses, they show a high level of stability. These people are released from external pressures and they form transparent, open and closed relationships with others more easily. Kernis and Goldman (2005) mentioned four components of authenticity: awareness, unbiased processing, behaviour and relation orientation. Awareness is related to self-knowledge; the knowledge of one's own strengths, limitations, motives, feelings and emotions. Unbiased processing is considered to be a strict evaluation without exaggerating or twisting the facts. Behaviour is acting according to one's own values, aspirations and needs. Relation orientation includes honesty, truth and openness in relationships. Other social psychologists claim that authenticity can occur when individuals are led by their own internal values, rather than external threats, instructions, social expectations or rewards (Rayan and Deci, 2003).

Authentic leadership is considered to be an important part of transformational leadership (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999). Burns (1978) based this on the fact that a transformational leader who possesses authenticity is a highly moral person. Also, Northouse (2013) claimed that Authentic leadership originates from transformational and ethical leadership.

Robbins and Coutler (2005) claimed that Authentic leadership is the most important dimension of ethical leadership. Although it originates from Transformational leadership, Authentic leadership is significantly different.

Avolio *et al.* (2004) claimed that truly transformational leaders have to be authentic while authentic leaders do not always need to be transformational leaders. Walumbwa *et al.* (2006) agrees with this opinion. He claimed that an authentic leader is mostly an honest person while a transformational leader manipulates his/her followers.

May *et al.* (2003) and Begley (2006) explained authentic leadership as a part of an organisational culture. Leadership influences its followers while using them to create an organisational culture in the environment (Zhu and Engels, 2014).

A study by Bento and Ribeiro (2013) explained the connection and mutual influence of school culture and authenticity.

There are several views which determine Authentic leadership. Gardner *et al.* (2011) claimed that the conceptualisation of Authentic leadership was mostly provided by the study carried out by Luthans and Avolio (2003) in one of their most important works. Luthans and Avolio (2003) explained Authentic leadership as a process which uses power from positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organisational context. Hence, a higher level of self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviour of leaders are developed. Ilies *et al.* (2005) and Kernis (2003) expanded the Authentic model with unbiased processing, authentic behaviour acting and authentic relational orientation. On the other hand, Shamir and Eilam (2005) claimed that Authentic leaders develop according to their life stories, which make them originals rather than copies. They noted the following dimensions of an Authentic leader: 1) self-concept; 2) high level of self-resolution; 3) self-concordant objectives; 4) self-expressive behaviour. According to these models,

Walumbwa *et al.* (2008) developed the most used definition of Authentic leadership. This definition is based on several assumptions: Positive psychological abilities and positive ethical climate, self-awareness, internalised perspective, balanced processing and relational transparency; interactive processes between leaders and followers; the importance of both followers' and their leader's development.

Also, there are two practical approaches: the approach by Terry Robert and the one by George Bill (Northouse, 2013).

Terry (1993) was oriented towards practice, and he used a formula: 'How management should work'. His Authentic leadership was aimed at the actions of a leader in a certain situation. Authentic leaders strive to act correctly. Each leader needs to ask himself/herself two questions: What is really happening? What are we going to do about it? The correct estimation and reaction of a leader to these issues are essential for the organisation.

Authentic leadership according to George identifies compassion and feelings. George (George, 2003; George and Sims, 2007) focused on the characteristics of authentic leaders. He described the most important features of Authentic leadership and explained how individuals can develop them if they want to become authentic. George claimed that authentic leaders truly want to serve others and that this desire originates from their core values. George (2003) listed the five main characteristics of authentic leaders: 1) understanding the purpose of leadership, 2) the ownership of high values, 3) the development of mutual trust, 4) self-discipline and 5) a passion for leadership which comes from the heart. George (2003) explained Authentic leadership using the life stories of Authentic leaders for which he claimed that critical events are factors which shape people's lives. He defined shaping as the creation of a personal organisational culture.

