J. Appl. Environ. Biol. Sci., 4(2)156-161, 2014

© 2014, TextRoad Publication

ISSN: 2090-4274
Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences
www.textroad.com

Relationship between Management Styles (Educational-Administrative) and Performance of Middle-Schools and High Schools in Rasht City, Iran

Mohammad Hadi Asgari[1], Masome Hosein Poor[2]

[1]Department of Business Management & Accounting, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Mazandaran, Iran
[2]M.A Student of Educational Management, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Mazandaran, Iran

Received: October 19 2013
Accepted: December 28 2013

ABSTRACT

Present project aim is educational- administration leadership methods relationship to Rasht guidance and high schools performance. present study statistical society includes all Rasht middle schools and high schools managers that 2 Successive years worked as middle schools and high schools managers. present study statistical case includes 70 girly and boy guidance and high Schools managers that select classical –randomly. Present study regarding to aim is practical type and in data collecting and analyzing method using method is 2 variables variance analysis. measurement tool is a questionnaire about educational- administration method that has 5 criteria which Its justifiability and stability certified. To analyze data used variance analysis and lambdai wilex test. there is a relationship between educational–official methods and schools performance with 95% confidence, and there is difference between educational- official method on schools performance position regarding to schools gender to means difference meaningfulness with 95% confidence and educational leadership is more in girly schools Than boy schools and management indicator on brucracy is more in schools Group that have high performance and are boy schools.

KEY WORDS: educational leadership method, administration leadership method, manager, performance, management, styles, leadership.

INTRODUCTION

Teachers work in schools which are led by managers. Teachers' working conditions are usually affected by managers' managerial and leadership style and school management directly influences on teachers and students' achievements (Halinger and Morphy, 1986; OECD, 2001; Pont and Noche and Moran, 2008). In the present century, technologic innovation, migration and globalization are the main issues and countries try to change their educational systems so that they can prepare youths and managers' roles have been changed basically. School effective management is viewed as a key to improved educational results. Global findings show that the quality of any educational system depends on educational managers' quality and no country can go beyond its managers. Therefore, if we want to have a developed country, we must care about our educational managers (Khorshidi, 2003: 9-10). In educational organizations, managers are involved in human systems more than other organizations, because such organizations are involved in teaching (by teachers and employees) and learning (students). This is why effective management of educational environments is difficult. Investment in facilitation of educational environments and encouragement of teachers is very important. Provision of such environments by managers which are educational managers is more tangible in schools than other organizations (Gholi Zadeh, 2003, p 2). The present research investigates the relationship between leadership styles (educational-administrative) and middle schools and high schools performance in Rasgt City, Iran. The results are used to select managers and develop schools performance.

In the 21st century, it is believed that management and leadership quality influences on students' and overall school performance.

Statement of the problem

In the 21st century, it is believed that management and leadership quality influences on students' and overall school performance. It is also believed that schools need effective and powerful managers and leaders. Schools need educated and committed teachers and also they need effective management. Little certainty exists about the influence of leadership behaviors on favorable performance. In this research, theoretical principles of educational leadership and management are investigated and various leadership models are evaluated and relative effectiveness of them in schools are studied (Bush, 1999: 240). In the present research, a survey was conducted to collect high schools and middle schools managers' opinions in Rasht city Districts 1 and 2.

Corresponding Author: Masome Hosein Poor, M.A Student of Educational Management, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Mazandaran, Iran

Leadership styles and managers characteristics were also described and the relationship between leadership style and effectiveness and teachers' cooperation was investigated.

Furthermore, research literature is reviewed in the following sentences.

Farahbakhsh, Saeed (1995) conducted a research titled "investigation and comparison of management and leadership styles of high schools women and men teachers". He concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female managers in using leadership styles. They also concluded that there is no relationship between "age, marital status, management experience, and educational services background" and "management style".

Taghi Khani, Nikzad (2002) conducted a research titled "investigation of relationship between educational groups managers' leadership style and their effectiveness in Tehran technical-engineering Universities". He concluded that managers' leadership styles have relationship with university type, managers' leadership styles have relationship with faculty type, managers' leadership styles does not have relationship with educational group type, and there is no significant difference between universities leadership styles.

