

The Relationship between Principals Leadership Style and Teachers Job Satisfaction of Kahrizak Region

Hassan Haji Mohammadi¹, Dr. Homa Ghafourian², Dr. Abbas Khorshidi³

¹ Master of Educational Management, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr, Iran

² Assistant Professor of Islamic Azad University Islamshahr Branch

³ Associate professor of Islamic Azad University Islamshahr Branch

ABSTRACT

The study has examined the relationship between principals' leadership styles and job satisfaction of teachers based on Fred E. Fiedler's contingency theory (relationship-oriented / task-oriented). The research method from the viewpoint of quiddity is descriptive and correlation type as well. The study population included all elementary school principals and teachers while representative sample have been selected using simple random sampling (51 principals, 197 teachers). The research instrument consists of a 16-item questionnaire of Fiedler opposite attributes (LPC) and Job Descriptive Index (JDI) a 39-item questionnaire of job satisfaction. Validity of the current research instrument has been calculated by Cronbach's alpha and the result of the measurement for LPC was 0.77 (relationship-oriented) and 0.8 (task-oriented) and also for JDI was 0.82. The collected data were analyzed via Pearson correlation coefficient and a two-group independent correlation t-test. The following results were obtained: There is a direct relationship between principals' leadership style and the teachers' job satisfaction. The teachers, whose principals have relationship-oriented leadership style, have more job satisfaction rather than teachers with principals with a task-oriented leadership style. Job satisfaction of female teachers was more than male teachers. Male managers are more relationship-oriented than female ones and Job satisfaction of experienced and veteran teachers is less than low-experienced teachers.

Keywords: Relationship-oriented leadership style, task-oriented leadership style, Job Satisfaction

1- INTRODUCTION

Leadership as a process means using influence without applying power leads and coordinates the activities of a group to fulfill its purposes. It also, as an attribute means collection of the attributes. Hence, the leader is who apply such an influence. From an organizational point of view, leadership is vital because it has a powerful influence on the behavior of individuals. In addition, it leads the group's endeavors forward to their objectives [1].

Leadership as one of the important tasks of management is the science and art of influence on the people to achieve goals. The style of individual leadership is based on the person's own behavioral pattern when he/she influence on the others activities to treat and interpret it [2].

One of the major elements of management is leadership; it is crucial in the organization dynamism. Leadership is the most prominent subject in the organizational behavior and human relationship field [3].

Leadership is influence, the art or process of influencing people so that they aim to provide the group with enthusiasm to practice [4].

Style or method of leadership is a way that makes use of the leader's influence to fulfill its purposes. Many experts believe that, style of managements is affected by the way he and his staff do their role [5].

On the other hand, Leadership Shows how to interact with the others and a sense of leadership is headed by employees. School principals are often the most effective means of behavior when they are strong enough in both dimensions (relationship-oriented) and manufacturing organization (task-oriented) [6].

Weak managers in both dimensions are not effective indeed. They have lack of leadership and their work atmosphere is full of public sedition.

Leadership as the ability to influence others to achieve organizational objectives is discussed. In this regard, two main styles, (task-orientation), the (relationship-orientation) and attitude to mutual relationship between people will help the manager.

Fiedler suggests that leadership styles in terms of performance (relation/ duty-oriented) must be adapted to the requirements of the position. In his opinion, influencing is the key element of leadership. The main point is that, effective leadership depends on the right person at the right time and the right place to be [7].

Since that job satisfaction is the most important concept in the study of organizational behavior; hence, the managers have to apply leadership and management practices. So that employees have more job satisfaction. That is why the advanced countries have considered programs and special facilities to create job satisfaction [8].

*Corresponding Author: Homa Ghafourian (PhD). Department of Education, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr, Iran. Email: homaghafourian@yahoo.com

Purpose of job satisfaction is the general attitude people have about it. Thus, a person who has a positive attitude towards his job has job satisfaction as well. And conversely someone who has a negative attitude towards his job has no job satisfaction [9].

Lussier [10] believes that, job satisfaction is a sense of meet the needs and desires and individual judging about what is happening in the job, would affect his job satisfaction.

