



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN BUSINESS & SOCIAL SCIENCES



Gen-Y Teacher Leadership on Conflict Management and Communication Satisfaction

Marlia Jamail & Yahya Don

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v9-i1/5488>

DOI: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v9-i1/5488

Received: 11 Dec 2018, **Revised:** 05 Jan 2019, **Accepted:** 20 Jan 2019

Published Online: 01 Feb 2019

In-Text Citation: (Jamail & Don, 2019)

To Cite this Article: Jamail, M., & Don, Y. (2019). Gen-Y Teacher Leadership on Conflict Management and Communication Satisfaction. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(1), 881–897.

Copyright: © 2019 The Author(s)

Published by Human Resource Management Academic Research Society (www.hrmars.com)

This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this license may be seen at: <http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>

Vol. 9, No. 1, 2019, Pg. 881 - 897

<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/IJARBSS>

JOURNAL HOMEPAGE

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/publication-ethics>



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN BUSINESS & SOCIAL SCIENCES



Gen-Y Teacher Leadership on Conflict Management and Communication Satisfaction

Marlia Jamail & Yahya Don
Universiti Utara Malaysia

Abstract

Distributed leadership through teacher leadership of generation Y teachers, is a practical necessity that should be emphasized as outlined in the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025. However, conflicts in educational organizations are difficult to avoid that came along with ineffective communication, thus causes teacher leadership becomes deniable to be implemented. The main objective of this pilot study is to determine the mean score of items used in the instruments. This study uses SPSS Version 21.0 in search of mean scores and Alpha Cronbach of the items involved. The sample of this study consists of 36 generation Y teachers in a selected secondary school in Kedah. The findings of this pilot study show that Alpha Cronbach values for distributed leadership, conflict management and communication satisfaction; are at high levels scoring .81, .73 and .86 respectively. While the overall mean score for distributed leadership is 4.46, conflict management mean score is 4.72 and mean score for communication satisfaction is 4.50 each; which indicates high mean score. Based on the pilot data, the highest mean score value for distributed leadership, conflict management and communication satisfaction; are in the dimensions of instructional programs, compromising styles and horizontal communication. This initial finding shows that generation Y teachers is a generation that desired attention, immediate feedback, have high curiosity and prefer to communicate in informal ways. They always demand to be led, seek clear direction, need support and guidance from school administrators, and require to be involved in decision making at school. Conflicts are solved by compromising style and they do not prefer in avoiding styles that then can lead to a more severe conflict in the future.

Keywords: Distributed Leadership, Teacher Leadership, Conflict Management, Communication Satisfaction, Generation Y Teachers.

Introduction

Leadership could initiate change through one's ability to influence other individuals to accomplish a stated mission. Moreover, educational leadership has allowed the implementation of the national education policy changes through the Malaysia Education Blueprint (MEB) 2013-2025 which concerns the transformation of the country's overall education system. It should be noted that the

transformation of the national education system not only involves improvements to curriculum content but also involves an adjustment in the educational leadership at the school level too (Male & Palaiologou, 2015).

As being mentioned in MEB Report 2015, the selection of leadership at the school level is no longer based on the criterion of service duration solely, but instead has shifted to competency-focused leadership. Ergo, a review of the Malaysia Quality Education Standard (SKPM) 2010 has been conducted by the Performance and Implementation Unit (PADU) from Ministry of Education (MOE) in 2014 to assess the existing standards and upgrade them to a more qualified and competent standard.

Nonetheless, the drastic transformation in the country's education system may result in some discomfort for others, creating different reactions (Zuraidah Juliana Mohamad Yusoff, Yahya Don & Siti Noor Ismail, 2016) and triggering conflicts within educational organization. Conflicts that are already existed and inherent in any organization, need to be resolved through the process of strategy analysis or conflict management style to further strengthen the management of the organization (Abdullah, 1991).

The study of conflict in an organization has been extensively carried out and this includes various facets such as psychology and communication (De Dreu & Gelfland, 2008; Putnam & Poole, 1987; Thomas, 1992). Umiker (1993) suggested that poor communication level within an organization may complicate the relationship between members of the organization and brings about interpersonal conflicts. In fact, communication is also one of the main challenges of school leaders to deliver effective information as it is crucial to match the difference in cohort of generation that exists at the school level. The lack of efficient communication among teachers will worsen the existing conflicts, reducing teacher motivation, initiating frustration and resulting in high level of uneasiness among colleagues, students and parents (Bakic-Tomic, Dvorski & Krinic, 2015).

The vision and mission of an organization is laborious to achieve without effective communication between individuals through different generation cohorts. Ineffective communication will result in the worsening of the conflict caused by the drastic transformation factor that occurs in an organization and manageable through efficient management (Fullan, 2001; Spillane, 2006; Yusoff, Don & Ismail, 2016).