2.2. Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction should be considered a legitimate goal of every organisation (Judge and Piccolo, 2004). Satisfaction can have an effect on the jobs at (Lee and Ahmad, 2009) and the work of a scho. Job satisfaction is defined as a positive attitude to one's own job which originates from the characteristics of that job (Robbins and Coutler, 2005). A person with a high level of job satisfaction has positive feelings for their job while a person who is not satisfied with his/her job has negative feelings (Robbins and Judge, 2009). Job satisfaction is considered to be important for organisational success (Von Krosigk, 2007). According to Galup *et al.* (2008), successful organisations are those with satisfied employees, while organisations with unsatisfied employees can be faced with many problems. Many factors can have an effect on job satisfaction. Madlock (2006) mentioned communication and the relationship between leaders and employees as factors which have a strong effect on job satisfaction. Lee and Ahmad (2009) claimed that low levels of morality and a lack of authenticity have an effect on employees' satisfaction.

Research has shown that managers are satisfied with their job if their followers are also satisfied (Nisen, 2014). Research has also shown that managers are satisfied with their job if they are satisfied with their work, the achievement of objectives and their salary (Robbins and Judge, 2009). Emery and Barker (2007) claimed that managers' job satisfaction depends on their leadership style and that transformational leaders with an authentic character feel more satisfied than other leaders.

As mentioned earlier, Authentic leadership is a part of transformational and ethical leadership (Pavlovic, 2013). The relationship between a transformational leader and job satisfaction should also be used for the relationship between Authentic leadership and job satisfaction. Bas and Bas (2008) noticed that leaders with an authentic and

transformational character pay more attention to the 'role of a model', which implies exemplary behaviour towards their followers rather than dedication to personal interests. Hence, a leader is satisfied if his/her followers imitate him/her or see him/her as an ideal model (Bono and Judge, 2003). During his research, Lashbrook (1997) claimed that leadership style plays an important role in affecting job satisfaction. Different leadership styles will make different working environments which will increase job satisfaction (Bogler 2001, Timothy and Ronald 2004). Emery and Barker (2007) claimed that Authentic leadership is an important factor for increasing job satisfaction among employees. Since schools are complex working places, Authentic leaders and Authentic teachers are needed. Leadership by Authentic leaders are key factors for a successful school. School employees feel encouraged when they have an Authentic leader as their school director (Bhindi, 2003).

3. Methods

The first aim was to determine the character of Authentic leadership in educational institutions. The second aim was related to determining the influence of the aspects of Authentic leadership on job satisfaction, while the third aim was related to defining the differences in Authentic leadership in Serbia, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska. Differences among the investigated countries are important in order to examine the effects of culture on Authentic leadership.

This research started with the following general question: Are authentic leaders satisfied with their job? The specific questions were: What is the main character of Authentic leadership in educational institutions? Do the aspects of Authentic leadership have an effect on job satisfaction? Are there differences in Authentic leadership

between Serbia, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska?

3.1. Research questions

This work seeks answers to the following research questions:

What is the character of Authentic leadership in schools?

How well can the four aspects of Authentic leadership (Self-awareness, Relational transparency, Balanced processing, Internalised moral perspective) be used for the prediction of job satisfaction?

According to which aspects of Authentic leadership can differences between Serbia, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska be noticed?

3.2. Instrument

The ALQ questionnaire was used for the research (ALQ Version 1.0, Avolio *et al.*, 2007). It included 16 questions of the type from the Lykert scale with 5 values ranging from 'absolutely agree' to 'absolutely disagree'. The questionnaire was developed for practical use and most of the researchers in the area of Authentic leadership use this type of questionnaire (Northouse, 2013). It is very helpful for comparing the obtained research results. Approval for the use of the questionnaire was provided by Mind Garden, Inc. (2014). The seventeenth question in the questionnaire was related to job satisfaction. The Robbins model of 'one global scale' was used for this research. It offers an equally correct scale for job satisfaction as more sophisticated models (Robbins and Judge, 2009).

3.3. Sample

The research was conducted during the second half of 2014 on a sample comprising 227 directors from primary and secondary schools in three countries: Serbia, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska.

It was important to follow the principle of representation and adequacy. The simple random sample was used for research in each of mentioned countries. There was a list of all directors in each of investigated countries. Each school director had approximately equal chance to become part of the sample. The sample had a mark of the stratified random sample since a proportional number of school principals from each country (Number of directors was approximately 15% of a total number of directors in the sample).

66% of the total respondents were directors of primary schools while directors of secondary schools made up 34% of the sample. The average working experience of the respondents was 23 years (SD=8.40), while the average working experience for the position of director was 8 years (SD=6.96). Also, the sample included 52% male and 48% female respondents. Most respondents - 171 (75%) were from Serbia, 36 (16%) were from the Republika Srpska and 20 (9%) were from Montenegro.