Robbins [11] identifies job satisfaction the difference between what a person gets rewarded with a reward value that thinks he should get. Job satisfaction is such a one's sense of satisfaction with his job and the organizations that work with. It is related to adequate job: motivations, the success rate in job, providing logical needs, talents, and job promotion, successful experiences and organizational atmosphere [12]. Job satisfaction is the extent of overall and positive feelings and attitudes of the person with relation to the job and employment conditions that contributes to successful employment [13]. Job satisfaction is an attitude a person has about his job, and this attitude is due to the perception of the job [14].

Therese [15] found that job satisfaction in a total of 22 key factors is: Thanksgiving, balance, challenge, discussion, orientation, coordination, personal growth, flexibility, innovation, equality, sense of ownership, support, organizational credibility, purpose, self-identity, respect, communication, informality, integrity, services, value and relevance [15].

Homan [16] in a study titled "preparation and standardization job satisfaction scale" enumerated the following factors as major factors in job satisfaction: 1- Academic & moral qualifications, superiors experience, 2- Deserve, skill and decisiveness in heads decision-making, 3 - Relationship with other, 4- Desirable work conditions, 5- Salary and allowance congruence, 6- Pay attention to staff training

Hoppock [17] believes that, job satisfaction is a complex and multi-dimensional concept and it is related to psychological, physical and social factors. The specific combination of different factors except one causes employer's job satisfaction feeling in the specific moment and makes the employee enjoy with his job.

Eric's findings [18] considered the following as the effective factors in job satisfaction:

1- Wage, 2- Job, 3- Promotion, 4 - Leadership and Supervision, 5 - relationships with colleagues, 6 - Job security, 7- Participation in Decision making, 8- Organizational Structure, 9- Specifying role, 10- Job physical conditions, 11- Culture and Organizational atmosphere, 12- 13 personality factors - performance appraisal, 14- personal characteristics, 15- meaning-therapy at work, 16- Thanksgiving or appreciation, 17- Balance, 18- Challenge, 19- Discussion, 20- Orientation, 21- congruence, 22- Professional Development, 23- Flexibility, 24- Innovation, 25- Equity, 26- Ownership, 27- Support, 28- Organizational dignity and credibility, 29- purpose, 30- Self-identity, 31-Respect, 32- Informality 33- informality, 34- Integration 35- Services 36- value, 37- relevance.

Regarding the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction, several studies have been carried out; some of them are as follows: Taylor and White [19], Locke [20], Chen [21], Smith et al. [22], Loden [23], who in their separate research evidence relating directly between leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. Considering the importance of managers' leadership style and its application in the process of management and organization and its impact on Job satisfaction paved the route of research on the topic titled "consideration of relationship between managers' leadership styles (relationship-oriented and task-oriented) with the teachers' Job satisfaction in Kahrizak area".

2- MATERIAL AND METHOD

Research method equipped with applied objective and from the viewpoint of quiddity is descriptive and correlation type as well. The research statistical population consists of all of the primary school principals and teachers who have been selected using simple random sampling (51 principals, 197 teachers) in order to select a representative sample. The research instrument consists of a 16-item questionnaire of Fiedler –an 8 rating scale of 1-8 degree of opposite attributes (LPC) and Wysocki and Kromm (JDI) a 39-item questionnaire of job satisfaction including 5 item and 39 options (work, supervisor, colleague, promotion and payment). Validity of both questionnaires has been obtained through face and content validity and it has been calculated by Cronbach's alpha and the result of the measurement for LPC was 0.77 (relationship-oriented) and 0.8 (task-oriented) and also for JDI was 0.82. The collected data were analyzed via Pearson correlation coefficient and a two-group independent and correlation t-test.

For data analysis, descriptive and inferential statistical methods have been utilized. Descriptive statistics of the characteristics of the data such as frequency distribution table, calculate percentages, measures of central tendency and dispersion of the mean and standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis and draw histograms have been used. And inferential statistics such as Pearson correlation and t-test statistics were used for both independent and group.

3- RESULTS

A) Descriptive analysis of the data

As Table 1 shows the job satisfaction mean equals 155.55 and the standard deviation is 6.22.

Table 1. Descriptive indicators of job satisfaction of teachers in the sample group

Variables	Number	Minimum	maximum	Average	Standard deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Career	197	30.00	50.00	45.00	50.79	-1.83	2.99
Supervisor	197	0.00	40.00	29.75	11.18	-1.26	1.06
Colleague	197	31.00	50.00	44.15	5.74	-0.72	-0.33
Promotion	197	0.00	25.00	16.20	5.89	-1.24	1.85
Payment	197	11.00	30.00	16.65	5.00	0.24	-0.12
Job Satisfaction	197	99.00	195.00	155.55	22.60	-0.42	0.66

Table 2. Principals sample distribution in terms of leadership style

Status	Frequency	Percent
Relationship-Oriented	166	83.84
Task-Oriented	31	1.8315.74
Total	197	100

Table 2 indicates most of the sample teachers know their principals leadership style as relationship-oriented (83.84 percent) and the others (15.74 percent) know their principals leadership style as task-oriented.