Statement of Problem

School-based leadership has been reformulated so that it is align with school leadership to discover alternatives to delegate leadership functions to organizational citizens (Green, 2009). Meanwhile, distributed leadership is an issue of leadership that is being widely discussed (Gronn, 2000 & Harris, 2008) and debated particularly in Malaysia in the context of education (Yaacob, 2009; Wahab, Aida, Zainal and Rafik, 2013; Zakaria & Kadir, 2013, Halim & Ahmad, 2015; Rabindarang, Khuan, & Khoo, 2014; Boon & Tahir, 2013) and have been acknowledged with their capability in driving development

progress and achievement of a school (Gronn, 2003; Harris, 2008; 2009; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004; Spillane & Sherer, 2004).

Even though the concept of distributed leadership has long existed (Gronn, 2008 & Harris, 2012), the study of distributed leadership form is still in its early stage of study (Spillane and Diamond, 2007; Jamalul Lail Abdul Wahab et al., 2013). Ergo, a more comprehensive and thorough study should be done on the influence of this distributed leadership (Hulpia, Devos and Rosseel, 2009; OECD, 2008) and become a necessity for today's leadership to shift towards the distributed leadership model (Gronn, 2002). Baker (2007) and Riggio (2014) state that recent research on leadership is a process developed jointly by leaders and followers in an organization such as distributed leadership.

Teacher leadership can be observed through leadership effectiveness at school level (Kowalski, 2010). Jamilah Man (2017) stated that the school leadership establishment consists mostly of the generation of Baby Boomers that is approaching retirement, while 70% of generation Y teachers are entering the realm of working and are still new in the workforce. Hence, this study will concentrate on the cohort of generation Y teachers who were born between 1980 and 2000 (Beekman, 2011 & Cekada, 2012). The generation Y teachers has a longer periods of service and these cohorts need to be given the space and chances to lead the educational organization.

Furthermore, the teacher leadership through the practice of distributed leadership that has multilateral interaction networks between leader, followers and situation, calls upon an appropriate and highly efficient communication medium (interaction). One of the biggest challenges leaders in managing this 21st century organization is in terms of communication management; whereby leaders should avoid using an overly critical, assertive, straight forward and threatening communication approaches (Green, 2009). Studies show that 80% of organizational management is practicing interpersonal communication. Therefore, school leaders need to have a clear-cut comprehension of the communication process that existed in their organization (Lunenberg & Orstein, 2008). This is necessary, as powerful communication will create effective schools (Hallinger & Walker, 2011), enhancing organizational effectiveness (Miller, 2001), improving job satisfaction and job performance (Ahmad Jawahir, Rosli, & Kalthom, 2011; Schmidt, 2014; Zulch, 2014) as well as encouraging organizational members to adhere to the leaders' instructions (Barret, 2006). On contrary, inefficient communication may lead to the relationship between the leader and the worker to be distant, affecting the ongoing task (Butts, 2010) and will eventually elicit a conflict.

School leaders should be aware that the communication climate that is not conducive in the workplace creates multiple conflicts. In actuality, conflict is an inevitable element as organizational member have different opinions, views and cultures, but are compelled to move towards a common vision (Wellington, 2011). Conflicts will happen because communication is always needed to carry out a task. Additionally, conflict is the most crucial and challenging process (Green, 2009) in the school environment. Nonetheless, the studies on the effect of conflict in schools are still at scarce level (Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

The well planned MEB 2013-2025 desire the expectations of effective school leadership so that the vision of the national education can be comprehended and appreciated by all members of the organization. Only through effective communication, members of the organization can work collaboratively to achieve the organizational vision (Green, 2009). The organization members will feel underappreciated, misunderstood, depressed and disappointed if organizational communication is not effective (Sobel & Ornstein, 1996) and will trigger catastrophic conflicts. If conflict frequency is high in an organization, certainly the objective, vision and aspirations of MEB 2013-2025 will fail, which in turn will disrupt the flow of MEB as well as the National Education Philosophy (NEP) itself.

Literature Review

The national education system is moving towards the second wave that is being implemented within 5 years from 2016 to 2020 (MEB 2013 - 2025). The quality of education is the main agenda of MOE is to concentrate on improving the quality of leadership of teachers in every school in Malaysia. This is necessary as the improvement of the national education system is extremely depending on teachers' quality (MEB Report 2015). The quality of teachers and schools reflects the quality of student enrollment in which this aspect began to be an indicator of educational success in Malaysia as noted in the Second Wave Malaysia Quality Education Standards (SKPMg2). Students' capability is a critical phase in MEB 2013-2025 as students are the output of success that can reflect the successful implementation of the 13-years state educational plan. This is aligned too, with the fifth shift requirement of MEB that is to: **'Ensuring High Performance Leadership is Practiced in Each School'**. This fifth shift is a clear MOE aspiration with the need to synthesize a quality leadership group at the school level to create a democratic school.

Distributed Leadership

Studies on distributed leadership in Malaysia need to be further reinforced to contribute more beneficial findings on distributed leadership in schools (Jamalul Lail Abdul Wahab et al., 2013). This is also recommended by Harris (2008) which suggested that although there is empirical study of distributed leadership, the study is still at a low level. Spillane, Camburn and Pareja (2007) argued that even though there are developments in distributed leadership literacy, empirical baseline studies and concepts are still new and deficient (Davis, 2009).