3.4. Procedure

The questionnaire was completed according to the instructions of the researchers.

All the respondents completed the questionnaire on a voluntary basis.

Directors of educational institutions originate from a common organisational school culture which implies the conclusion that they will have similar attitudes in understanding the key terms in the survey. This was confirmed by the results analyses.

3.5. Statistical analysis

All the data were analysed using statistical software SPSS 20 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences for Windows).

The Cronbach α coefficient was used to test the internal consistency of the questions. The internal consistency of the scale, according

to which Authentic leadership and job satisfaction were measured, was acceptable and the value of this coefficient was 0.73.

A descriptive analysis was used as proof of the existence of Authentic leadership in educational institutions. The influence of the aspects of Authentic leadership on job satisfaction was investigated using multiple linear regression where the aspects of Authentic leadership were independent variables while job satisfaction was a dependent variable. The strength of the connection between the identified aspects of Authentic leadership was investigated using the Pearson coefficient of correlation.

A multivariate analysis of variance was used to analyse the differences between the countries regarding the aspects of Authentic leadership (MANOVA).

4. Results

Character of Authentic leadership

Authentic leadership and its aspects were developed into dichotomous variables for the purposes of description, in a way recommended by the author (Northouse, 2013). According to this, scores equal to and lower than 15 on the aspects were classified into the category of Unauthentic leaders, while scores equal to and higher than 16 were classified into the category of Authentic leaders. Regarding the total score of Authentic leadership, scores equal to and lower than 63 were classified into the category of Unauthentic leaders while scores equal to and higher than 64 were classified into the category of Authentic leaders. Authentic leadership cannot be viewed as a total sum of its parts. Therefore, directors who had a low score (15 and less) for only one factor belong to the group of Unauthentic leaders. 17.6% of the directors were in this group. The percentage of directors who did not have a character of authenticity or any other factor was 9%.

Table 1. Descriptive analysis

	self-awareness	internalized moral persp.	balanced procesing	relational transparency	Authentic leadership
N	227	227	227	227	227
Mean	1.56	1.56	1.67	1.48	1.48
Std.Deviation	0.497	0.498	0.473	0.5011	0.494
Variance	247	248	224	251	244
Kurtosis	-1.950	-1.968	-1.517	-2.014	-1.893
Authentic leader in%	56,4%	55,5%	66,5%	48,5%	23,3%
Nonauthentic leader in%	43,6%	44,5%	33,5%	51,5%	76,7%

The above table shows that the aspect of Balanced processing is specific. It includes 2/3 of the total number of directors. However, 23.3% of the directors were authentic according to all the factors (Table 1). The highest number of Authentic leaders was seen in Montenegro (35% of the total number of directors in that country). Furthermore, the RepublikaSrpskahad 17% and Serbia 24% Authentic leaders.

What is the connection between the aspects of Authentic leadership and job satisfaction?

A multiple regression was conducted in order to determine the influence of the four factors of Authentic leadership on job satisfaction. The linear model where the four factors of Authentic leadership (Self-awareness, Internalised moral perspective, Balanced procesingandRelational transparency) are predictor variables was used. Job satisfaction was the criteria variable. Scores for Authentic leadership factors were obtained by using factor analysis.

Assumptions on the use of multiple regression were satisfied: the size of the sample was sufficient according to the criterion of Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), multicollinearity and singularity showed that

the correlation was below 0.5. Values of VIF for all four predictor variables were less than 10, while the values of tolerance were higher than 0.01. This showed that there was no multicollinearity. Also, there were no untypical points; linearity, homogeneity of variance and independency of residuals were achieved. The value of the Mahal distance was 14.70, which is acceptable if it is known that the limiting value of the four variables is 18.47. The value of the Cook's distance should be below one according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). It had the value of 0.18 in this research.

The multiple correlations between the independent and dependent variables were positive and moderate ($R=0.36$). The independent variables together explained 13% ($R^2=0.13$) of the variance for job satisfaction (Table 2). Since the standard error of the model ($Se_{\beta}=0.75$) was less than the standard deviation ($SD=0.80$), it was concluded that the model contributes to a better explanation of the influence of the predictor variables on the criteria variables regarding the theoretic model without variables. There is a significant size of this effect ($R^2=0.13$, $F(4,223)=8.32$, $p=0.00$).

