

**AN ASSESSMENT OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPALS'  
LEADERSHIP STYLES AND TEACHERS JOB SATISFACTION IN  
GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF SHEKA ZONE**



**JJIMMA UNIVERSITY**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

**BY**

**CHECHITO CHINO**

**OCTOBER, 2021**

**JIMMA, ETHIOPIA**

**AN ASSESSMENT OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPALS'  
LEADERSHIP STYLES AND TEACHERS JOB SATISFACTION IN  
GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF SHEKA ZONE**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES  
JJIMMA UNIVERSITY**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO JU CEBS IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN  
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

**BY**

**CHECHITO CHINO**

**MAIN-ADVISOR: MR. TADESSE ABERA**

**CO-ADVISOR: MR. FEDILU ABBAGUMBUL**

**OCTOBER, 2021  
JIMMA, ETHIOPIA**

**JJIMMA UNIVERSITY**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES,**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

An Assessment of Relationship between Principals' Leadership Styles and Teachers Job Satisfaction in Government Secondary Schools of Sheka Zone

By: Chechito Chino

**Approved by Board of Examiners**

Main-Advisor Signature Date

\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

Co-advisor

Signature

Date

\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

Internal Examiner Signature

Date

\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

External Examiner Signature

Date

\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

## **Declaration**

I declare that this thesis entitled as “An assessment of relationship between principals leadership styles and teachers job satisfaction in government secondary schools of Sheka Zone is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and all the sources of materials used for the thesis has been properly acknowledged.

Name: Chechito Chino

Signature -----Date of submission -----

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university advisor.

Main advisor: Mr. Tadesse Abera

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Co-advisor: Mr. Fedilu Abbagumbul

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Next to God, I would like to express special gratitude to my advisor Mr. Tadese Abera and Mr. Fedilu Abbagumbul, for their constructive comment, patience and encouragement, critical and valuable comments through the research work and professional support and guidance that made this work possible and direction without which this thesis would never have attained at this stage. Next, I would like to express my grateful thanks to the respondents for their willingness and cooperation.

Then, I must express my heartfelt thanks to my lovely wife and all my families for giving me their continuous encouragement, support and taking responsibilities of caring my sons and properties. Finally, my thanks goes to Jimma University in general and college of education and behavioral sciences in particular for their being kind to help me and achieved me to this unexpected success.

### ***Abstract***

*The purpose of the study was to assess the relationship between principals' leadership styles and*

*teachers' job satisfaction in government secondary schools in Sheka zone. The study used both qualitative and quantitative approach that examined leadership styles in relation to a set of job satisfaction variables, including supervision, working conditions, responsibility, work itself and advancement. The researcher used the higher limit of 43% of the teachers. The sample was therefore comprised of the 8 principals and 140 of the sampled/selected schools which is 50% (8) of the 16 schools and 43% (140) of teachers out of 100% (320) teachers. Purposive sampling was used to identify the sample schools. The study revealed that there was a significant association between the style of leadership and teachers' job satisfaction  $\chi^2 (1) = 76.76, p < 0.001$ . This represents the fact that based on the odds ratio, the odds of a teacher being satisfied was 26.12 times higher if they were led by a democratic or transformational leader than if they were led by a transactional leader. This result supports hypothesis 3, which predicted a positive association between school principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for all of the individual Leadership Style (LSQ) and Teacher Job Satisfaction (TJSQ) 35-item variables. Results indicated that all job satisfaction variables had positive correlations with transformational styles of leadership, and negative correlations with transactional styles of leadership. Contingent reward, however, was the only characteristic from the transactional leadership styles that scored all positive correlations with the job satisfaction variables. Based on the findings of the study the following were the recommendations. The study recommends that the principals should actively improve leadership style and give feedback on inquires on a timely basis and improve on job appraisal practices to be competitive and fair in order to enhance teachers' job satisfaction. The school leadership should listen and take suggestions from the teachers and promote the school goal, mission and vision together.*

## **Table of Contents**

Contents	Pages
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i

<i>Abstract</i> .....	i
Lists of Table .....	v
CHAPTER ONE .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem .....	4
1.3 Research Questions .....	6
1.4 Objectives of the Study .....	7
1.4.1 General Objective of the Study .....	7
1.4.2 Specific objectives of the Study .....	7
1.5. Significance of the Study .....	7
1.6. Delimitations of the Study .....	8
1.7. Limitation of the Study .....	8
1.8 Definitions of Terms .....	9
1.9. Organization of the Study .....	9
CHAPTER TWO .....	11
2. LITERATURE REVIEW .....	11
INTRODUCTION .....	11
2.1 Concepts and theories of leadership style .....	11
2.1.1 Concepts of leadership .....	11
2.2 An Overview of Leadership Theory .....	13
2.2.1 Trait Theories of Leadership .....	13
2.2.2 Behavioral Leadership Theory .....	14
2.2.3 Situational Theories of leadership .....	14
2.3 Types of Leadership .....	15
2.3.1 Democratic/ Transformational Leadership Style .....	15
2.3.2 Autocratic Leadership .....	20
2.3.3. Laissez- Faire Leadership .....	22
2.4 Job Satisfaction Theories .....	24
2.5 Concepts of Teachers' Job Satisfaction .....	29
2.6. Leadership style and Teachers' job satisfaction .....	31

2.7 Leadership and Teacher Morale/Motivation .....	33
2.8 Leadership and Teacher Efficacy .....	34
2.9 Leadership and Working Conditions.....	35
2.10 Leadership and Responsibilities.....	36
2.11 Leadership and Advancement .....	37
2.12 The Need of Teacher Satisfaction in Schools .....	38
2.13 Determinant Variables of Teacher satisfaction .....	39
2.13.1 School Development and Climate .....	39
2.13.2 Policies of Compensation and Benefit.....	40
2.13.3 Job Security .....	40
2.13.4 Working Environment & Condition .....	40
2.13.5 Leadership Style .....	40
2.14 Strategies to Foster Teachers' Job satisfaction .....	40
2.14.1 Teacher Reward and Recognition Programs .....	40
2.14.2 Energizing Teacher .....	41
2.14.3 Implementation of Promotion.....	41
2.14.4 Provide a Good Salary Package.....	42
2.15 Empirical Studies on Leadership Style and Teachers' Job Satisfaction .....	42
2.16.Theoretical Framework .....	43
CHAPTER THREE .....	44
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	44
3. INTRODUCTIONS .....	44
3.1 Research Design.....	45
3.2 Target Population .....	45
3.2.2.Sample Size and Sampling Techniques.....	46
3.3 Data collection tools/ Instruments.....	47
3.4.Validity and Reliability of the Instruments .....	48
3.5.Data Collection Procedures.....	48
3.7. Data Analysis .....	49
CHAPTER FOUR.....	49
4. DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION .....	49



INTRODUCTION .....	49
4.1 Demographic Information of Respondents .....	49
4.2 Leadership Styles and Teachers' Job Satisfaction .....	50
4.3 Teachers' perceptions about their Principals' Leadership Styles.....	51
4.4 Leadership Characteristics .....	51
4.5 Teachers' Job Satisfaction Results .....	53
4.6 Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction Combined .....	54
4.7 Pearson Correlations for LSQ and TJSQ Variables .....	55
CHAPTER FIVE .....	64
5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations .....	64
5.1 Summary .....	64
5.2 Conclusion.....	68
5.3 Recommendations .....	69
References.....	70
Appendix A.....	74
Appendix B.....	79

### **Lists of Table**

Table 3.1: Proportional Sample Size of Teachers per School.....	48
Table 1: Demographic information of respondents .....	51

Table 2: Mean and Standard deviation of Teachers' perceptions falling in different Leadership Styles.....	57
Table 3: Leadership Characteristics.....	58
Table 4: Teachers' Job Satisfaction .....	60
Table 5: Teacher's job Satisfaction measures.....	60
Table 6: Chi-Square testing of TJSQ (35-item).....	61
Table 7: Pearson Correlations for LSQ and TJSQ Variables .....	<b>62</b>

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter discusses the background of the study, statement of the problem, basic research questions, objectives of the study, delimitation of the study, significance of the study and operational definitions of the key terms used in the study and organization of the study.