Similarly, the statement of inadequacy of this study was also supported by Rosnarizah Abdul Halim and Hussein Haji Ahmad (2015) and Shakir, Issa and Mustafa (2011) in the context of distributed leadership in Malaysian education. Since this distributed leadership is still recent and secluded for school leadership, a further study must be conducted thoroughly to observe ways in which this distributed leadership approach can be developed optimally in schools (Jamalul Lail Abdul Wahab et al., 2013). Practical distributed leadership is described as the consequent of the interaction between leader, followers and the situation (Spillane, 2005). Effective followers strongly affect the achievement of leadership in an organization. They will work collaboratively with leaders to realize their vision and solve problems arising through their own action, because of their capabilities and influences (Chen, Kanfer, Kirikman, Allen & Rosen, 2007; Hoption, 2014).

Meanwhile, the followers at the school level referred as teacher leadership is one of the dimensions inherent in distributed leadership. Teachers can influence others through efforts to administer an environment of engagement and collaboration in all activities and instructional programs. There are various studies proving that principals play a vital function in developing teacher leadership capabilities in schools. This situation applies to teacher leadership factors that can influence the existence of effective schools (Harris, 2003; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Frost & Durrant, 2002; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999). This is also supported by the statements from Berry, Daughtrey and Wieder (2010) that more studies need to be conducted on teacher leadership as it can be developed according to different needs. Teachers should also be given the opportunity to make decisions especially issues that relates to teacher work scope in the school (Alanezi, 2011). According to the MEB Report 2016, the quality of teachers and school leaders stays as focus of MEB and continues to be established every year.

Generation Y

Referring to the issue of cohort differences generations that have now entered the 21st-century working sector, there are 3 generation cohorts have begun to exist in organizations namely the generation of Baby Boomers, generation X and generation Y (Tapscott, 2009). Nonetheless, this study only concentrates on the generation Y teachers. This is because the generation Y teachers is the cohort of teachers who were born between 1980 and 2000 (Beekman, 2011 & Cekada, 2012) which has a longer service period. For the next 30 years, generation Y will be aged between 48 years up to 68 years old. Generation Y teachers is a notable component of future leaders who will govern and lead the country to ensure that Malaysia will be among the top 20 countries in the world in numerous aspects. Ergo, it is essential for school leaders to delve into the exclusive features of the generation Y teacher to obtain the best output from the generation Y cohort itself.

Balda and Mora (2011) portray the generation Y as a very distinguished generation in comparison to the previous generation. Leaders in an organization should apprehend the behavior of the generation Y to get the best output from them. A further study needs to be carried out in regards the attitude of generation Y workers as it can have long-term impact on an organization based on their unique characteristics (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). McNamara (2005) labels the generation Y as a Digital Generation that is realistic, optimistic and always consider current developments. This generation is always curious and asks questions such as why in order to get the answer rationally (Kehril & Sapp, 2006). Additionally, generation Y is also an end result-oriented as it seeks the desired output (Streeter, 2007) and requires guidance for each task to be done.

Generation Y is the first generation to be exposed with computers and digital media (Raines, 2002). This generation is also known as the Millennial generation who loves digital technology (IT savvy) and has the skills and expertise in the field of information and communication technology. Generation Y enjoys working with the environment that uses modern and upcoming approaches as there are challenges and opportunities that can be tested (Martin, 2005). Myers and Sadaghiani (2010) suggested that a detailed study on how organizational members should adapt themselves to communicate with generation Y to avoid conflicts in the organization. They always desire precise

instruction of methods on how they want their work to be completed and they are comfortable to work collaboratively (Alch, 2008). Misleading instructions for this generation will cause communication barriers and triggers conflict within an organization.

Conflict Management

The conflict management style depends on the type of interaction that occurs between the conflicting individual (Rahim, 1983). Generally, conflicts occur because of contrasting opinion involving a significant discrepancy between the generational gap of teachers in the school. Therefore, the study of conflict management in an organization is paramount to accomplish the national education of vision and mission which is intended, can be exercised and achieved within the prescribed period without any destructive conflict. An organization will be paralyzed if the conflict is not solved and properly managed and it will worsen the leadership to retrieve the conflict which has happened before (Sabanci, Sahin and Ozdemir, 2018).

As being suggested by Ab Aziz Yusof (2000) in conflict management, the best negotiating skills are to assure that all members of the organization will benefit through a win-win situation. When conflicts are well handed, a win-win attitude can be forged and harmonize the organization (Green, 2009). An efficient-functioning conflict aids the achievement of goals by members of the organization and can provided a new solution from the previous conflicts (Putnam & Poole, 1987). On the other hand, if the conflict does not work accordingly, the win-loss situation will take place and indirectly creates estrangement (Owens, 1995) which will negatively impact an organization and eventually distract the productivity of the organization. Ergo, the leader itself plays a vital role in the management of interpersonal conflicts that occur within the organization.