Table 2. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,364 ^a	,133	,117	,75234

Factor 2 (Internalised moral perspective) ($\beta=0.272$, $t(223)=3.787$, $p=0,000$) and factor 3 (Balanced processing) ($\beta=0.165$, $t(223)=2.247$, $p=0.026$) significantly predict job satisfaction (Table 3). There is a unique

contribution from each factor: the factor of Internalised moral perspective explained 6%, and the factor of Balanced processing explained 2% of the variance.

Table 3. Factors Authentic leadership and job satisfaction

	B	std. err	Beta	t	Sig.	zer.o.	Parti	Part	Tol.	VIF
self-awareness	.024	.037	.049	.652	.515	.211	.044	.041	.699	1.430
internalized moral perspective	.122	.032	.272	3.78	.000	.327	.247	.238	.766	1.305
balanced processing	.069	.031	.165	2.24	.026	.244	.150	.141	.734	1.363
relational transparency	.019	.029	-.048	-.639	.524	.142	-.043	-.040	.697	1.435

Is there a difference between countries regarding the aspects of Authentic leadership?

In order to determine the differences in Authentic leadership between directors from schools in Serbia, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska, a one-factor MANOVA analysis was conducted for the independent samples. The model included the dependent variables presented in the four factors of Authentic leadership: Self-awareness, Internalised moral perspective, Balanced processing and Relational transparency. The independent variable was presented by countries where the respondents work and live: Serbia,

Montenegro and the Republika Srpska. The assumptions for the use of the MANOVA analysis were satisfied: the size of the sample (satisfied), the normality of division, untypical points (the value of the Mahal distance was 14.78, which is below the limit for the four dependent variables of 18.47), linearity (the diagrams of dispersal are in limits), the homogeneity of regression was fine, including multicollinearity and singularity (the correlation was below 0.5), the homogeneity of the variance matrix and covariance (the Box Test Equality of the Covariance Matrices showed that there was Sig.0.027. Therefore, the assumption was confirmed).

Table 4. Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Interc.	Pillai's Trace	.985	3679.087	4.000	221.000	.000	.985
	Wilks' Lambda	.015	3679.087	4.000	221.000	.000	.985
State	Pillai's Trace	.048	1.373	8.000	444.000	.206	.024
	Wilks' Lambda	.952	1.368	8.000	442.000	.208	.024

The value of Pillai's Trace of 0.048 was obtained (Sig. 0.206, Table 4). These values indicated that there was no difference between the countries' relating factors of Authentic leadership. Also, the Test of Between-Subject Effects indicated that the values of Sig were higher than 0.012 (adapted level alpha) and that the Partial Eta Squared by Cohen (1988) had a very low value (below 0.020). According to the table, the mean values were 61.38 for Montenegro, 63.16 for Serbia and 63.35 for the Republika Srpska. Although a difference was statistically recorded, it had a very small value, less than two units on the scale.

5. Discussion

The first aim of this research was to determine the character of Authentic leadership in educational institutions. The results showed that schools include authentic leaders. Also, the suggestion that school environments should foster authentic leaders who have hope, openness to change, vision and creative responses to social circumstances was supported by Begley (2006).

On the other hand, Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) used his analysis of national cultures to claim that some of them are not favourable places for the development of authentic leaders. He claimed that the culture in the former Yugoslav States includes a high distance of power, a high level of risk avoidance, expressed collectivism and characteristics of 'female' values. Each of these dimensions acts against creating authenticity and directs leaders to create a

collective style where differences between leaders become negligible. National culture has a strong influence on forming all the organisational cultures in one society. Also, they influence the formation of school organisational culture (Schein, 2010; Pavlovic, 2014). This is also confirmed by the results of our research where balanced processing is a dominant factor in Authentic leadership, among others. It was already mentioned that balanced processing is the acceptance of peoples' views in a working environment and whose opinion can sometimes be acceptable or unacceptable. Social psychologists (Aronson *et al.*, 2013) also claim that leaders often act conformist call. In other words, they align their behaviour according to the expectations of the group or environment. They do this in order to avoid rejection. Leaders of educational institutions accept existing cultures, adapt to them and do not change them (Peterson and Deal, 2009). The acceptance of a 'female' culture means that directors do not want to work hard and they do not appreciate the results of their work (Vujic, 2008). Within such a culture, connections and social status are appreciated. Unauthentic leaders accept work in a bad environment as this is the only way for them to achieve 'good' results.