Khoshbakhti, Jafar (2004) conducted a research titled "designing and explanation of a three-dimensional model for leadership styles and effectiveness". He concluded that there is significant difference between managers' leadership styles (primary style, developmental style) and their effectiveness.

Nasiri, Mehdi (2009) conducted a research titled "comparison of schools' leadership profile with an emphasis on demographic components of Tehran middle schools managers" and concluded that there is significant difference between younger managers' leadership style who age below 40 than managers who age above 40.

Raj Elahi, Narges (2010) conducted a research titled" comparison between personality characteristics of successful and unsuccessful managers in Mazandaran Province high schools". They concluded that there is significant difference between responsiveness of successful and unsuccessful managers and also there is significant difference between the fact of being pleasant of successful and unsuccessful managers but there is no significant difference between extroversion and flexibility and neurosism of successful and unsuccessful managers.

Research hypotheses

1. There is relationship between leadership styles (educational-administrative) of managers in terms of schools performance level.
2. There is difference between leadership styles (educational-administrative) in terms of schools performance level and considering students gender.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present research is a descriptive research and it is a correlation one. Statistical population of the research included all managers of middle schools and high schools in districts 1 and 2 in Rasht city in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 academic years (totally 70 managers). Because population size is limited and small, sample size was also considered to be 70 people. Variance, covariance and Wilks Lambda test were used to analyze the hypotheses with 95% of certainty.

Data analysis

First hypothesis

There is relationship between leadership styles (educational-administrative) of managers in terms of schools performance level.

Multi-variate variance analysis was used to investigate the first hypothesis. Before conducting this test, its preconditions (assumptions), i.e. distance quality of data, normality of distribution, randomness of data and homogeneity of variance matrix were investigated.

Investigation of variance matrix homogeneity assumption has been reported in table 1.

Table 1: Box test for analyzing homogeneity of variance and covariance matrices

P	F	$_2$df	$_1$df	Box's
0.087	2.305	141120	15	16.457

Box test was conducted in order to investigate covariance and variance matrices. Considering the results in table 1, because significance level is P>0.05, the calculated F is not statistically significant. Therefore, the assumption of covariance and variance matrices homogeneity holds.

Results of investigation of variances error equality assumption have been presented in table 2.

Table 2. variances error equality assumption

p	$_2$df	$_1$df	f	
School management goals index	1.890	1	68	0.078
Educational management index	3.699	1	68	0.059
School direct education index	1.389	1	680.085	
Management based on auditing index	2.218	1	68	0.141
Management based on bureaucracy index	0.440	1	68	0.509

Because significance level of dependent variables of leadership styles indices are P>0.05, variances error equality assumption holds. Therefore, the researcher is allowed to use multi-variate variance analysis because variance matrix homogeneity assumption and variances error equality assumption hold. After conduction of survey, leadership styles indices were calculated based upon educational performance and the results are summarized in table 3.

Table 3. means and standard deviations for educational and administrative leadership styles as separated according to high performance of schools and low performance of schools

variables	high-performance schools group		low-performance schools group	
	$\overline{X}$	s	$\overline{X}$	s
School management goal index	4.25	0.933	3.44	1.01
Educational management index	3.97	0.895	0.758	3.21
School direct education index	3.66	1.06	0.652	2.96
Management based on auditing index	3.97	0.895	0.901	2.70
Management based on bureaucracy index	3.60	1.050	0.661	2.25

Table 4. partial Eta squared based on Wilks Lambda test for compound variable

variable	Value	F	df_1	df_2	p	Eta	Test power
Wilks Lambda test	0.303	29.501	5	64	0/001	0.697	1.00

Eta squared is a part of variance which is related to new compound variable. In the present research, school management goals index includes educational management index, school direct education index, management based upon auditing index, management based upon bureaucracy index and the new compound variable can be called indices of educational and administrative leadership styles. This variable's value is equal to 0.697 and this shows the schools performance partial Eta squared. Because the calculated eta value is greater than 0.14, this indicates high influence of schools performance on administrative and educational styles indices.