Communication Satisfaction

Futile form of communication may affect relationship between leaders and employees negatively, thus affecting the task given (Butts, 2010) and finally causing a conflict. By practicing effective communication approaches, employees can express their feelings about their dissatisfaction toward organizational members, and improving work performance too (Szilagyi & Wallace, 1990). Gray and Laidlaw (2004) stated that employee communication satisfaction can boost the understanding of communication practices that occur in an organization and enhance other type of satisfaction such as job satisfaction (Pettite, Goris, & Vaught, 1997 & Pincus, 1986). Zulhamri Abdullah and Jong Hui (2014) agreed that school leaders must comprehend strategies to improve communication satisfaction with the teachers and the environment of the work place they needed, especially the generation Y teachers who love communication through social media mediums. Communication satisfaction is vital to be assessed as it highlighted a significance of the communication process itself, such as the medium, style and communication functions that occurs in an organization (Clampit & Girard, 1993).

On contrary, if communication does not materialize optimally through the established Professional Learning Communities (PLC) platform, the conflict will be prompted and the aspiration of MEB to enable teachers to collaborate in sharing existing expertise, will find a plight and will distract the

planning of the MEB itself. On top of that, it will also cause brain-drain situation among teacher expertise where they intend to refuse sharing the expertise available because of conflicts that is not properly handled. Ergo, the school leadership should improve the relationship with the teacher as the teacher is a professional worker and has expertise in their respective fields (Alanezi, 2011). The school leadership need the teacher leadership to launch teaching and learning sessions at schools (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009; Lambert, 2003) and the combination of both is needed to improve the quality of the school (Bakar, Basri & Fooi, 2015).

The vision and mission of an organization is arduous to achieve without effective communication between individuals through different generation cohorts. Without communication, an organization is like having several groups of individuals performing their respective tasks without the same goal (Sabanci, Sahin & Ozdemir, 2018). Ineffective communication will add to the conflict caused by the drastic transformation factor that occurs in an organization, which should be managed through effective management (Fullan, 2001; Spillane, 2006; Zuraidah Juliana Mohamad Yusoff, Yahya Don & Siti Noor Ismail, 2016). This potent management should be looked at and examined from the dimensions of communication and conflict management styles involving the generation Y teachers. Jamilah Man (2017) agreed that 70% of teachers are generation Y who will be in a future educational organization. Ergo, it is crucial to see the quality of the generation Y teachers to be adapted into the 21st century education sector to align a clear MOE vision and mission to the successful MOE 2013-2025.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This study aims to:

1. Identify the distributed leadership level, conflict management level and communication satisfaction level of generation Y teachers.
2. Determine the alpha Cronbach value for each items in distributed leadership, conflict management and communication satisfaction instruments of generation Y teachers.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The design of this study is through quantitative method which to determine the mean score and alpha Cronbach values for distributed leadership, conflict management and communication satisfaction instruments of generation Y teachers. The data obtained will be analyzed using Statistical Packages for the Social Science (SPSS) version 21.0.

Instruments

Questionnaire is one of the instruments used to attain data as more universal, numerical, quantitative, inexpensive, time-saving, and far-reaching (Rosli Mohammed, 2016). It is also a process usually adopted in descriptive research (Creswell, 2009; 2012; 2014; Johnson & Christensen, 2014). This study had adapted the Distributed Leadership Survey (DLS) instrument by Davis (2009), Communication Satisfaction Questionnaires (CSQ) by Downs and Hazen (1977) meanwhile the instruments of Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI-II) Form A for the measurement of

conflict management style by Rahim, 1983. All the instruments were measured by the reliability of items in the instruments of distributed leadership, communication satisfaction and conflict management for this study are 105 items.

Data Analysis of Pilot Study

A pilot study had conducted which was a trial study done on a small group of respondent prior the implementation of a real study. This study focuses to assess the level of construct validity and reliability of the instrument as well as to obtain feedback on the veracity and accuracy of the research instrument. Through the implementation of the pilot study, the researcher could gain the experience, and be more prepared with any possibilities, (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001) reduced the confusion in the use of the format and the wordings (Sekaran, 2003).

The researcher had conducted a pilot study concerning a total of 36 generation Y teachers from a national secondary school in Baling, Kedah and were not involved with the actual study. The researcher conducted the pilot study herself to ensure no discrepancies in the rate of return of the questionnaires. Respondents involved in this pilot study will not engage in the actual studies. Tables 1, 2 and 3 represent the analysis of the findings of the pilot study for the reliability values that have been implemented using the instruments involved in pilot study.