Every authentic leader deals with organisational culture and has the task of changing and adapting it to the new demands of the environment. This was also confirmed by Begley (2006), who claimed that authentic leaders should offer a creative response to their social circumstances.

Such claims shift the discussion to an

explanation of functioning of organisational school culture and the leader's influence on making changes (Shein, 2010; May *et al.*, 2003).

These claims lead a discussion on the explanation of the functioning of a school's organisational culture and its influence on the leaders. The same conclusions were drawn by Schein (2010) and May *et al.* (2003), who claimed that leadership style depends on the organisational culture.

Although every fourth school director has all the characteristics of an authentic leader, the results showed that over 90% of directors have at least one factor. According to Erickson (1995), these results are common as leaders are not always authentic and they are not authentic in every characteristic. If there is the possibility for them to learn and develop their authenticity, these leaders could improve in their other characteristics (Walumbwa *et al.*, 2010; Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998). Morris (2014) confirmed that personal characteristics are not crucial for a manager to work well. He also emphasised that the selection of an Authentic leadership style and the setting of a healthy organisational culture are more important than many individual leader characteristics.

The second aim was an investigation of the connections between the components of Authentic leadership and job satisfaction. A correlational approach was helpful to discover the connections between the two factors of Authentic leadership: Internalised moral perspective and Balanced processing, as well as job satisfaction in an authentic leader. Directors who are authentic leaders are satisfied with their job if they act morally and accept others' opinions with which they do not always agree. Similar results were found by Gardner (2005), who claimed the positive role of moral perspective for Authentic leadership. Walker and Shuangye (2007) and Walumbwa *et al.* (2010) claimed that authentic leaders find accepting the opinions of people with which they disagree

as a very important aspect. Nisen (2014) and Chalofsky (2003) claimed that authentic leaders find work and the fulfilment of organisational goals more important than money and their own satisfaction. Similar results were found by (Bono and Judge 2003; Bass and Bass, 2008; Bamford *et al.* 2012), who claimed that authentic leaders are satisfied if their followers are satisfied with their jobs. Azanza *et al.* (2013) concluded that the existence of Authentic leadership includes a positive psychological capacity and an organisational context, which leads to the following: if followers are satisfied with their job, then an authentic leader is also satisfied. The same conclusion was reached by Kernis (2003), who connected Authentic leadership with job satisfaction on the part of followers and their working performance. Robbins and Judge (2009) claimed that authentic leaders who have positive feelings for their work have high levels of satisfaction with their jobs. Authentic leaders do not have time to think about their own satisfaction. Hence, they think about the satisfaction of their followers and their development (George, 2003). A common thread in all of these results is the importance of organisational culture, which is a regulating factor of organisational behaviour (Schein, 2010).

It is important for further research to note that Authenticity and the satisfaction of leaders originate from his/her personal organisational culture which is shaped under the influence of school and national culture. The personal organisational culture was explained by George (2003). He claimed that it originates from the life stories of Authentic leaders. Organisational culture and Authentic leadership are the bases for maintaining a healthy working environment which provides job satisfaction (Shirey, 2009). Authenticity and leader satisfaction originate from the organisational culture which is formed by the influence of the school and the national culture. Personal organisational culture is explained by George (2003) by using the life stories of authentic leaders.

Organisational culture and Authentic leadership are the bases for maintaining a healthy working environment, which in turn provides job satisfaction (Shirey, 2009).

The results of the research on Authentic leadership for all three samples do not imply any differences. What is the explanation for this situation? Serbia, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska used to be parts of former Yugoslavia. Therefore, they originate from a common national culture which influenced on forming of school culture and its leaders (Schein, 2010; Pavlovic, 2014). However, similar educational policies also had an influence on small differences among selected countries.

6. Conclusions

Authentic leadership exists in educational institutions of Serbia, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska; the authentic leaders in these countries are oriented towards Balanced processing, which leads to the assumption that the environment influences the work and the selection of the leadership style of the school directors. Values of national culture such as collectivism, respect for social values, and social status are not favourable for the development of Authentic leadership and they can slow down the processes of change in management in school environments. A national culture whose values are not appropriate for the

development of Authentic leadership can slow down the processes of change in school environments. A school director would rather choose to adapt to a school's culture than to change themselves towards authenticity in order to change the culture itself. Authentic leadership is connected with job satisfaction. If the leaders are satisfied with their jobs, their followers are also satisfied. The influence of a common cultural environment leads to the fact that differences in Authentic leadership are not statistically important between the investigated countries in the West Balkan area.