### **1.1 Background of the Study**

It is clear that managerial responsibilities, resultant accountabilities, increased workload and the day-to-day role of a school principal and a classroom teacher are becoming increasingly multifaceted (Sherman and Crum et al., 2010). In many situations, both principals and teachers may not have had the appropriate training or relevant professional development to equip themselves with the many challenges they are currently expected to undertake. “The factors that once influenced a teacher’s job satisfaction are no longer confined to the microcosm of the school” and instead, encompass factors at the system level, as well as including wider social forces (Dinham& Scott, 2000).

By strengthening the leadership, and promoting quality teaching at a school level, student outcomes could be improved (Clinton, 2008; Hattie, 2009). Currently, each independent school sector and jurisdiction pursues various strategies to improve the quality and depth of school leaders’ skills. Of critical importance, however, is the extent to which the centralized ‘control’ of these school sectors and jurisdictions may be limiting the capacity of principals to exercise leadership, and the effects these limitations have on a principal’s time and ability to improve the overall quality of teaching and learning in their schools.

It is imperative for educational organizations to start examining principal leadership in their organizations as a means to making positive improvements to teachers’ perceptions that may contribute to building successful learning environments (Adamowski, 2007). Recent and foreshadowed policies facilitating greater school autonomy and support from central agencies on matters such as training, teacher standards, and curriculum are needed (Cavanna, 2007 and Goodwin, 2010).

Education and training are a vital instrument to fight backwardness and poverty of the country. In the current knowledge and technologically improved society, people are facing rapid social, technological and economic change. In order to meet the changes of the society, educational change and innovation is critical for all schools. The attainment of educational objectives directly depends on the effectiveness of leadership and it has key role in the success or failure of school organization.

Among the factors that affect educational change and innovation, the school principal's leadership style is a very important factor that affects the changing process of educational innovation. Different scholars have argued that there is no precise definition for describing the complex phenomenon of leadership. According to Ciulla (2004), leadership is the inspiration on mobilization of others to undertake collective action in pursuit of common good. Therefore, school leadership is a process of encouraging and helping teachers and learners to work enthusiastically towards realization of schools and educational objectives (Ciulla, 2004).

Spector (2007) defines job satisfaction as an extent to which people like or dislike their jobs. According to Miskel (2008), job satisfaction is that emotional state resulting from appraisal of one's job or experience. Significant indicators of job satisfaction which emerged from a study done by Mwamwenda (1995) in Transkei included positive relationship between teachers and principals, results and achievements and the fact that teaching is culturally considered to be fine and challenging profession. Olando (2008) contends that low levels of job motivation and job satisfaction leads to strikes, slowdowns, absenteeism and employee turn-over. North house (2010) believed that 'a teacher's job satisfaction may serve to influence their morale, motivation and general willingness to maximize their teaching potential'.

Teachers who are not satisfied with their jobs may result in bad teaching or learning process and school effectiveness will consequently be negatively impacted. Leadership styles exhibited by a school principal affect school climate, learning situations and levels of professional and job satisfaction among teachers (Ingolo, 2001).

Liu (2004) carried out research on determinants of job satisfaction and found that loyalty to one's employer and job longevity are important as compared to compensation, benefits and supervision for Mexican-American and vice versa for the non-Hispanic.

A study to identify effective leadership styles in education sector of Pakistan by Modley and Laroche (1995), manifested that transformational leadership was more successful in Pakistan in enhancing job satisfaction.

A study carried out by United States Education Department (1997) found that teachers job satisfaction is strongly associated with participation and influence in decision making and influence on school policy, (Bogler, 2009). A study carried out in Malaysia by Mohd (2012) supported Lumsden (1998) who found that if teachers received support from their principal and from local parents, if they were involved in the decision-making process, and if they worked within a positive school climate and culture, they were likely to succeed and remain in the profession. In the same study teachers needed to feel included in the decision-making process and wanted to know that their opinions are valued. A study in Pakistan by Muhammed (2015) concluded that leadership style and job satisfaction exist, however it varies in its degree with reference to different leadership styles and different aspects (intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction).

Achua (2001) conducted a study on the principals 'leadership styles and teachers' job performance in senior secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. Teachers' job performance was found to be at a moderate level in the schools. The significant relationship found in this study between the autocratic leadership style and teachers' job performance is value added. Differences in leadership styles used by principals have been raised in performance of schools in which some perform better while others perform poorly.

Today many teachers feel dissatisfied with their jobs because of increased accountability and stress, heavy, workloads, poor pay and working conditions, a negative school atmosphere and specifically perceived inadequate principal support (Metlife, 2001, Popham, 2004). Despite the Kenyan government's commitment to improving terms and conditions of teachers, Schools have been faced with increased cases of teacher shortage and low morale especially in secondary schools (Okumbe, 2008).

Nzuve (2009) says that the leadership style a manager has should influence the employees such as teachers to accept willingly their direction and control. In Sheka issues relating to teacher motivation and enhancement of the job performance have been addressed in various forums. It has been pointed out that there is need to improve the working conditions of teachers especially the pay package.

It is therefore not surprising that there is pressure mounted by stakeholders on effective leadership among principals in Sheka. This increases job satisfaction among teachers in government secondary schools, with particular attention to government secondary schools in Sheka zone. The relationship between principals' leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction has been a subject of controversy by many researchers (Adeyemi, 2006). The controversy has been centered whether or not the style of leadership of principals' influence job satisfaction among teachers which is subject of the study. Reports of 2013, many principals have been transferred and deployed to other schools in Sheka zone. The report shows that most of the principals from Sheka zone have been redeployed owing to poor leadership in their respective schools (Sheka zone education department, 2013).

Therefore, the current study was to assess relationship between principals' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in government secondary schools in Sheka zone

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Teachers' satisfaction is widely studied across many academic disciplines, including psychology, sociology, economics, and the management sciences (Jung et al., 2007). Research has shown that satisfied teachers are more active, deliver higher quality of teaching and improve students' success (Garrido et al., 2005). Additionally, teacher's satisfaction continues to play an important role, as the landscape of teaching across the school has been changing dramatically in response to teaching methodology shifts and instructional advances.

On the other hand; according to Mwita, (2000), teachers' job satisfaction is an important building block of school and factors which lay the foundation for high satisfaction must be analyzed by the school. Since every school leadership cannot progress by depending on one or two individual efforts, it is collective effort of all the members of the school.

So, it is one of the mandatory aspects to be considered by the school leadership, because the satisfaction of the teachers requires the school to achieve its goals. A review of the literature suggests that higher teacher satisfaction is associated with better school and student's achievement and increased positive climate of school (Taris, 2006).

Job satisfaction is a positive or pleasant emotional state resulting from a person's appreciation of his/ her own job which has direct relationship with leadership styles. Teachers who are satisfied with their job are more enthusiastic and interested in devoting more energy and time to student achievement (Nguni et al., 2006).

Therefore, understanding the important factors affecting teacher job satisfaction is vital to attain the required information to support an educational system to succeed in its objectives (Perie et al., 1997). Since the principal's leadership behavior is one of the positive factors that have a direct relationship with job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001, Miars, 2004), considerable research has been carried out on the influence and impact of leadership behavior on job satisfaction (Stockard and Griffith, 2004).

Furthermore, the principal's decision-making style also affects teacher job satisfaction. Working with a principal who encourages teachers to get involved in decision making tasks has a positive influence on teachers' involvement and commitment to their teaching duties and classes (Bogler, 2001).

Numerous research projects have focused on the study of the relationship between job satisfaction and the employed leadership style since the 1960s (Miles, 2010). The outcome of some of these studies is the discovery of a positive relationship between job satisfaction and leadership style (Cheng and Yang, 2007 and Skinner, 2009). The principal's perception of teachers' involvement in decision making tasks is more important than the teachers' perception of their own participation in such responsibilities (Goodlad, 1984). These two variables, i.e., teacher job satisfaction and the principal's decision-making style are interrelated (Lynch, 2010), in that, teachers who are encouraged to get involved in their principal's decision-making tasks tend to commit themselves more to their teaching job (Bogler, 2001).

The previous studies support the existence of a positive relationship between job satisfaction and the two variables of participative decision making and transformational leadership (Maeroff, 2008). Other researchers have also examined the relationships among teacher satisfaction and teacher's performance, and the principal's leadership style and the decision-making process (Silins, 2002). However, the current study intended to illustrate that, relationship between principal's leadership styles and teacher's job satisfaction in government secondary schools of Sheka Zone. In addition to the researcher's long year work experience, there are a prevailing problem include: teachers' low dedication to their work, early disappearance of teachers from work place and late coming and early leaving the school working time. The cumulative effect of turnover increases the failure of learner in their academic performance, increase the number of drop out learners, and low academic performance and decline school climates.