Table 1: Pilot test results on item reliability of DLS

Distributed Leadership Dimensions	Items	Alfa Cronbach Values	Mean Score
School Organization	7	.83	3.81
School Vision	5	.89	4.06
School Culture	6	.81	4.00
Instructional Program	3	.85	4.16
Artifact	4	.82	4.07
Teacher Leadership	6	.87	4.12
Principal Leadership	6	.88	4.04
Total		.81	4.46

Table 2 : Pilot test results on item reliability of ROCI-II Form A

Conflict Management Dimensions	Items	Alfa Cronbach Values	Mean Score
Intergrating	7	.85	3.89
Obliging	6	.84	3.93
Compromising	4	.84	3.98
Avoiding	6	.84	3.19
Dominating	5	.81	3.77
Total		.73	4.72

Table 3 : Pilot test results on item reliability of CSQ

Communication Satisfaction Dimensions	Items	Alfa Cronbach Values	Mean Score
Communication Climate	5	.83	3.85
Supervisory Communication	5	.82	3.54
Organizational Intergration	5	.78	3.87
Media Quality	5	.82	3.83
Horizontal Communication	5	.87	3.91
Organizational Perspective	5	.85	3.56
Personal Feedback	5	.82	3.56
Subordinate Communication	5	.85	3.75
Total		.86	4.50

Discussion

An instrument can precisely measure the material to be measured which instrument with high validity value and is able to provide justification based on the findings collected (Noraini Idris, 2010). Reliability testing refers to the ability of a study to achieve consistent value through the measurement process (Chua, 2012). The internal consistency method is done by finding the correlation value between the scores for each item in the test with the total score for all items in the test index score ie using Alpha Cronbach's reliability coefficient (Chua, 2012; Nunally, 1978; Sekaran, 2003). This pilot test had calculated the reliability coefficient to reflect the suitability of the items in an instrument as a set of questions (Sekaran, 2003). This reliability coefficient (Alpha Cronbach) test is used too, to observe the internal consistency of instruments in the data collection process (Rosli Mohammed, 2016).

As being suggested by Hogan (2007), the Alpha Cronbach value of an instrument should be at the range between .70 and .90 to ensure it is reliable in the study. In this pilot study, the Alpha Cronbach test was applied on all variables, namely the dimensions of distributed leadership, conflict management and communication satisfaction that either reached the range or not. The researcher found that the Alpha Cronbach's value for each dimension of distributed leadership, communication satisfaction as well as conflict management is more than .70 and within the acceptable range. The reliability analysis of all distributed leadership dimensions is from .81 to .88, the reliability analysis conflict management is from .81 to .85, meanwhile the reliability analysis for communication satisfaction is from .78 to .87. The results of these analysis shows that all dimensions of the instruments used in this study demonstrate consistency and have a high reliability.

The mean score of distributed leadership instruments demonstrated that the instructional program dimension was the highest at 4.16, while the mean score of the teacher leadership was the second highest at 4.12. This implies that generation Y teachers require unequivocal direction in completing a given assignment and practices leadership at school if they received appropriate guidance. Generation Y teachers are often curious and always ask questions such as why to get rational answers

(Kehril & Sapp, 2006). Generation Y teachers are also attracted to the outcome like obtaining desired output (Streeter, 2007) and needed to be maneuvered by the tasks authorized to them.

In regarded to school organization, this dimension has the lowest mean score of 3.81 of distributed leadership. This is because generation Y teachers believed that they are lack of given spaces and opportunities to practice the leadership and seldom involved in the process of making decisions at school from the school administration. This is because of the hierarchy structure that still hold the power and communication in one way that is from top to down.

As for the conflict management style, the highest mean score for the instrument is compromising style with 3.98 and the mean score of the obliging style is the second highest with 3.93. Generation Y teachers feel that when conflicts occur between them and the administrators, they prefer to use compromising style. The style is often applied because it concerns a give and take action between both parties and no party win or lose (Rahim, 1983). Thomas and Kilmann (1974) highlighted that this compromising style motivates all parties to benefit from it and this approach is known as 'win some – lose some'. This compromising style is also founded to be moderate between the two dimensions in concerning for self and concerning for others between the conflicting parties. The two conflicting parties will then create an agreement to find a solution (Rahim, 1983).

The avoiding dimension is also the most undesirable conflict management style with the lowest mean score of 3.19. Generation Y teachers are not individuals who tend to avoid, withdraw, defer conflicts, do not accentuate themselves and seek other solutions by means of this avoiding style (Rahim, 1983). Generation Y teachers always demand immediate answers and feedback on the task assigned as they are responsible in whatever they are involved (Martin, 2005). The administration should establish relevant work space and draw the attention of generation Y teachers since the nature of this cohort who demands attention and immediate feedback (Jane, Regina & Edward, 2009). Although this avoiding style can be adapted to conflict situations, the consequent of a slow decision will interfere with any decision to be made later (Goodwin, 2002; Gross & Guerrero, 2000; Rahim, 2004). This is against the individual characteristics of the generation Y who always require immediate feedback and decisions.