According to this and previous research, it cannot be concluded whether Authentic leadership is strong enough to lead to the improvement of schools all by itself. The existence of a greater number of authentic leaders would be a step towards respecting moral and ethical principles and work results. Authentic leadership can be learned and obtained during the life and working cycle. Therefore, leaders of education institutions are constantly faced with the task of developing themselves and their followers – teachers in order to create authenticity. Therefore, changes in management would become possible. It would at least partially diminish the crisis in the ethical side of management and contribute to the improvement of schools.

References:

- Aronson, E., Vilson, T., & Akert, R. (2013). *Socijalna psihologija*, 5 izdanje, Mate, Beograd
- Avolio, B.J. & Gardner, W.L. (2005). *Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315–338.
- Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Walumbwa, F.O., Luthans, F., & May, D.R. (2004). *Unlocking the mask: a look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors*. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 801-823.
- Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O., & Weber, T.J. (2009). *Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449.

- Azanza, G., Moriano, J.A. & Moler, F. (2013). Authentic leadership and organizational culture as drivers of employees' job satisfaction, *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(2), 25-30.
- Bamford, M., Wong, C. & Laschinger, H. (2012). The influence of authentic leadership and areas of worklife on work engagement of registered nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21(3), 529-540.
- Bass, B.M. & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Bass, B.M. & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). *Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership. The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181–217
- Begley, P. (2006). Self-knowledge, capacity and sensitivity: Prerequisites to authentic leadership by school principals, *Journal of Educational Administration and Leadership*, 44, 570-589.
- Begley, P. (2007). Introduction Cross-cultural Perspectives on Authentic School Leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(2), 163-164.
- Bento, A. & Ribeiro, T. (2013). *Authentic Leadership in School Organizations*, *European Scientific Journal*, 9, 31-49.
- Bhindi, N. (2003). Practising creative leadership: Pipe dream or possibility? *The Practising Administrator*, 1, -21.
- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662–683.
- Bono, J.E. & Judge, T.A. (2003). *Self-concordance at work: toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders*, *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(5), 554-571.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row
- Bush, T. (2014). Instructional Leadership in Centralized Contexts: Rhetoric or Reality? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership January*, 42, 3-5.
- Chalofsky, N. (2003). An emerging construct for meaningful work. *Human Resource Development International*, 6, 69-83.
- Chan, A. (2005). *Authentic leadership measurement and development: Challenges and suggestions*. In W. L. Gardner, B. J. Avolio, & F. O. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects, and development (227–251)*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Emery, C.R. & Barker, K.J. (2007). The effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication & Conflict*, 11(1), 77-90.
- Engelbrecht, A.S., Van Aswegen, A.S. & Theron, C.C. (2005). The effect of ethical values on transformational leadership and ethical climate in organisations, *South African Journal of Business Management*, 36(2), 19-26.
- Erickson, R.J. (1995). The importance of authenticity for self and society. *Symbolic Interaction*, 18(2), 121–144.
- Galup, S.D., Klein, G. & Jiang, J.J. (2008). *The impact of job characteristics on is employee satisfaction: A comparison between permanent and temporary employees*. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 48(4), 58-68.