Table 5. results of variance analysis for administrative and educational leadership styles indices

Test power	Eta	p	F	ms	df	SS	Diffraction source
1.00	0.379	0.001	2.048	11.441	1	11.441	School management goals index
Educational management index			10.108	1	10.108	14.677	0.001	0.308	1.00
School direct education index	8.624		1	8.624	11.071	0.001	0.140	0.907	
Management based on auditing index			26.047	1	26.047	30.279	0.001	0.178	0.965
Management based on bureaucracy index			31.557	1	31.557	40.948	0.001	0.151	0.928

According to table 5, Bonferroni's adjusted alpha (0.01)was used to analyze dependent variables: school management goals, educational management index, school direct education index, management based on auditing index, and management based on bureaucracy index. According to F calculated for school management goals index ((df=1, 68)=12.048, p=0.001, Eta squared=0.376), because significance level is less than Bonferroni's adjusted alpha (0.01), the calculated F is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that there is significant difference between school management goals index points in the two groups of "high school performance" and "low school performance" . comparison of the difference between school management goals means in the two groups (high-performance schools and low-performance schools) revealed that school management goals level is higher in schools which have high performance. Furthermore, results of table 5 for educational management index variable ((df=1, 68)=14.677, p=0.001, Eta squared=0.308) showed that because significance level is lower than Bonferroni's adjusted alpha (0.01), the calculated F is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that educational management index points in the two groups of schools are significantly different. Comparison of the mean difference for educational management index in the two groups revealed that educational management index is higher in schools which have higher performance. Results of calculations for school direct education index variable in table 7-4 ((df=1, 68)=11.071, p=0.001, eta squared=0.140) reveal that because significance level is less than Bonferroni's adjusted alpha (0.01), the calculated F is statistically

significant. Therefore, it can be said that there is significant difference between school direct education index points in the two groups (high-performance and low-performance). Comparison of school direct education index means in the two groups reveals that this index is higher in schools which have higher performance. Furthermore, results of management based on auditing index variable in table 4.7 ((df=1, 68)=30.279, p=0.001, eta squared=0.178) show that because significance level is less than Bonferroni's adjusted alpha (0.01), the calculated F is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that there is significant difference between the points of this index in the two groups of schools. Comparison of means difference of this index in the two groups reveals that this index value is higher in schools which have higher performance. Furthermore, results of management based on bureaucracy index variable in table 4.7 ((df=1, 68)=40.948, p=0.001, eta squared=0.151) show that because significance level is less than Bonferroni's adjusted alpha (0.01), the calculated F is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that there is difference between the points of this index in the two groups of schools (high-performance and low-performance). A comparison of means difference in management based on bureaucracy index reveals that this index variale's value is higher in schools which have high performance. Considering the significance of means difference, it can be said with 95% of certainty that the first hypothesis (there is difference between administrative and educational management styles in terms of schools performance level) is verified.

Second hypothesis

There is difference between educational-administrative management styles in terms of schools performance status considering students gender.

Multi-variate variance analysis was sued to investigate the second hypothesis. Before this analysis, its preconditions were analyzed: distance quality of data, normality of data distribution and randomness of data, homogeneity of variance matrix. Table 6 shows the results of investigation of variance and covariance matrices homogeneity.

Table 6: Box's test for investigation of variance and covariance matrices

P	F	$_2$df	$_1$df	Box's
0.082	2.742	141120	15	27.339

Box's test was conducted in order to investigate variance and covariance matrices homogeneity assumption. Because significance level is P>0.05, the calculated F is not statistically significant. Therefore, the assumption holds. Table 7 indicates results of variances error equality assumption.

Table 7: variances error equality assumption

p	$_2$df	$_1$df	F	
School management goals index	2.456	1	66	0.058
Educational management index	1.116	1	66	0.349
School direct education index	2.798	1	66	0.052
Management based on auditing index	2.702	1	66	0.053
Management based on bureaucracy index	1.108	1	66	0.231

Because significance level of administrative and educational management styles indices dependent variables is P>0.05, variances error equality assumption holds. Therefore, the researcher is allowed to use multi-variate variance analysis. Table 8 shows raw points of questionnaire execution for educational and administrative management styles in terms of schools performance status and considering schools students gender.