The existence of less teacher's satisfaction is a problem for government school in order to retain its teachers and to motivate them to perform their work properly, this can be manifested as teachers become eager to leave the organization as well as they do not get satisfied and they dislike their profession. As a result of this, the quality of education failed and the learner academic performance is turned down time to time. In addition to these, statistics at Sheka zone Teachers Service Commission unit showed that the rate of teachers' turnover rose from 10 percent in 2009 to 13 percent in 2010.

In 2011, teacher's turnover rose to 17 percent thus portraying a worrying trend (Sheka Zone Education Department, 2011). The area of environment is conducive for working and not the reason for the high turnover. Therefore, the main purpose of the study was targeted to investigate the assessment of relationship between principals' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in government secondary schools in Sheka zone.

### **1.3 Research Questions**

1. What are the styles of leadership being practiced by school principal?
2. How secondary school teachers in Sheka zone are satisfied in their job?
3. What is the relationship between school principals' leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction?



## **1.4 Objectives of the Study**

### **1.4.1 General Objective of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to assess the relationship between principals' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in government secondary schools in Sheka zone.

### **1.4.2 Specific objectives of the Study**

- ✓ To identify leadership styles being practiced by Sheka zone secondary schools.
- ✓ To examine how secondary school teachers working in Sheka zone satisfied in their job satisfaction
- ✓ To find out the relationship between leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction in government secondary schools of Sheka zone

## **1.5. Significance of the Study**

The research findings on the assessment of relationship between principals' leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction in governmental secondary schools in Sheka zone would to provide useful information to the principals and teachers in Sheka zone. Such information might be useful to stakeholders and education planners in designing very important and more effective strategies or interventions to the problem.

The education sector would use the findings of this study to formulate leadership policies. Parents and the community would also use these findings to advise the students towards quality performance and achieve good result of education. The research findings from this study could assist in making school principals more familiar of their own leadership ability and style and assist them in developing their own leadership capacity to support teachers in adequately managing the increased demands placed on them thus improving levels of teachers 'job satisfaction.

The study has practical implications for school administrators, consultants and principals. Principals are often in the best position to change school cultures, and the leadership styles and behaviors that create the culture of a school (Kottkamp, 2004 and Collard, 2000).

This study may assist principals and school administrators to improve policies and practices, to respond to problems related to the job satisfaction of staff members and to

improve their existing leadership styles and their current behaviors, thereby becoming more effective managers of people.

The findings of this study provide further insight into the aspects of workplace culture in secondary schools and the effects leadership styles can have on teachers' job satisfaction: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, works itself, advancement and recognition. The insights gained from this study would add to the current literature concerning workplace culture, and it would also contribute to current knowledge of the culture of Sheka zone secondary schools.

The findings may also help teachers to improve working conditions of the teachers in order to increase teachers' levels of job satisfaction. It may also be useful to Sheka zone educational department as they train schools managers on the leadership styles suitable for schools. The research so as to fill the information gap and also to add to the pool of currently existing study would help other researchers in this area in identifying the areas that require further knowledge.

## **1.6. Delimitations of the Study**

The main focus of the study was on governmental secondary schools in Sheka zone or the study will be carried out in the schools of Sheka zone only on sampled government schools. The study excluded teachers from private schools because they have different management systems from government schools. The data was collected from three woredas office selected government secondary school principals, vice principals and teachers in Sheka zone. Conceptually, this study was confined to identify leadership styles being practiced; to examine how secondary school teachers working in Sheka zone satisfied in their job satisfaction and to find out the relationship between leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction in government secondary schools of Sheka zone

## **1.7. Limitation of the Study**

While writing this thesis the researcher faced different limitations. The first limitation was lack of access of computer and typing skills internet, skill gap of the researcher in applying different

computer applications like SPSS. The second limitation was shortage time to cover required things on time. The third limitation was lack of transportation services to arrive sampled schools was the only limitations but the researcher used his own strategies to tackle these limitations in the research session.

## **1.8 Definitions of Terms**

The following are the definitions of significant terms:

**Autocratic leadership:** refers to giving full empowerment to the leaders with minimal participation from the follower (Ram, 2001).

**Democratic leadership:** refers to a situation where there is equal work among leaders and followers (Oyetunyi, 2006).

**Job satisfaction:** refers to how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs (Mullins, 2006).

**Leadership style:** refers to the perceived behavior that a person exhibits when attempting to influence the activities of others (Bass, 2004).

**Laissez-faire-leadership:** refers to a leadership style in which leaders are hands-off and allow group members to make decisions (Bass, 2004)

**School principal:** administrative head and a professional leader for school system, policy and manages the school's total program (Yuki, 2010).

## **1.9. Organization of the Study**

The study has five chapters. Chapter one contains background information of the study, the statement of the problem, research questions, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitations of the study, definitions of key terms and organization of the study. Chapter two contains review of related literature, leadership and job satisfaction, how democratic leadership style influences teachers' job satisfaction, how autocratic leadership style influences teachers' job satisfaction, how laissez faire leadership style influences teachers' job satisfaction. It also contains theoretical framework and conceptual framework.

Chapter three highlights methodology of the study. This includes research design, target population, sample size and sampling techniques, data collection instruments, validity and

reliability of research instruments, data collection procedure, data analysis and ethical considerations. Chapter four consists of data analysis, presentation and interpretation. Chapter five consists of summary of the study, conclusions and suggestions of further research.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter mainly consists reviews of the literature in relation to the relationship between principal leadership and teachers' job satisfaction. Theoretical foundations for the study are therefore, entertained in such a way that it elaborates the meaning of leadership and jib satisfaction; a brief overview of the evolution of theory and models of leadership style and teachers' satisfaction; competencies of leadership vital to improve or increase teachers' job satisfaction; the relationship between teachers' satisfaction and leadership with regard to the schools. Moreover, empirical studies are reviewed in order to support the theoretical arguments that are intended to make the research questions addressed.

#### **2.1 Concepts and theories of leadership style**

##### **2.1.1 Concepts of leadership**

Leadership is defined in a number of ways by scholars and researchers. Yuki (2010) tries to review a number of definitions of leadership and he finds out what is common in these definitions i.e., most of the definitions take into consideration the assumption that there is an influence of a leader in the process of accomplishing a certain task. He also notices that all definitions have strong differences most likely due to the perspectives purpose and methodology employed by those scholars or researchers who try to define leadership.

Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what need to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individuals and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives (Yukll, 2010). Leadership literatures also provide a different definition of it's based on their focus of interest in the topics they raised. Nahavandi (2003) and Northouse (2006), after conducting comprehensive reviews of leadership literature, have found three common elements to define leadership no matter where or how leadership is exercised. These elements are; Leadership involves interaction with a group; Leadership involves the exercise of influence, and Leadership involves the attainment of a goal.

Leadership is a robust concept that occurs among all people, regardless of culture. According to Bass (1981), the study of leadership is an ancient art, which suggests that the success of any institution or endeavor has been due to effective leadership. In the light of current educational reforms impacting on Australian schools, the field of leadership study has received considerable attention.

Educational organizations need to start examining the leadership in their organizations as a way of making positive improvements and to build successful and effective learning environments. This particularly applies to independent (non-government) schools, in which greater leadership autonomy is implemented. It is imperative for these empowered leaders to examine student outcomes, teacher performance and most importantly, teacher job satisfaction.

While in literature there is no shortage of definitions pertaining to leadership, definitions vary in accordance to the context, aim and purpose in which the studies have been conducted. As Stogdill (1974) once quoted, “There are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (p.259). According to the Oxford Dictionaries Online (2012), “leadership may be defined as the action of leading a group of people or an organization; to lead is to be in the state or position of being a leader.” Northouse (2007) also defines leadership as being a “process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal”. Furthermore, Burns (1978), primarily working in the field of politics, and widely known for his influential work in the field of leadership states:

“I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivation the wants and the needs, the aspirations and expectations - of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers’ values and motivations”.

These definitions imply that leadership is an action or a process of leading, influencing or motivating others to achieve a desired goal. Many scholars including Burns (1978) and Ciulla (2004) agree that leadership not only consists of these factors, but also includes deep and complex relationships.