- Gardner, W., Avolio, B., Luthans, F., May, D.R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 343–372.
- Gardner, W., Cogliser, C., Davis, K., & Dickens, M. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1120-1145.
- George, B., & Sims, P. (2007). *True north: Discover your authentic leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hofstede, G. & Hofstede, G.J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations, software of the mind: intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F.P., & Nahrgang, J.D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: understanding leader–follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 373–394.
- Judge, T.A. & Piccolo, R. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 755-768.
- Kernis, M.H. & Goldman, B.M. (2005). *From thought and experience to behavior and interpersonal relationships: A multicomponent conceptualization of authenticity*. In Tesser A, Wood JV, Stapel D (Eds.), *On building, defending and regulating the self: A psychological perspective*: 31-52. New York: Psychology Press.
- Kernis, M.H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 1–26.
- Lashbrook, W. (1997). Business performance, employee satisfaction, and leadership practices. *Performance Improvement*, 36(5), 29–33.
- Lee, H.Y. & Ahmad, K.Z. (2009). The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behaviour and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30(1), 53–86.
- Luthans, F. & Avolio, B.J. (2003). *Authentic leadership development*. In K. Cameron, S., Dutton, J. E., and Quinn, R. E. (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship*, 241-258. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Madlock, P.E. (2006). Do differences in displays of nonverbal immediacy and communicator competence between male and female supervisors affect subordinates, job satisfaction? *Ohio Communication Journal*, 44, 61–78.
- May, D.R., Chan, A.Y.L., Hodges, T.D. & Avolio, B.J. (2003). Developing the moral component of authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 32, 247-260.
- Mind-Garden (n.d.), (2014). Retrieved from: <http://www.mindgarden.com/>, Accessed December 12, 2014.
- Morris, J. (2014). The impact of authentic leadership and ethical firm culture on auditor behavior, Sam Houston State University, *Journal of Behavioral in Business*, 7, 1–32
- Nisen, M. (2014). *Heres why your Boss is Much happier than you*, Retrieved from: <http://www.businessinsider.com/manager-job-satisfactio/>, Accessed December 12, 2014.
- Northouse, P. (2013). *Leadership-Theory and Practice*, Sixth Edition, SAGE Publications Ltd, UK

- avlovic, N. (2013). *Savremene koncepcije liderstva i organizaciona kultura*, Djura Jakšič, Rača.
- Pavlovic, N. (2014). *Nove uloge menadžera ljudskih resursa*, Djura Jakšič, Rača.
- Peterson, K., & Deal, T. (2009). *The Shaping School Culture Fieldbook* Paperback, the second edition, JB, printed in USA
- Rayan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2003). *On assimilating identities to the self: A self-determination theory perspective on internalization and integrity within cultures*. In M. Leary, R. and Tangney, J.P. (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity*: 253-272. New York: Guilford.
- Robbins, S. & Coutler, M. (2005). *Management*, VIII izd., Data status, Beograd
- Robbins, S. & Judge, A. (2009). *Organizacijsko ponašanje*, 12 izdanje, Mate doo, Zagreb
- Schein, E. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*, Published by Jossey-Bass, S.A.
- Shamir, B. & Eilam, G. (2005), "What's your story?" A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 395–417.
- Shirey, M. (2009). Authentic leadership, organizational culture, and healthy work environments. *Critical care nursing quarterly*, 32(3), 189-98
- Stajkovic, A.D. & Luthans, F. (1998). *Social cognitive theory and self-efficacy: Going beyond traditional motivational and behavioral approaches*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 26, 62–74.
- Tabachnick, B. & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 5th edn. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Terry, R.W. (1993). *Authentic leadership: Courage in action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Timothy, A. J., & Ronald, F. P. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768.
- Von Krosigk, B. (2007). A holistic exploration of leadership development, *South African Journal of Business Management*, 38(2), 25-31.
- Vujic, D. (2008). *Menadžment ljudskih resursa i kvaliteta*, Centar za primenjenu psihologiju, Beograd
- Walker, A. & Shuangye, C. (2007). Leader Authenticity in Intercultural School Context. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(2), 185-204.
- Walumbwa, F.O., Avolio, B., Gardner, W.L., Wernsing, T., & Peterson, S.J. (2006). *Authentic leadership: Development and validity analysis of a multi-dimensional theory-based measure*. Working paper, Arizona State University. Tony Bush, 2014, Instructional Leadership in Centralized Contexts: Rhetoric or Reality? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42, 3-5.
- Walumbwa, F.O., Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Wernsing, T.S. & Peterson, S.J. (2008). *Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure*. *Journal of Management*, 34, 89-126.
- Walumbwa, F.O., Wang, P., Wang, H., Schaubroeck, J. & Avolio, B.J. (2010). Psychological processes linking authentic leadership to follower behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 901–914.
- Zhu, C., & Engels, N. (2014). Organizational culture and instructional innovations in higher education: Perceptions and reactions of teachers and students. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(1), 136-158.

Nebojsa Pavlovic

University Kragujevac,
Faculty of Hotel and
Tourism
Vojvodjanska bb, Vrnjacka
Banja
Serbia
racapn@gmail.com