Table 8: means and standard deviations for educational and administrative leadership styles as separated by schools high performance, schools low performance considering schools gender

variables	high-performance group				low-performance group			
	Boys school		girls school		boys schools		girls schools	
	$\overline{X}$	s	$\overline{X}$	s	$\overline{X}$	s	$\overline{X}$	s
School management goals index	3.62	0.923	4.92	0.139	2.77	1.128	3.89	0.632
Educational management index	3.26	0.595	4.73	0.374	3.25	0.686	3.19	0.818
School direct education index	2.71	0.443	4.66	0.351	3.014	0.700	2.92	0.633
Management based on auditing index	4.51	0.666	3.29	0.803	2.70	1.218	2.69	0.644
Management based on bureaucracy index	4.52	0.437	2.623	0.414	2.54	0.831	2.066	0.446

Table 9: effect size (Eta squared) based on Wilks Lambda test for compound variable

variable	Value	F	df_1	df_2	p	Eta	Test power
Wilks lambda test	0.251	36.963	5	62	0/001	0.749	1.00

Eta squared is a part of variance which is related to the new compound variable which includes school management goals index, educational management index, school direct education index, management based on auditing index, management based on bureaucracy and this new compound variable can be called indices of administrative and educational leadership styles. This value is equal to 0.749 which indicates effect size of schools performance considering schools students gender. The calculated effect size indicates great effect of schools performance considering schools students gender. Schools performance can influence on administrative and educational management styles indices level considering schools students gender.

Table 10. analysis of variance results for administrative and educational management styles indices of schools performance considering schools gender

Power test	Eta	p	F	ms	df	SS	Diffraction source
1.00	0.314	0.001	6.324	11.34	1	11.34	School management goals index
Educational management index			10.71	1	10.71	24.153	0.004 0.120 0.841
School direct education index			17.77	1	17.77	59.480	0.001 0.474 1.00
Management based on auditing index			6.221	1	6.221	9.015	0.001 0.268 0.998
Management based on bureaucracy index			8.669	1	8.669	30.140	0.001 0.345 0.987

According to table 10, Bonferroni's adjusted alpha was sued to analyze dependent variables of school management goals index, educational management index, school direct education index, management based on auditing index and management based on bureaucracy index in two groups (high-performance and low-performance schools) considering schools students gender (0.01). the calculated F for school management goals index variable ((df=1,66)=26.324, p=0.001, Eta squared=0.314) shows that because significance level is less than Bonferroni's adjusted alpha (0.01), the calculated F is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that there is significant difference between school management goals index in the two groups (high-performance and low-performance) in terms of schools students gender. A comparison of school management goals means difference in the two groups in terms of schools gender revealed that school management goals level is higher in schools with higher performances and female students schools. Furthermore, results of table 10 for educational management index variable ((df=1, 66)=24.153 , p=0.001, eta sqared=0.120) show that because significance level is less than Bonferroni's adjusted alpha (0.01), the calculated F is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that there is significant difference between educational management index points in the two groups of schools considering schools students gender. A comparison of educational management index means difference revealed that this index value is higher in schools which have higher performance and in students with female students. Furthermore, results of table 12.4 for school direct education index variable ((df=1, 66)=59.480, p=0.001, eta squared=0.474) showed that because significance level is less than Bonferroni's adjusted alpha (0.01), the calculated F is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that school direct education index points in the two groups of schools are significantly different. A comparison of school direct education index means difference in the two groups of high-performance and low-performance schools in terms of schools students gender revealed that schools which have higher performances and female students have higher school direct education index. Furthermore, results of table 10 for management based on auditing index variable ((df=1, 66)=9.015, p=0.001, eta squared=0.268) showed that because significance level is less than Bonferroni's adjusted alpha(0.01), the calculated F is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that there is difference between the points of this index variable in the two groups of schools in terms of schools studnts gender. A comparison of means difference of this index variable in the two groups of schools revealed that this index value is higher in schools which have higher performances and male students.

Furthermore, results of table 10 for management based on bureaucracy index variable ((df=1, 66)= 30.140, p=0.001, and eta squared=0.345) showed that because significance level is less than Bonferroni's adjusted alpha (0.01), the calculated F is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that there is significant difference between the points of this index in the two groups of schools in terms of schools students' gender. A comparison of means difference of this index in the two groups of schools in terms of schools gender revealed that this index level is higher in schools which have high performance and male students. Considering the significance of means difference, we can say with 95% of certainty that the second hypothesis (there is difference between educational-administrative styles of management in terms of school performance status and considering schools students gender) is verified.