They argue that leadership is not only an action or process of influence, but it seeks to better understand the complex relationship that exists between a leader and those being led. According to Ciulla (2004) “leadership is not a person or a position. It is a complex moral relationship between people, based on trust, obligation, commitment, emotion, and a shared vision of the good”. Ciulla’s definition suggests that leadership not only focuses primarily on the implementation and daily constraints of administration, but also on relationship building, team work, commitment and a shared vision to reach common goals.

These definitions suggest that a leader’s main aim is to empower and guide others in a way that encourages them to achieve personal goals. They imply a process of transformation. A leader, who encourages, supports, guides and empowers others, is one who distributes the control of leadership from self to others. A transformation of empowerment occurs, so that others take on greater responsibility and accountability for achieving set goals, thus gaining a greater sense of personal and collective achievement.

Drawing on these selected definitions, leadership can be viewed in a number of ways. The main theme occurring across all definitions is that leadership is an action or a process of leading or influencing others to achieve a desired goal. Leadership entails moral and ethical relationships sustained through trust, commitment, direction, emotion and inspiration, and requires teamwork, commitment, relationship building and a shared vision. Leadership for the purpose of the current study suggests that a leader’s aim is to empower, transform and guide those being led, to support them to achieve greater accomplishments. Leadership is active, not passive.

## **2.2 An Overview of Leadership Theory**

### **2.2.1 Trait Theories of Leadership**

Between the 1920’s and 1930’s leadership research focused on trying to identify leaders from non-leaders. This was the first systematic effort by psychologists and others to research leadership. They tried to understand the personal characteristics of a leader. The trait theory assumes that leaders shared certain inborn personality traits the view that some people are born leaders. The focus on what an effective leader is not how to effectively lead.

According to Hersey and Blanchard (1988) the leadership trait model was established in early 1900s, with its associated theories and perspectives. In the mid-20th century the trait theory was challenged by the research that questioned the universality of leadership traits.

## **2.2.2 Behavioral Leadership Theory**

The perceived failure of trait approach and the growth emphasis on behaviorism lead the researchers to direct their attention the behavior of a leader. Behavioral theories of leadership are based up on the belief that great leaders are made, not born. A classical study was done in the late 1930s by Kurt Lewin his associates which led to the emergence of new leadership model. Behavior theory touches on what effective leader do rather than figuring out who effective leaders are. The behavioral theories identify determinants of leadership so that people could be trained to be leader because behavior can be trained. The new approach prompted scholars and researchers to look beyond leader trait and consider how leader's behaviors predicted effectiveness. This led to reach on initiation of structure and consideration, and established the behavior paradigm of leadership (Derue & Wellman, 2011). However, the limitations of these behavioral theories are their oversight of situational factors on the level of effectiveness.

## **2.2.3 Situational Theories of leadership**

Situational/contingency theories of leadership are the most important breakthrough in leadership research, since it gives the recognition for that effective leadership involves matching leadership behaviors and strategies to particular situational contexts. These theories propose that leaders choose the best course of action based upon situational variables. Leadership effectiveness depends on a combination of the leader, followers and situational factors.

According to Hay (2010) there are many situations which can influence organizational outcomes to those associated with leader's qualities and behaviors. He argued that in contrast to the supporters of trait and behavioral theories, leader's behavior should be contingent up on the organizational situation prevailing.

In connection to the above argument, Fiedler's (2004) contingency theory asserts that the leader's ability to lead is contingent up on various situational factors including the leader's proffered style, the capabilities and behaviors of workers that depend heavily on the situational factors. This theory propounds the intimate approach to management by focusing on the situation first rather than organizational means, to a specific leadership style that will stimulate individual performance.

The situational theories contend four factors can influence the leadership effectiveness and performance in a given setting and that situational leadership can understand along four



dimensions; the personal characteristics' of the leader, the nature of the job, the nature of the organization and the nature of the people who follow (Bertocci, 2009).Covey (1992) and Winston (1977) also ascertained that achievement of balance does not necessarily rely on development of any particular trait or style of leadership but more on the leader's ability to analyze the situation and adopt a leadership approach that mobilize followers.

## **2.3 Types of Leadership**

### **2.3.1 Democratic/ Transformational Leadership Style**

The principal may seek discussion and agreement with teachers over an issue before a decision is taken by consensus or may allow teachers take a vote on an issue before a decision is taken. Using this style is not a sign of weakness; rather it is a sign of strength that one respects the employee's ways of thinking. However, the concern expressed by Dubrin (1998) is that participative style of leadership wastes time due to endless meetings and may lead to confusion and lack of direction, therefore not appropriate for use in times of crisis when the situations demand on the spot decision (Oyetunyi, 2006).

Savery (2004) found that democratic leadership style related positively to teachers' job satisfaction and commitment in Western Australia secondary schools, while in contrast, Rad (2006) found no relationship between leadership behavior and teachers job satisfaction in Isfahan University in Iran, where participative leadership style was prevalent. Morris (2003) and Spector (1997) carried out a study on local authorities' employees in Britain and found that employees were likely to be Satisfied by their ability to harness and input into work planning.

Bernard Bass's 2005 work is the cornerstone research on transformational leadership in the classroom, highlighting transformational leadership behaviors. Transformational leadership behaviors refer to particular behaviors/activities engaged in by leaders that improve overall organization performance and outcomes. According to Bernard Bass, transformational leaders exhibit the following transformational leadership behaviors in their daily interactions with the staff or subordinates: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

Inspirational motivation entails leaders communicating high performance expectations in an encouraging and enthusiastic fashion. Individualized consideration involves leaders coaching,

mentoring, and providing feedback in a manner consistent with each individual's needs and intellectual stimulation calls upon leadership to challenge followers to embrace new ways of thinking and doing, and to reassess values and beliefs. The leader solicits new ideas from followers and shows tolerance for mistakes. Idealized influence is leadership providing vision and a sense of mission while displaying total commitment to the vision and mission. Evidence demonstrates that the aforementioned transformational leadership behaviors have significant and progressive influence over subordinates/followers within organizations

It could be fair to say, that many characteristics of a transformational leadership stem from a combination of theories. In particular, Lewin's participative leadership theory (1946) also recognizes that the minds of many make better decisions than the judgment of a single mind alone, and therefore, supports a collaborative authentic style of leadership.

Transformational leadership in an educational setting would incorporate leadership that is visionary and authentic, and aimed to 'transform' not only the school, but also the teachers who work in it. Yukl (2009) defines transformational leadership as "the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organizational members and building commitment for the organization's mission, objectives and strategies". This style of leadership considers the behaviors, traits and qualities of school principals and includes situational and contingency factors. The relationship between principal and teacher is of utmost importance, whereby predominantly democratic/participative leadership styles would be practiced.

In an educational setting, this style of leadership would build relationships between teachers and principals, as well as building trust and collegiality amongst staff. Moreover, Bass (2009) surmises that transformational leaders offer a purpose that transcends short-term goals, whereby leaders influence, inspire, stimulate and mentor their followers, and thus have a greater impact on attitudinal change. In accordance, followers are inclined to trust, admire, respect and identify with the needs of the leader. The original works of Bass (1985; 1990b), who extended the work of Burns (1978) and who was influenced by Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory (1943), included three factors of transformational behavior: idealized influence, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. A later revision of the theory added attributed and behavior forms of idealized influence as well as inspirational motivation. Each factor is based on

behavioral measures that determine a leader's level of influence, stimulation, consideration, inspiration and motivation as perceived by those rating them.

The first factor of transformational leadership is Idealized Influence. Idealized influence is a style of leadership that influences subordinates to view their leaders in an idealized way (Bass and Avolio, 2004). These leaders behave admirably, which usually causes followers to idealize and identify with them. In the case of a school setting, these leaders take stands for their teaching colleagues and appeal to them on an emotional level. The relationship is built on genuine trust and there is a solid moral and ethical foundation between the two parties (Covey, 2007).

Principals, who are idealized leaders, envisage a desirable future, articulate how it can be reached, provide examples to be followed, show determination and confidence, and set high standards of performance (Bass, 1999). Gerhardt (2004), believes that these leaders use “outstanding influence in order to move and motivate others to accomplish tasks beyond personal and organizational norms” (Gerhardt, 2004).

Researchers such as Kouzes and Posner (1987) found that by strengthening others, trust is built and a leader's influence is more effective. If a school principal is seen to be going out of the way to help subordinates, their credit is increased “credit that may be drawn upon when extraordinary efforts are required” (Kouzes & Posner, 1987).