The highest mean score for communication satisfaction was on the dimension of horizontal communication with 3.91, while the mean score of the organizational integration was the second highest with 3.87. Generation Y teachers feel comfortable with informal communication through a grapevine network because this generation of teachers does not have any problems engaging in groups. Furthermore, generation Y teachers can communicate efficiently with the administrator if this informal communication is concerned, but the accuracy of the information should be retained (Downs & Hazen, 1977). Rosli Mohammed (2016) clarifies that horizontal communication satisfaction is a process of action integration to enhance operational efficiency in solving problems, teamwork and gaining the goal of setting up an organization. Organizational integration is also a dimension that can determine the satisfaction of generation Y teachers' communication as they always call for ample information from the organization about the direction and needs of the organization towards the

assignment given to them (Rosli Mohammed, 2016). Generation Y teachers are also often aware of ways in their work should be implemented and they enjoy working collaboratively (Alch, 2008). The generation Y teachers requires a relaxed and less assertive communication environment. Moreover, these generation Y teachers are comfortable in working in a team that required a workflow that fits with the assignment given to them.

The dimensions of communication with school administration have the lowest mean score of 3.54. Generation Y teachers found that administrators were less guided in completing any task given to them. Additionally, they also found that administrators lack of confidence in their abilities and were not open when they faced problems in each task. Satisfaction with supervisor communication explains the extent of openness of leaders to listen, accepting opinions, paying attention to the problems of subordinates (Rosli Mohammed, 2016). It also includes the ability of leaders to communicate openly with their subordinates, whether interacting with them or listening to their complaints (Downs & Hazen, 1977) and includes aspects of communication from top to down with leaders (Downs, 1988; Gray & Laidlaw, 2002). Ergo, the administrator should give more trust on the generation Y teachers so that they can also participate in the success of the mission and vision set by the MOE.

Conclusion

The results of this pilot study offered an overview of the generation Y teachers in the aspect of distributed leadership, conflict management style and communication satisfaction with the school administrations. Chun Yu and Miller (2005) suggested that a form of leadership that fits with the modern working environment should dodge leadership approach based on organizational hierarchical structure and focus more on leadership based on knowledge. Stretched over leadership for some individuals is one of the major elements that has been pointed up in this distributed leadership (Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2002; Spillane et al., 2001). Furthermore, PLC culture among teachers can also be intensified through organizational learning culture resulting from this distributed leadership.

In conclusion, generation Y teachers is a generation that always need a desired attention, immediate feedback on each of their actions, and being high curiosity are the unique characteristics of this cohort. They always demand to be leaded, and seek clear direction in the issue of teacher leadership in school through a proper guidance until they are able to complete the task given to them. They needed support and guidance from school administrators, and required to be involved in decision making at school. Conflicts that are solved by compromising style proven that generation Y teachers are still respected the administrator. They do not prefer in avoiding styles to resolve any conflict which will then lead to a more severe conflict in the future. Communication with generation Y teachers must be more geared towards informal communication because of their preferable communication using social media. The use of social media also creates the characteristics and communication style of generation Y teachers in teacher leadership in the educational organization.

Corresponding Author

Yahya Don, Dean of School of Education and Modern Languages, Universiti Utara Malaysia, UUM
PhD (Educational Leadership)

References

- Alanezi, A. S. (2011). *Communication satisfaction and its relationship to organizational commitment among secondary school teachers in Kuwait*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana State University, Indiana.
- Alch, M. L. (2008). Get Ready for a new type of workplace: the net generation. *Supervision*, 69(6), 18-21.
- Yaacob, B. (2009). *Respective approaches in promoting distributive leadership in school*. Seminar Nasional Pengurusan dan Kepimpinan Pendidikan ke16. Institut Aminuddin Baki, Genting Highlands.
- Baker, S. (2007). Followership: The theoretical foundation of a contemporary construct. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 14, 50-60.
- Bakic-Tomic, L., Dvorski, J., & Kirinic, A. (2015). Elements of teacher communication competence: An examination of skills and knowledge to communicate. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 1(2), 157-166.
- Balda, J., & Mora, F. (2011). Adapting leadership theory and practice for the networked, millennial generation. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5, 13-24. doi:10.1002/jls.20229
- Barrett, L.F. (2006). Solving the emotion paradox: Categorization and the experience of emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 20-46.
- Beekman, T. (2011). Fill in the generation gap. *Strategic Finance*, 93(3), 15-17.
- Berry, B., Daughtrey, A., & Wieder, A. (2010). Teacher Leadership: Leading the Way to Effective Teaching and Learning. *Center for Teaching Quality*.
- Butts, A.G. (2010). *Managers communication style and employees' job satisfaction: A quantitative study*. Doctor of Philosophy Doctoral dissertation, Capella University.
- Cekada, T. L. (2012). Training a multigenerational workforce. *Professional Safety*, 57,40-44.
- Chen, G., Kanfer, R., Kirkman, B., Allen, D., & Rosen, B. (2007). A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 331-346.
- Chua, Y.P. (2012). *Asas statistik penyelidikan buku 2 edisi kedua*. Malaysia: McGraw-Hill Sdn. Bhd.
- Chun, H.Y., & Miller, P. (2005). Leadership style. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(1), 35-50.
- Clampit, P. G., dan Girard, D.M. (1993). Communication Satisfactions: A useful Construct? *New Jersey Journal of Communication*, 1(2), 84-102.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research, (4th ed)*. Boston: Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research, (4th ed.)*. Pearson new international