Conclusion

Today's world is confronted with great transformations. These transformations create new knowledge and needs which both contribute to society's welfare and increase problems. These transformations make responsibilities and duties and social organizations heavier and more complicated. Education system is directly

related to transformations. Schools are social organizations and play important roles in economic, social and political developments. Fulfillment of educational system goals depends on improvement of schools managers' performance. If a school cannot fulfill its functions and duties, both school and society are damaged and in wider level, it can result in social and economic and industrial crises. Educational system managers should hold in-service courses and improve managers' performance. Schools managers can improve their knowledge and keep their knowledge up-to-date and therefore improve students' performance.

Acknowledgment

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest in the research.

REFERENCES

Allix NM 2000. Transformational leadership: Demoratic or despotic? Educational Management and Administration ‹28: 7- 20

Badat S 1995. Educational politics in the tran sition period. Comparative Education ‹31: 141- 159.

Bolman LG& D eal TE 1997. Reframing Organizations: artistry ‹choice and leadership. san Fran cisco C A: Jossey Ba ss.

Bottery M 2001. Globalisation and the UK competition state: no room for transformational leadership In education? school Leadership and Management ‹21: 199- 218

Bush T 1986. Theories of Educational Management, 2nd edn. London: Paul ch apman.

Bush T 1998. The Nation al Pro fissional Qualification for H eadship: the key to effective school leadership? School Leadership and Management. 18: 321- 334.

Bush T 1999. Crisis or Crossroads? The Discipline of Education al management in the late 1990s Educational Management and Administration, 27: 239- 252.

Bush T 2003. Theories Of Educational Management, 3rdedn. London: sage.

Bush T (inpress). Leadership and Management Development in Education. London: Sage.

Bush T & Anderson L 2003. Organizational culture. In: T Bush ‹M Coleman & M Thuriow (eds). Leadership and Strategic Management in South African Schools. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Bush T & Glover D 2002. School leadership: Concepts and Evidence. Nottingham: Leadership and Management 405 National College for school leadership.

Bush T & Heyste K J 2003. School Governance in the new South Africa. Compare, 33: 127- 138.

Bush T & Joubert R 2004. Education Management Development and Governor Training in Gauteng: An Overview. Paper presented at the EMASA Conference, Port Elizabeth, May.

Bush T & Heystek J 2006. School Leadership and management in South Africa: Principal"s Perceptions. International Studies in Educational Administration, 34: 63- 76.

Bush T, Bisschoff T, Glover D, Heystek J, Joubert R & Moloi K 2006. School Leadership, Management And Governance in South Africa: A Systematic literature Review. Johannesburg: Matthew Goniwe School of Leadership and Governance.

Caldwell B 1992. The principal as leader of the self- managoing school in Australia. Journal of Educational Administration ‹30: 6- 19.

Caldwell B& Spinks J 1992. Leading the Self- Managing School. London: The Falmer press.

Carrim N & Shalem Y 1999. School effectiveness in south Africa. Qualitative Studies in Education ‹12: 59- 83.

Chirichello M 1999. Building Capacity for Change: Transformational Leadership for school principals. Paper presented at ICSEI Conference, San Antonio, January 3- 6.

Cuban L 1988. The Managerial IMP erative and the practice of Leadership in schools. Albany ‹NY: State university of New York press.

Day C, Harris A& Hadfield M 2001. Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership. International Journal of Leadership in Education ‹4: 39- 56.

De Liefde W 2003. Lekgotla: The Art of Leadership through Dialogue. Jacana Education ‹South Africa.

De Meillon N 2001. Interpersonal relationships in multiracial schools in a South African con text. International Journal of Group Tensions ‹30: 135- 159.

Department of Education 1996. Changing Management to Manage Change in Education. Report Of the task team on education Management Development. Pretoria ‹South Africa.

Khorshidi, Abbas (2003), educational leadership and management, Yastaroun publications, first edition.

Taghi Khani, Nik ZAd (2002), investigation of relationship between leadership style of educational groups managers and their effectiveness in Tehran technical-engineering universities, master degree thesis, faculty of psychology and educational sciences, Tehran university.