The second factor of transformational leadership is one known as inspirational motivation. Inspirational motivation is the ability to inspire and motivate followers. It denotes a leader as a figure, who inspires and articulates a vision that is appealing. Inspirational leaders express, in simple ways, shared goals and mutual understanding of what is right and important; they inspire and they motivate (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

In an educational setting in which transformational change is being conducted, principals have the task of stimulating others to adopt new ideas. Principals who display behaviors of this leadership style encourage enthusiasm and optimism, rousing team work, pointing out positive results and advantages, and emphasizing aims, stimulating teachers and more (Simic, 1998). Principals displaying inspirational and motivational behaviors challenge their teaching subordinates with high standards, communicate a sense of optimism towards future goals, and provide meaning for the task at hand (Bass, 1999). Importantly, teachers also

require a strong sense of purpose if they are to be motivated to act, and school principals need to acquire communication skills that allow their vision to be articulated in a persuasive way (Bass, 1999).

Thirdly, a transformational leader is known for displaying Intellectual Stimulation. Intellectual stimulation is modelled when leaders pay attention to the developmental needs of followers, and support and coach their development to become more innovative and creative (Bass, 2009).

Bass and Avolio (2004) believe that principals who promote intellectual stimulation encourage teachers to question assumptions, their own beliefs and values, and when appropriate, those of the principal, which may be outdated or inappropriate for solving current problems. Principals who promote intellectual stimulation help those in their presence to think about old problems in new ways (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

A principal who promotes intellectual stimulation willingly allows for a shift in power or distribution of leadership authority. Such leaders encourage their subordinates to take on greater responsibilities in the workplace as well as engage with key stakeholders to impart educational practice with a higher purpose and meaning (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997; Duignan & Bhindi, 1997; Begley, 2001).

Scholars such as Harris (2004) and Goethals, Sorenson et al. (2004) believe that this style of leadership “implies inter-dependency rather than dependency” and entails genuine and dependable leaders, who focus on a redistribution of power and a shift in authority across and within their organization.

Interested in teacher empowerment, Blasé (1987) carried out research that drew upon teachers’ perceptions of empowerment across a range of schools in the United States. The findings suggested that ‘teacher empowerment’ should focus on ‘leadership strategies’ of principals, and ways in which leaders’ impact on teachers’ sense of empowerment. The study also pointed to strategies and leader characteristics that influence teachers’ sense of empowerment. Some of these included: demonstrating greater trust in teachers, developing shared governance structures, encouraging/listening to individual input, and greater teacher autonomy, all of which fall under intellectual stimulation. Overall, Blasé (1987) believed that the significance of transformational leadership in relation to the development of

teacher empowerment and building strong, positive relationships between principals and teachers cannot be overstated

Lastly, Individualized Consideration is a transformational leadership characteristic whereby leaders recognize and attempt to satisfy their associates' current needs and aspirations. Paying attention to others is one of the most important aspects of transformational leadership (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman et al., 1990).

Principals who display characters of this leadership style try to understand and share in others' concerns and developmental needs, and treat each individual uniquely (Bass, 1999b). They expand, elevate and empower those needs in an attempt to maximize and develop their full potential (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Those principals delegate or distribute assignments as opportunities for growth (Bass, 2009), spend time teaching and coaching, develop individuality, and facilitate rather than dictate. They create supportive climates and value the teachers with whom they work. The focus of this leadership style is on the performance and potential of individual group members (Kendra, 2012). Moreover, Lewin's participative leadership theory (1946) also supports this leadership characteristic whereby a principal takes on a participative role, and takes into account the opinions of others.

It is believed that this leadership characteristic encourages teacher dedication and greater involvement in the decision-making practices of the school. In the works of Bhindi (2006), it is reiterated that leadership is more successful when it is distributed. His studies reveal that distributive leaders "instill genuinely empowered learning communities, where teachers value and celebrate interdependence and teamwork, relationships are sustained by mutual, trust and collegiality". He believes that "distributive leadership is an intentional platform driving the workplace culture, and empowerment creates the necessary potency".

Harris (2004), also advocates that this style of leadership entails genuine and dependable leaders, who focus on a redistribution of power and a shift in authority across and within their organization. It implies inter-dependency rather than dependency (Harris, 2004). Furthermore, Blasé (1997) believes that activities that serve to recognize or enhance a person's self-esteem

and work satisfaction are examples of leadership consideration. It would be fair to argue that individualized consideration can be viewed differently, depending on the behaviors, styles and intentions of the leader, and whether or not the reasons for distribution and empowerment are in fact for the enhancement of work-satisfaction as opposed to a leader's self-profit (Kendra, 2012).

### **2.3.2 Autocratic Leadership**

Autocratic leadership refers to a system that gives full empowerment to the leaders with minimal participation from the followers. Yuki (2004) found that autocratic leaders tend to have the following five characteristics; they do not consult members of the organization in the decision-making process. The leader set all policies, the leaders predetermine the methods of work, the leaders determine the duties of the followers, and the leader specifies technical and performance evaluations standards. In this case the teacher has a feeling that he/she is not appreciated thus losing job satisfaction. In an open climate, when principals are perceived as democratic managers who maintain open channels of communication with the staff, teachers would be more satisfied with their job as compared to schools where principal exhibit a harsh and authoritative attitude (Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy, 2007).

Autocratic leadership style is characterized by individual control, overall decision-making and little input from group members. Autocratic leaders typically make choices based on their own ideas and judgments and rarely accept advice from followers. Leaders dictate all the work methods and processes. In autocratic type of leadership, communication is usually described as one way. Leaders say what exactly they want done, in other words, decision-making is usually unilateral. Leaders accomplish goals by directing people (Melling & Little; 2004 Mgbodile, 2004).

Autocratic leaders create a situation where subordinates who do not want to realize the importance of work are forcefully led to work (Mullins, 2002). According to Mullins (2002), autocratic leaders supervise subordinates very closely to ensure compliance and completion of work in the designated time. Leadership is meant to be effective even where the situation seems harsh so as to drive organizational intentions towards goal achievement. Autocratic leadership can manifest in different ways. It is therefore not completely rigid and different situations can influence how the

organization and the leader implement the style. The three manifestations are directing autocratic leadership; permissive autocratic leadership; and paternalistic autocratic leadership (Ram, 2001).

Several studies suggest that schools with many autocratic leaders have higher turnover and absenteeism (Umeakuka, 2005). There are cases where this type of leadership style only makes the work environment worse, for example, in institutions where employees are struggling with low morale or are interested in building employee relationships. This type of leadership style should not also be used where a leader would wish to engage employees in decision making process.

Research findings by Kasule (2007) on the effect of leadership styles on teacher productivity in private secondary schools in Wakiso District indicate that autocratic leaders usually emphasize „authority“ as a means of having the work done. Principals generally emphasize it, since it reaps results very quickly as subordinates work under pressure to meet deadlines.

Bolarinwa (2013) and Nsubuga (2008) state that autocratic leadership occurs in a situation where the manager retains most authority for him or herself and makes decisions with a view to ensuring that the staff implements it. The autocratic leader’s authority emanates more from the office than from personal attributes. Bolarinwa and Nsubuga characterize the autocratic leader as an authoritarian. He directs group members on the way things should be done and issues orders without explanation which he expects should be obeyed whether or not the members of staff have initiative (Russell & Stone, 2002).

All powers in an organization are concentrated in his hands such that when he is away, it would be difficult for the staff to know what to do. Okumbe (1998) and Tuitoek, Yambo, and Adhanja (2015) add that school principals who use this kind of leadership do not give room to participation in decision-making. They unilaterally make decisions, are task oriented, hard on workers, keen on schedules, and expect people to do what they are told without much debate. Such principals are influenced by the scientific management approach

Another study by Story (1993), however, noted that head teachers, who use authority to get things done, are too strict in the formality by which things are done. This hinders teacher creativity especially in instances where creativity and planning are imperative to anchor academic

programmers in schools. Autocratic leadership leads to lower levels of job satisfaction, while democratic leadership leads to higher level of job satisfaction (Ajuoga, 2000).