- edition. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Davis, M.W. (2009). *Distributed Leadership and School Performance*. Tesis Kedoktoran yang tidak diterbitkan. The faculty of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development of the George Washington University, UMI Number 3344534.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Gelfand, M. J. (2008). Conflict in the Workplace: Sources, Functions, and Dynamics across Multiple Levels of Analysis. *The Psychology of Conflict and Conflict Management in Organizations*. 3–54.
- Downs, C. W., & Hazen, M.D. (1977). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 14(3), 63-73.
- Downs, C.W. (1988). *Communication Audits*. Glenview: Scott Foresmen.
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington : The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Frost, D., & Durrant, J. (2002). Teachers as leaders: Exploring the impact of teacher-led development work. *School Leadership and Management*, 22(2), 143-161.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodwin, J. (2002). Auditors 'conflict management style: An exploratory study. *Abacus*, 38 (3), 378-405.
- Gray, J., & Laidlaw, H. (2004). Improving the measurement of communication satisfaction *Management Communication Quarterly*, 17(3), 425-448.
- Green, R.L. (2009). *Practicing the art of leadership: A problem-based approach to implementing the ISLLC standards*. (3rd ed.). Pearson.
- Gronn, P. (2000). Distribute properties: A new arcgitecture for leadership. *Educational Management and Administration*. 28(3), 317-338.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 423-451, doi:10.1016/s1048-9843(02)00120.
- Gronn, P. (2003). *The new work of educational leaders : Changing leadership practice in an era of school reform*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Gronn, P. (2008) The future of distributed leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 46, 141–158.
- Gross, M. A., & Guerrero, L. K. (2000). Managing conflict appropriately and effectively: An application of the competence model of Rahim 's organizational conflict styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 11(3), 200-226.
- Hallinger, P., & Walker, A.D. (2011). School leadership in Asia Pacific: Identifying challenges and formulating a research agenda. *School Leadership & Management*. Doi:10.1080/13632434.2011.606988
- Harris, A., & Muijs, D. (2003). Teacher leadership: Improvement through empowerment? *An overview of the literature Educational Management an Administration*, 31, 437-448.
- Harris, A. (2008). Distributed Leadership: According to the evidence. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 46(2), 172-188.
- Harris, A. (2009). *Distributed School Leadership : Evidence, issues and future directions*. ACEL Monograph 44. Penrith, NSW: Australian Council for Educational Leaders.

- Hogan, R. (2007). *Personality and the fate of organizations*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hoption, C. (2014). Learning and developing followership. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13, 129-137.
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). The relationship between the perception of distributed leadership in secondary schools and teacher's and teacher leaders' job satisfaction and organisational commitment. *American Educational Research Association*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40284858>.
- Jane, W.G., Regina, A.G., Edward, F.M. (2009). Generational Differences In The Workplace: Personal Values, Behaviors, And Popular Beliefs, *Journal of Diversity Management*. 4 (3). 1-7.
- Katzenmeyer, M., & Moller, G. (2001). *Awakening the sleeping giant: Helping teachers develop as leaders*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kehril, S. & Sopp, T. (2006). *Managing generation Y*. HR Magazines, 51(5). 113.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. (2010). *Standard Kualiti Pendidikan Malaysia Jemaah Nazir dan Jaminan Kualiti*. Kuala Lumpur.
- Kowalski, T.J. (2010). *The School Principal; Visionary Leadership and Competent Management*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group: New York & London.
- Lambert, L. (2003). Leadership Redefined: An Evocative Context for Teacher Leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 23 (4), 421-430.
- Laporan, P.P.P.M. (2015), <https://www.moe.gov.my/index.php/my/pemberitahuan/2016/1343-laporan-tahunan-2015-pelan-pembangunan-pendidikan-malaysia-2013-2026>
- Laporan, P.P.P.M. (2016), https://www.moe.gov.my/images/KPM/UKK/2017/08_Ogo/Laporan%20Tahunan%20PPPM%202016.pdf
- Leedy, P.D. & Ormrod, J.E. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design (7th ed)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Buckingham, UK : Open Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Lunenberg, F. C., & Orstein A. C. (2008). *Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices (5th ed.)*. Belmont, CA : Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Male, T. & Palaiologou, I. (2015). Pedagogical leadership in the 21st century: Evidence from the field. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(2), 214–231.
- Martin, C. A. (2005). From high maintenance to high productivity: What managers need to know about Generation Y. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 37(1), 39–44.
- McNamara, S. A. (2005). *Incorporating generational diversity*. AORN Jurnal.
- Miller, E. (2006). *The effect of rewards, commitment, organizational climate, and work values on intentions to leave: Is there a difference among generations?* PhD Dissertation, University of New York, Albany, NY.
- Myers, K.K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millenials in the workplace: A communication perspective on millenials' organizational relationship and performance. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25, 225-238. Doi10.1007/s10869-010-9172-7
- Idris, N. (2010). *Penyelidikan dalam pendidikan*. McGraw Hill (Malaysia).
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978), *Psychometric Theory, 2nd ed.*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