B) The data inferential analysis

Hypothesis 1: there is a direct relationship between leadership styles of principals (relationship oriented - task oriented) and teachers' job satisfaction.

The correlation matrix in Table 3 shows that there are correlation between relationship oriented leadership and promotion (0.392) and payment (0.314) and there are correlation between task-oriented leadership style and work (0.460) and supervisor (0.381) and partners (0.357) which are significant at the 99% level. So, the null hypothesis is rejected and the study hypothesis is accepted so it is concluded that there is a direct relationship between managers' leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: Teachers whose principal's leadership is relationship-oriented are much more satisfied in job than teachers whose principal's leadership style is task-oriented.

Table 3. Pearson correlation matrix between Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Work (1)	1							
Supervisor (2)	0.374*	1						
Colleague (3)	0.418*	0.473*	1					
Promotion (4)	0.484*	0.322*	0.396*	1				
Payment (5)	0.469*	0.376*	0.409*	0.457*	1			
Job Satisfaction (6)	0.796*	0.659*	0.749*	0.719*	0.716*	1		
Relationship-Oriented (7)	0.292	0.235	0.284	0.392*	0.314*	0.202	1	
Task-Oriented (8)	0.460*	0.381*	0.357*	0.250	0.243	0.317*	-0.89*	1

P < 0.01

Table 4. Test of the mean difference between teachers' job satisfaction, in terms of managers' leadership style (t-dependent)

Variable	Sex	Mean	Degrees of freedom	T value	Significance level
Job Satisfaction	Relationship-oriented	124.78	197	3.165	0.004
	Task-oriented	148.43			

Since, the calculated t (3.165) is more than the critical t in the table with 197 degrees of freedom, the null hypothesis that there is no difference in teachers' job satisfaction and their principals task-oriented or relationship-oriented leadership style will be rejected. This shows that, there is meaningful difference between

the job satisfaction means of teachers whose principals have task-oriented or relationship-oriented leadership styles. And this difference is significant at 99% level. Thus, it can be concluded that job satisfaction of teachers with relationship-oriented principals have more than whose principals are task-oriented.

Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction of female teachers is more than male teachers'.

Table 5. Test of mean difference between teachers' job satisfaction, in terms of Principals leadership style (t-independent)

Variable	Sex	Mean	Degrees of freedom	T value	Significance level
Job Satisfaction	Female Teachers	164.78	196	3.02	0.007
	Man Teachers	143.43			

According to the table above, obtained t value (3.02) is greater than t value of the table at 196 degrees of freedom. So we can say there are differences between men and women in job satisfaction. Following null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, we conclude that job satisfaction of female teachers is more than male teachers'.

Hypothesis 4: male principals are more relationship-oriented than female ones.

Table 6. Test of Relationship-oriented leadership style mean difference between male and female principals (t-independent)

Variable	Sex	Mean	Degrees of freedom	T value	Significance level
Job Satisfaction	Female Teachers	0.56	197	6.43	0.0001
	Man Teachers	1.67			

The above table shows that the relationship-oriented leadership style's mean difference is significant between male and female principals with 6.43 t value at the 99% level. In other words, according to the means, it can be said that male principals have a relationship-oriented leadership style. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 5: Job satisfaction of more experienced teachers is more than lower experienced teachers'.

Table 7. Pearson correlation matrix between work experience and job satisfaction of teachers

Variable	(1)	(2)
Experience (1)	1	
Job Satisfaction (2)	-0.37*	1

* P <0.01

High correlation matrix shows that there is inverse relationship between the experience of teachers and job satisfaction ($r=0.37$) which is significant at the 99% level. So, it can be said with 99% confidence that increase in the job experience of teachers is associated with their job satisfaction increase.

4- DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Test results show that when principals' leadership style (relationship-oriented and task-oriented) was considered as the dependent variable in the model, the null hypothesis of dependent variable (relationship oriented - task oriented) and interactive effect of the combination of independent dual variables cannot be rejected. And its impact on job satisfaction cannot be ignored.