### **2.3.3.Laissez- Faire Leadership**

Laissez- Faire leadership is defined by Kornmaz (2007) as being a style of leadership where leaders refuse to make decisions, are not available when needed, and choose to take no responsibility for their lack of leadership ability. Bass (2003) label the laissez-faire leader as not clarifying goals and standards that the followers must achieve or basically having no expectations for the followers in the organization.

Laissez-faire leadership may occur due to the avoidance of leadership behavior altogether, which enables the followers to ignore assignments and expectations. The laissez-faire leader exudes an attitude of indifference as well as non-leadership approach towards the followers and their performance. According to Korkmaz (2007) this leadership style actually decreases the commitment levels of teacher to stay at a particular school.

Bass & Avolio (1995) also asserted that there is no transaction or transformation of any kind with the follower because laissez-faire leaders do nothing to affect either the followers or their behaviors. However laissez-faire style is described by Zerras & Lassiter (2007) as most effective style especially where followers are mature and highly motivated. In a study examining the effectiveness of laissez-faire and the degree of employee satisfaction with the leadership style in the public banking sector, Siranathan (2002) found that laissez-faire leadership was highly and positively correlated with extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction.

Contingent rewards were also positively related to the outcome measures but less than to the transformational scale ratings. However, management by exception (Active and passive) and laissez faire were strongly and negatively correlated with the outcome. Furthermore, Erkutlu and Chafra (2006) found that laissez-faire leadership style in a boutique hotel led to negative results in organizational performance such as low satisfaction, high stress, and low commitment by followers.

Karugu (2000) conducted a study of the relationship between laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction by teacher coordinators. The study founded out a significant negative attitude between



the style and job satisfaction. There were non-significant leadership perceptions of vocational education administrators and teacher co-coordinators.

Laissez-Faire is also a leadership style whereby principals avoid getting involved. These school principals are usually absent when important issues arise and quite often delegate responsibility (Bass & Avolio, 2004). This style of leadership may be considered 'free-rein' in style as decisions are often left to others or simply not made at all. Very rarely, do these leaders take action for matters in need (Bass, 2009). Yukl (2002) describes this style of leadership as the absence of effective leadership rather than an example of transactional leadership.

As can be seen, the above styles of leadership all result in numerous negative impacts and can have adverse effects on teachers. The following studies have been carried out in educational settings and delve deeper into the impacts these leadership styles can have on teachers working in these systems.

In the study, 'The Dark Side of Leadership; Teacher Perspectives of school Principal Mistreatment', Blase and Blase (2002) presented findings from the perspective of 50 U.S. teachers who revealed the harmful effects that transactional styles of leadership and principal mistreatment had on them. Not only were they affected psychologically, emotionally and physically, but classroom instruction and relationships with colleagues were strongly impacted.

The research revealed serious adverse effects on teachers' physical well-being, such as: "sleep disorders, fatigue/exhaustion, irritable bowel syndrome, heart arrhythmia, first-time substance abuse, suicide" and more (Blase & Blase, 2002). The psychological and emotional effects that teachers experienced included such conditions as: depression, powerlessness, cynicism and distrust, self-doubt, guilt, embarrassment, disillusionment, poor concentration and lowered self-esteem.

Effects on work performance included reductions in: job effort, commitment, job satisfaction and morale, as well as increases in absenteeism, turnover, and attrition (Johnson, 2003). Social effects noted in the literature included isolation and loss of friendships (Lombardo and Pearson, 2000).

In support of the work carried out by Blasé and Blasé (2002), and drawing from

management literature and personal experience across different educational settings, Bhindi (2008) observed that “in low-trust, toxic cultures (where transactional forms of leadership exist), collegiality is superficial, relationships are snarled, productivity is affected, workplace commitment is compromised and happiness depends on whether you are in the inner or the outer circle of the micro politics (Bhindi, 2008).

The serious and somewhat adverse effects, discussed by teachers in Blasé and Blasé’s (2002) research were described as the result of long-term mistreatment from school principals. This clearly demonstrates the connections between the behaviors associated with leadership styles/behaviors and teacher job satisfaction. With leadership behaviors and personality traits such as those described, it is reasonable to conclude that these organizations cannot sustain genuinely empowered learning communities in which teacher’s value and celebrate interdependence (Bhindi, 2006).

Graetz (2000) emphasizes, that due to ever-increasing demands and complexities, leadership of change is a critical matter, however, existing leadership literature does not really focus on this facet of leadership, and a greater understanding of this phenomenon is required (Higgs & Rowland, 2005).

Blase and Blase (2003) confirmed that in 2003, “no empirical studies had systematically examined this side of school leadership and the extremely harmful consequences such forms of leadership could have on life in schools” (Blasé and Blase, 2003). Bhindi (2008) believes that this side of leadership is “often swept under the carpet and ignored altogether, as many people are reluctant to bring these issues out in the open because they fear entrenched interests” (Bhindi, 2008).

This study addressed the current gap in the literature by assessing principal leadership styles and teachers’ job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined and a number of theories are briefly reviewed and discussed.

## **2.4 Job Satisfaction Theories**

Much of what is known about job satisfaction has developed as a result of numerous studies and job satisfaction theories. Numerous theories have looked at a variety of contributing factors that may relate to one’s satisfaction in the job. Such received knowledge,

experience and on-going research help an understanding of how job satisfaction has been conceptualized. The notion of motivation is associated with job satisfaction, and theories of motivation form the basis of models and measures of job satisfaction (Mullins, 1996). Furthermore, it is argued that job satisfaction is closely associated with motivation because satisfaction may motivate effort and motivated effort may lead to satisfaction (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985).

The relationship between job satisfaction and motivation can be viewed as a symbiotic process, and numerous theories are divided into two contrasting theoretical approaches, including content theories and process theories (Dunford, 2002; Ivancevich & Matteson, 2003).

**Content theories** are those concerned with motivation and identifying people's needs, their strengths and the perceived goals to satisfy those needs.

Major content theories include: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory, McGregor's X and Y theory, Alderfer's (ERG) theory, Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, and Scott and Dinham's Three Domain Theory, all of which underpin the current study.

**Process theories** on the other hand, emphasize the actual process of motivation and the relationship between variables, including the way in which behavior is directed. Well known process theories include expectancy theory, equity theory, goal theory and attribution theory. In the following section a brief description of the above-mentioned job satisfaction content and process theories are discussed with relevance to the current study and educational settings.

Originally intended as a theory of human motivation and used predominantly in leadership, **Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory** is a theory that relates job satisfaction to the fulfillment of personal needs. The theory is based on a simple hierarchy of needs model, whereby basic (physiological) needs are met before the higher (sociological, esteem and self-actualization) needs are met (Locke, 2006).

In accordance with this theory, once a teacher's lower needs are satisfied, then that teacher will seek to meet the satisfaction of higher needs. If a teacher fails to satisfy needs at any given level, this may result in the individual striving to satisfy that particular need and thus not fulfilling the higher-level needs (Owens, 2001 and De Nobile, 2003). When these needs are not met, lower job

satisfaction occurs.

A transformational leader on the other hand is more concerned with meeting the higher needs of teachers and thus driving teachers to obtain higher levels of performance and productivity, and in turn raising levels of job satisfaction (Bass, 2009).

The more experienced and competent principals are within an educational setting, the more the teachers' needs are met and satisfied (Mullins, 2006). Scholars, such as Locke (2006) and Wofford (2011), argue that Maslow's theory and the hierarchical order of needs was not based on empirical evidence and, therefore, required further research. Despite this fact, Maslow's theory still supports the basis of a number of job satisfaction theories, such as Alderfer's (ERG) theory and Herzberg's two-factor theory, which are discussed in further depth in the next section.

**Alderfer's (ERG) theory** attempts to improve on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory by allowing greater flexibility of movement between the five levels of needs. Alderfer limited Maslow's five levels down to 'three' with the idea that each individual's needs are varied. Unlike Maslow's theory, the orders of levels Alderfer presents can be pursued at any stage simultaneously, and work in both directions. The three categories are based on existence, relatedness and growth.

**Existence**, shown at the base consists of factors such as those found in Maslow's two lowest basic needs levels. In an educational setting, these needs would refer to a teacher's physiological, safety and security needs and would include food, shelter and water, and the means by which they are secured, such as employment security, stability and income.

**Relatedness**, the next level up, consists of a teacher's social relationships and external esteem including involvement with family, friends and co-workers. This category is consistent with a combination of Maslow's self-esteem, love and belonging levels.