- Nurulaim Asyikin Zakaria & Suhaida Abdul Kadir (2013). *Kepimpinan Distributif Sekolah Menengah Di Daerah Kangar, Perlis*, Seminar Pasca Siswazah Dalam Pendidikan (GREduc 2013) Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- OECD. (2008). *Education and Training Policy, Improving School Leadership*, Volume 1: Policy and Practice, Summary in English. Paris: OECD.
- Petite, J. D., Goris, J. R., & Vaught, B.C. (1997). An examination of organizational communication as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 34 (1), 81-98.
- Pincus, J.D. (1986). Communication satisfaction, job satisfaction and job performance. *Human Communication Research*, 12(3), 395-419.
- Putman, L. L., & Poole, M. S. (1987). Conflict and negotiation. *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Raines, C. (2003), *Connecting Generations: The Sourcebook*, Crisp Publications, Menlo Park, CA.
- Rabindarang, S., Khuan, W.B., & Khoo, Y.Y. (2014). Refleksi tenaga pengajar terhadap kepemimpinan distributif dan tekanan kerja dalam pendidikan teknik dan vokasional. *Jurnal Akademika*, 84(1&2). 17-27.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983). Measurement of organizational conflict. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 109(2), 189-199.
- Rahim, M.A. (2004). *Rahim organizational conflict inventories: Professional manual*. Bowling Green, KY: Center for Advanced Studies in Management.
- Riggio, R. E. (2014). Followership research: Looking back and looking forward. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13, 15-20.
- Mohammed, R. (2016). *Audit Komunikasi Organisasi*. Kedah: Penerbit Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Sabancı, A., Şahin, A., Özdemir, I. (2018). The Correlation Between Interpersonal Communication Skills of Inspection Groups And Their Conflict Management Strategies. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 4(4). 176 – 195.
- Schmidt, G. B. (2014). Virtual leadership: An important leadership context. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 182-187. Doi:10.1111/iops.12129
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Educational Research methods for business: A skill-building approach*. New York, NY: Wiley
- Sekaran, U. (2005). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach (4th ed)*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Smola, K. W. & Sutton, C. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 363–382.
- Sobel, D. S., & Ornstein, R. (1996). *The healthy mind, healthy body handbook*. New York: Time Life Medical
- Spillane, J.P., Harverson, R. & Diamond, J.B. (2001). *Investigating School Leadership Practices*. Educational Researcher, 30(3), 23-28.
- Spillane, J.P., Harverson, R. & Diamond, J.B. (2001). *Towards A Theory of Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective*. Chicago: Northwest University.

- Spillane, J.P., & Sherer, J.Z. (2004). *A distributed perspective on school leadership: Leadership practice as stretched over people and place*. Preliminary draft prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Education Association, San Diego.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A Distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36, 3-34.
doi:10.1080/0022027032000106726
- Spillane, J., P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *The Educational Forum*, 69, 143-150.
doi:10.1080/00131720508984678.
- Spillane, J.P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Spillane, J.P., & Diamond, J.B. (2007). *Distributed Leadership in Practice*; Teachers College Press: New York, NY, USA.
- Spillane, J. P., Camburn, E. M. and Pareja, A.S. (2007). Taking a distributed perspective to the school principal's work day. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(1), 103-125.
- Spillane, J. P., Camburn, E.M. et al. (2008). Taking a distributed perspective: Epistemological and methodological tradeoffs in operationalizing the leader-plus aspect. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(2), 189-213.
- Streeter, B. (2007). Welcome to the new workplace. *ABA Banking Journal*, 99(2), 7.
- Szilagyi, A.D. & Wallace, M.J. (1990). *Organizational Behavior and Performance* (5th ed.). USA. Harper Collions.
- Tapscott, D. (2009). *Grown up digital: How the net generation is changing your world*. New York: McGraw-Hill Professional.
- Thomas, K. W., & Kilmann, R. H. (1974). *Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument*. Tuxedo, NY: XICOM.
- Thomas, K.W. (1992). Conflict and negotiation processes in organizations. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., vol. 3, pp. 719-822). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39, 308-331.
- Tulgan, B. (1996). *Managing Generation X, How to Bring Out the Best in Young Talent*, W.W. Norton and Co., New York, NY.
- Umiker, W. (1993). Powerful communication skills: the key to prevention and resolution of personnel problems. *The Health Care Supervisor*, 11(3), 30-34.
- Wellington, P. (2011). *Effective people management: Improve performance delegate more effectively handle poor performance and manage conflict*. London: Kogan Page Publishers.
- Zulch, B. (2014). Leadership communication in project management. *Proceedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 119, 172-181. Doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.021.