First result: there is a direct relationship between principals' leadership style (relationship oriented - task oriented) and job satisfaction. So, it showed that correlation is significant in the level 99%, between the relationships oriented leadership style and upgrades (0.392) and between the relationships oriented leadership style and payment (0.314) and task-oriented leadership style and job (0.460). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the study hypothesis is accepted, and $P<0.01$ conclude the principal Leadership styles and teachers job satisfaction are related. The correlation is positive, so as the type of leadership style becomes more relationship based, job satisfaction of teacher increases, and vice versa. The result of the research was disagreement with findings of Taylor and White [19], Kazemi [24], Wiles and Bandi [24], Nikzad [26], and Niknami [27].

Second result: teachers with relationship oriented leadership style principals have greater job satisfaction than whose principals have task oriented leadership style. The calculated $t = 3.165$ at 197 degrees of freedom $df = 197$ and level of significance $sig = 0.004$ show its significant in $p<0.01$ level, And the null

hypothesis: there is no difference in teachers' job satisfaction with relationship oriented and task-oriented leadership style principals by $p < 0.01$ in the sig = 0.004 meaningful level will be rejected. And the study hypothesis: there is a meaningful difference in teachers' job satisfaction with relationship oriented and task-oriented leadership style principals in the 99% meaningful level will be accepted. It is concluded that teachers whose principals are relationship-oriented have more job satisfaction than teachers whose principals have task-oriented leadership style. The result of the research is confirmed by findings of Hersy and Blanchard [2], Chen [21], Patrick [28] and Steinberg and Morris [29].

The third result: female teachers the job satisfaction is more than male teachers. According to the t value ($t = 3.02$), degrees of freedom ($df = 197$) and level of significance (sig = 0.007), the result is significant in $p < 0.01$ level. So, there is a difference between male and female job satisfaction. Then the null hypothesis that there is no difference between job satisfaction of female and male teachers is rejected and research hypothesis is accepted. It can be concluded that job satisfaction of female teachers are more than male teachers. The results of the research are consistent with the findings of Herzberg et al. [30], Gappa [31] and Fisher et al. [32].

The fourth result: male principals are much more relationship oriented than female principals. With respect to the calculated $t = 6.43$ with degree of freedom $df = 197$ and significant level sig = 0.0001 the fourth result is significant at the 99% level. In other words, according to the means we can say that male principals have a relationship-oriented leadership style. So the null hypothesis is rejected. We conclude that male principals are more relationship oriented than female ones.

The fifth result: veteran teachers' job satisfaction is more than less experience teachers. As the correlation matrix shows, there is an inverse relation between the teachers job experience and their job satisfaction ($r = 0.37$). this result in $p < 0.01$ at the 99% level is significant. So with 99% confidence, it can be said with increasing work experience of teachers their job satisfaction decreases; i.e. the correlation is negative. On the other hand, as the teachers work experiences increase their job satisfaction proportionally with higher rate decrease. This result is inconsistent with findings of BarghiJani [33], Kazemi [24], Roberts [25] and Brayfield and Rothe [35], based on having longer experience and doing the same job for a long time is increasing job satisfaction. Probably the inconsistency would be due to the following factors:

Having low an unrelated diploma, teaching in higher educational levels, lower income, avoiding children's noise and teaching problems and crowded classrooms, lack of adequate information about new teaching methods, the use of computer software and new IT technology, senescence, lack of work incentives and etc. are among the factors that could be considered reasons which lead to veteran teachers have less job satisfaction than the low experienced teachers.

At the end, it is suggested to ministry of education managers to select qualified and sympathetic principals in order increase teachers motivation and job satisfaction.

5- ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Support of Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr Branch, is gratefully acknowledged. This study was extracted from MSc. thesis that was done in IUA, Islamshahr Branch, Iran. I am thankful to Dr. Homa Ghafourian for his valuable scientific assistance at the all steps of study.