Alderfer's final level, Growth, comprises internal esteem and self-actualization, the most abstract of a teacher's needs, including the desire to succeed, to be creative or to be productive (Alderfer, 1969). This category is relative to Maslow's higher needs level of self-actualization.

The main difference between Alderfer's ERG Theory and Maslow's Needs Theory is the

order in which needs are met. Alderfer's theory works on the premise that as individuals progress from existence to relatedness to growth, satisfaction is achieved. However, when one regresses from growth towards existence, levels of frustration rise, hence job satisfaction is affected.

As previously mentioned, Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959) is another content theory, which has received considerable attention during the past decade. This theory is also highly pertinent to the current study as the factors suggested by Herzberg are strongly associated with those in an educational setting. Also known as motivator hygiene theory, this theory suggests that a teacher's job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are driven respectively by 'two' different factors known as hygiene factors and motivation factors.

In relation to a teacher's job satisfaction in an educational setting, Herzberg's hygiene (extrinsic) factors, would be placed at the base of the pyramid and include a combination of basic/existence and relatedness needs. These needs are pertinent to a teacher's working environment such as pay, supervision, policies, supervisor relationships/colleagues and working conditions (Herzberg, 1968). These factors are considered extrinsic to the job and are related to lower levels of satisfaction or job dissatisfaction.

Herzberg's motivation (intrinsic) factors on the other hand, would be placed at the top of the pyramid and be representative of Maslow's higher needs and form the basis of Alderfer's relatedness and growth needs.

Herzberg stresses that a teacher's job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are determined by a variety of factors and are not necessarily on two opposing ends of a scale. Whilst job satisfaction may be related to such aspects as advancement, achievement and recognition, other aspects such as insufficient pay and unstable working conditions can cause great frustration and lead to dissatisfaction. Therefore, the reversal of factors contributes to the reversal of one's satisfaction.

Despite its extensive use, the two-factor theory has been criticized for being too limited in its categorization of (motivators) satisfiers and (hygiene factors) dissatisfies (Gruneberg, 1979; McKenna, 1987) whereby some of the hygiene (extrinsic) factors have been identified as sources of job satisfaction rather than dissatisfaction, and vice versa. An example of

this is from the work of Menon and Christou (2002) that identified headmaster relationships with a sample of primary school teachers as a significant source of job satisfaction (De Nobile & McCormick, 2006) as opposed to job dissatisfaction.

Scholars such as Dinham and Scott (1996; 1998; 2000), whose studies predominantly lie in the field of education, also found limitations with the previous two-dimensional models whereby satisfaction and dissatisfaction were presented as two mutually exclusive domains. In their study of 2000 teachers across England, New Zealand and Australia, they provided evidence for a third domain which was grounded in the wider environment surrounding the organization and, in this case, the educational setting (the school). Their findings disclosed that those working in educational settings are surrounded by an outer domain, a domain 'which teachers and school executives find uniformly dissatisfying' (Dinham & Scott, 2000).

Dinham and Scott's three-domain theory (2000), therefore, is specifically associated with educational environments, and incorporates a third factor of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction called 'school-based factors. These factors account for aspects of work (eliciting satisfaction or dissatisfaction to some degree in teachers), and include school-based matters extrinsic to the task of teaching and working with others.

Dinham and Scott's study also revealed that the most strongly felt dissatisfies included factors such as society's poor attitude towards teachers, the negative image portrayed of teachers in the media, the apparent easy working conditions, issues associated with change and change management, added responsibilities, the lack of support and promotion opportunities and more (1998; 2000).

These 'third domain' dissatisfies relate specifically to the unique governance structure associated with educational settings. They are associated with school based social systems, community involvement and society's expectations on teachers and schools. They are not factors associated with larger business or corporate organizations. Thus, when two-factor theories are applied to educational settings, teacher satisfaction and teacher dissatisfaction can be misinterpreted. Therefore, consideration of the third 'school-based factors' domain as presented in Dinham and Scott's (2000) research is vital when conducting research on job satisfaction in educational settings.

## **2.5 Concepts of Teachers' Job Satisfaction**

Locke and Lathan (1990), define teachers' satisfaction as the pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Furthermore, according to Omodifar (2013), teacher satisfaction is generally recognized as the most important and frequently field studied attitude in school behavior. Teacher satisfaction significantly influences organization behavior. Most studies have indicated that teacher job satisfaction positively affects teachers' working performance and organizational commitment, and negatively influences teachers' turnover (Agarwal, 2001).

Teachers' job satisfaction is also the degree to which an individual feel positively or negatively about various aspect of the job is called job satisfaction. Teachers' job satisfaction is the degree of fit between the features of a job and workers' expectations (Tutuncu, 2007).

Locke and Lathan (1990) define teachers' satisfaction as the pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Job satisfaction may be defined as favorable or positive feelings about work or the work environment (Furnham, 1997) and describes how happy one is with the job. On the flip side, it can also be defined in terms of unfavorable or negative feelings about work or the work environment, and describes how unhappy one is with the job.

A widely accepted definition offered by Locke (1976) states that job satisfaction can be defined as "the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the 'perception' of one's job as fulfilling or allowing the fulfillment of one's important job values.

Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (2009) also confirm that satisfied workers are more productive than those who are unsatisfied (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959). Scholars in the field of education, including Davis (1992) and Birkeland and Johnson (2003), also contend that high levels of job satisfaction are linked to positive behaviors and consist of higher productivity and performance levels, while low levels of job satisfaction are linked to negative behaviors and consist of lowered commitment and lower productivity (De Nobile & McCormick, 2006).

Research carried out by De Nobile and McCormick (2006) revealed that teachers working in educational settings, who experienced low job satisfaction in their jobs suffered a variety of

adverse mental and physical effects, some of which included psychological withdrawal from the job, poor staff interrelations and absenteeism. It was revealed that in schools where job satisfaction was low, staff turnover was high. With outcomes and adverse effects such as those described, it is reasonable to conclude that raising levels of job satisfaction in educational settings is vital.

From the various definitions that have been presented, and for the purposes of this study, the following definition will be adopted: teacher satisfaction is the feeling that emerges as a result of fulfillment of an employee's needs (intrinsic needs, extrinsic needs) and its strength depends on the degree of meeting individuals' expectations. This feeling controls and drives the employee's behavior and work attitude, which may in return have an effect on the organizational functioning.

Hammer and Organ (1978) look at a more complex set of factors pertaining to the job satisfaction of teachers in educational settings. Their work takes a snap shot of the wider community and reviews job satisfaction in terms of the values and beliefs of society. They believe that job satisfaction is closely related to societal value judgments and the mental and physical health of teachers. Additionally, they suggest that when factors such as mental and physical health are low, staff turnover and absenteeism rates are low. This, in turn, increases societal judgment values and works in favor to the educational setting as a whole, thus working as a public relations asset to the organization.

It can be argued that when a teacher values a particular facet of a job, satisfaction is more greatly impacted both positively (when expectations are met) and negatively (when expectations are not met), compared to a teacher who doesn't value that facet at all (Locke, 1969 and 1976). Furthermore, Weiss (2002) views job satisfaction as an attitude but suggests that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which affect emotion, beliefs and behaviors.

In the case of educational settings, researchers would need to be mindful that teachers form attitudes towards their jobs based on their overall values, and factors such as feelings, behaviors, and beliefs would need to be taken into account. With this in mind, De Nobile and McCormick (2008), found that a variety of factors and dimensions can influence a person's level of job satisfaction, and that "levels of job satisfaction felt by different teachers in similar work environments can vary from one individual to another" (De Nobile & McCormick,



2008).

For the purpose of this study, job satisfaction is defined as “the degree to which a teacher feels positive about their work, the teachers with whom they work and the organization or environment in which they work”. This definition signifies that when feelings of teachers are positive, they are satisfied and when the feelings of teachers are negative, they are dissatisfied. According to the same source, teachers’ job satisfaction is closely related to the gratification of needs. It is composed of effective, cognitive and behavioral elements. These elements vary in their intensity and consistency from one individual to another. Thus, job satisfaction is the satisfaction derived from any pursuit directed by the process of fulfillment of the needs.

## **2.6. Leadership style and Teachers’ job satisfaction**

In this section, a critical perspective on leadership is discussed to address a possible connection between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Unlike the plethora of research associated with teachers and their job satisfaction, limited research focused on the direct relationship between principal behaviors and teacher job satisfaction in educational settings.