REFERENCES

- 1 Morhed, G. and Griffin, R. (2011). *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations*. January 27, 2006 | ISBN-10: 0618611584.
- 2 Hersy, P. and Blanchard, K. (2001). *Management of Organizational Behavior* (Kabiri, G.) (8th Ed.). Tehran: Islamic Azad University Press. (Original work published 1982).
- 3 Rezaeian, A. (2005). *Management of organizational behavior*. Tehran: publisher samt
- 4 Koontz H. and Wehrich, H (2006). *Management, A Glow Ball Perspective*. termen. P. 396.
- 5 Hendy, C. (1992). *Break Tradition Age* (Mokhber, A. Trans.). Tehran: Tarheno Press.
- 6 Imani, MN and Azarakhsh, T and Ismail Tabar, M. (2006). *Management from start to post modern* (2nd ed.). Tehran: FarhangeSabzPress.
- 7 Mitchell, T.R (2007). *People in Organization. Understanding Their Behavior*. www.eric.com.
- 8 Moghimi, S.M. (2011). *Organization and Management Research Approach* (8th Ed.). Tehran: Ramin Publication.
- 9 Khorshidi, A. (2010). *Organizational behavior research approach*. Tehran: Yastaroon Publications.
- 10 Lussier, R.N. (1998). *Management, Concepts, Applications & Skilldevelopment*. Sout-western college. Publishing Ohio.
- 11 Robbins, S.P. (1998). *Organizational Behavior*, WWW.Eric.Com.
- 12 Mirkamaly, S.M. (2005). *Behavior and relationships in the organization and management* (2nd ed.). Tehran: Ramin Publications.

- 13 ShafiAbadi, A. (2007). Educational and vocational guidance and counseling (7th Ed.). Tehran: Samt publication.
- 14 Raymond. J.S. (1998). Human Resource Management. Astralial: John Wiley and Sons. P. 32.
- 15 Therese, T (2000). 22 Keys Creating a Meaningful Work Place. Columbus, Ohio: Work place Solutions, Inc. Toma meaningful Work Place.
- 16 Homan, H. (2002). Prepared and standardized to measure jobsatisfaction. Tehran: Publications Management Center
- 17 Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Harper and Brother.
- 18 Eric, Educational Resources Information Center, 2010. The effective factors on students towards drug; www.eric.com.
- 19 Taylor, JC and White, VJ (1991). Faculty attitudes towards teaching in the distance education mode; an exploratory investigation. Research in distance education, 3(3).
- 20 Locke, E.A. 1979. The nature and causes of job satisfaction in M.D. Dunnette (Ed). Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally. York: McGrew. Hill.
- 21 Chen, CC (1997). Modern life and health: Physical fitness guidebook. Taipei, Taiwan: Aerobic Fitness & Health Association of R.O.C.
- 22 Smith, P.C. et al. (1989). User's manual for the job descriptive index (JDI) & the job in general (JDI) scales. Bowling Green State University: Bowling Green, Ohio.
- 23 Loden and Rosener, E:Durham, C. and Kluged, A. (1991). Dispositional effects on job & life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83: 17-34.
- 24 Kazemi, E. (2009). Current Issues Associated with Graduate Training in Applied Behavior Analysis. 35th Annual ABAI Convention, Phoenix, Arizona.
- 25 Wiles, J and Bandi J. (2000). Monitoring in administration, planning and training guidance.
- 26 Nikzad, M (2006). The context of guidance and counseling in education. Keyhan Press.
- 27 Niknami, M (1999). Educational monitoring and guidance", SAMT Publications. Kamal Tarbiat Press.
- 28 Patrick, M. (1995). Study of the relationship between transformational leaders ships an organizational climate of elementary school in western Pennsylvania.
- 29 Steinberg, L. and Morris, A.S. (2001). Adolescent development. In S. T. Fiske, D. L. Schacter, and C. Zahn – Waxler (Eds.), Annual review of psychology (Vol. 52; pp. 83 – 110). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- 30 Herzberg F., Mausner B. and Synderman B. (1959) The Motivation to work, New York: Wiley
- 31 Gappa, J.M. (2000) "The new faculty majority: somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure " New directions for institutional research, 27: 1.
- 32 Fisher JL. et al. (1988). Leadership Behaviors of Effective Colleague Presidents, Reports- Research; Speeches/Meeting Papers; Tests/Questionnaires.
- 33 BarghiJani, A. (2007). The review of relationship between participative management and effectiveness in schools at Saghez City; Tehran, Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Faculty of Management.
- 34 Roeberts, J.S. (1995). Item response theory approaches to attitude measurement (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia 1995. Dissertation Abstracts International, 56: 70-89B.
- 35 Brayfield, A.H. and Rothe, H.F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 35, 307-311.