Studies that were directly linked, however, included the work of, scholars such as Houser (2007) Kornhauser and Sharp (2002), Bergen (2009) Lawshe and Nagle (2003) who all highlight the importance of leadership behavior when determining the attitudes of job satisfaction.

As previously stated, Dinham and Scott (2000), also focus strongly on teacher job satisfaction and principal relationships. They believe that the most strongly-felt job dissatisfies found amongst teachers relating to teacher dissatisfaction included factors such as society’s poor attitude towards teachers, the negative image portrayed of teachers in the media, the apparent easy working conditions, issues associated with change and change management, added responsibilities, the lack of support and promotion opportunities and more. They believe that principals are held accountable for addressing the above stereotypes and the challenges presented to teachers. They need to demonstrate consideration of societal pressures in order to establish satisfying work environments.

As presented in the work of Dinham and Scott (1998; 2000), the ‘school-based domain’ is

of great importance for leaders to understand if teacher morale is to be increased. This outer domain encompasses many of the factors that contribute to a teacher's dissatisfaction. If a leader can ensure that teachers feel empowered, motivated and valued, these outer factors may have less impact on teachers' morale, and eventually may start to lose value. Upon review of the literature, clear patterns emerged from the numerous studies examined. Some of the recurring themes included teacher morale and motivation, teacher efficacy, working conditions, collegiality, responsibility and advancement. These perspectives on job satisfaction are discussed in relation to possible connections with leadership in the following section.

A study carried out by Richards (2003) examines long-term teacher/principals' relationship and job satisfaction. Teachers who have worked for long periods of time with the same principal tend to be able to work closely with that principal. The teachers come to feel comfortable with their principal and her/his leadership style, and this long-term interaction can improve the level of satisfaction for the teachers and principal.

Heller (2003), takes conflicting view point. He discusses a situation where the leadership between a principal's leadership style and teacher's job satisfaction may not be as much of a factor in a school setting. In some cases, when teachers are least satisfied with the financial aspect of teaching and the most satisfied with their co-workers, Heller (2003), did not find that job satisfaction was related to the principal's leadership style. Instead, teachers' job satisfaction was related to principals' overall friendliness, warmth, support and rapport with the teachers.

Job satisfaction was also dependent on the individual followers' personality traits. This coincides with Hersey and Blanchard's (2008) research stating that the theory of leadership should be based on specific situations and on follower characteristics, not on an overall style. Unfortunately, this research did not include an overview of autocratic and transformational leadership styles in their studies. Autocratic leadership leads to lower levels of job satisfaction, while democratic leadership leads to higher level of job satisfaction (Ajuoga, 2000). The level of job satisfaction under *laissez faire* is also less than under democratic leadership (Bass, 2009). Extensive research supports the claim that job satisfaction is positively related to participative decision making and to transformational leadership (Maeroff, 2008).

## **2.7 Leadership and Teacher Morale/Motivation**

It is vital for leaders to understand the positive and negative effects their leadership styles may have on teachers' satisfaction, particularly when it has been determined that job satisfaction can be the seminal factor of a school's success. Accordingly, when a leader understands the relationships between morale, satisfaction and school climate, improvements to the overall educational establishment can be put in place.

Numerous studies can be cited to support the contention that leaders make a difference in their subordinates' satisfaction and performance. Allen (2011) contended that the school principal's leadership was the most important factor in determining a school's climate and the students' success.

Fullan (2008) also contended that "if anyone can influence teachers on a day-to-day basis, it is the principal, both directly and indirectly". These leaders can have a profound effect on the way they influence and motivate teachers, and a better understanding of this relationship is imperative for leaders in these organizations.

As discussed in the job satisfaction section, Herzberg's (1966) Motivation Hygiene Theory suggests that motivation and hygiene are two central factors that determine job satisfaction. Previously mentioned, Herzberg (1964) is known for his studies on employee motivation, particularly in relation to organizations, because it significantly affects employee productivity. Discussed in this section was that motivators (satisfiers) fulfill an individual's need for psychological growth and hygiene factors (dissatisfies) are preventative and environmental.

Achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement are examples of motivators. In order to accomplish organizational objectives, leaders must understand and motivate people. This understanding is essential if support from followers, peers, and others, is to be achieved.

Furthermore, principals as formal leaders need to start recognizing the common themes, traits and the individual attitudes contributing to the job satisfaction of teachers. Kelley et al. (2005) also believed that job satisfaction could be improved if leaders better understood the link between theory and practice. Winfrey (2009) contends that principals are the formal leaders in schools who heavily influence school organizational effectiveness and

culture. By better understanding the research that has been carried out previously, it is implied that school principals may put into practice better strategies that will prevent possible negative situations from occurring and enhance the overall morale and motivation of teachers.

Not only is it important for leaders to understand the link between theory and practice, so too must teachers. While teachers need to feel motivated and valued, they should also be respected as professionals who are competent in their field of work. Moreover, it can be implied that a teacher's job satisfaction is increased and work performance is raised when they are treated as true professionals.

Continual professional development opportunities for teachers ensure that the links between theory and classroom practice are constantly being improved. According to Allen and Cosby (2000) "We need teachers who are trained to learn from their students. For this to occur, they must be alive intellectually, and constantly updating their skills". Moreover, once leaders acknowledge the relationship between their influence and job satisfaction, they can start the process of implementing new strategies that will facilitate the needs of their staff and improve the overall morale and motivation amongst teachers in their educational setting.

## **2.8 Leadership and Teacher Efficacy**

Empirical studies found in the area of educational leadership support the contention that leaders make a difference in employees' satisfaction and overall teacher performance. In better understanding the issue of being appreciated as teacher professionals, Kranot (2006) conceptualized self-efficacy as a way to try and better understand the role that leadership has on teacher's perceptions.

It was determined that several aspects of a transformational leadership style and personal teacher efficacy were connected, therefore, revealing that transformational leaders promote personal teacher efficacy. Hipp and Bredeson (1995) published a study that looked at the relationship between a school principal's leadership style and teachers' self-efficacy. The basic assumption of this publication was that a school principal's leadership style and personal teacher efficacy are directly linked (Hipp & Bredeson, 1995).

The relationship between personal teacher efficacy and a principal's leadership style is seen to be rather complex and mediated by teachers' satisfaction on the job. In their study, Nir and Kranot (2006) established that the leadership style of a school principal is a major source of influence on the internal content and work circumstances an individual experiences in an organizational setting (Nir & Kranot, 2006). Their empirical research confirmed the argument raised by Hipp and Bredeson (2005) who stated that these two factors are directly linked when transformational leadership is involved.

Although different leadership styles differ in the way they influence and shape the inner organizational settings, the findings from Nir and Kranot's (2006) study suggest that leadership style is not an exclusive element of personal teacher efficacy. Transformational leadership that is supportive and positive stems back to the thought of a teacher's self-efficacy. If a leader is positive, it is highly likely that the performance level of those working with the leader will also be positive. The abovementioned literature implies that, as perceived by teachers, a leader's behavior and attitude are of great importance.

## **2.9 Leadership and Working Conditions**

Macmillan and Northfield (2009) linked morale, whether it be positive or negative, to an individual's attitude towards the working environment or working conditions. Working conditions in the context of this study relate to the working environment in which people are employed. If leaders can create comfortable working environments and conditions for their teachers, then teachers may wish to stay working in those working environments for longer periods of time.

As can be seen throughout the literature pertaining to working conditions, Kim and Loadman (1994) point out that these conditions can be the very factors that strongly affect an individual's job satisfaction. While leadership style alone cannot be responsible for the many elements that surmount to one's satisfaction in the job, leadership is responsible for providing the best working conditions available to employees (McCormick, 2008).

Studies have produced consistent findings regarding how teacher job satisfaction is related to decisions encouraging teachers to remain in the teaching profession. Lieberman (1988) noted that for leaders to retain quality teachers, then "Teachers must have opportunities to take on more

responsibilities, more decision-making power, and more accountability for results. Teachers must also be paid higher salaries, in due recognition of complexity and significance of their work".

## **2.10 Leadership and Responsibilities**

Employees are more satisfied when they have adequate freedom and authority to do their jobs, when they have challenging opportunities at work, and when their managers are good leaders (Bavendam, 2000). As suggested in Maslow's (1970) needs theory, responsibility served as a higher need, and employees who had the drive and motivation to take on extra responsibility in the work place generally had higher levels of satisfaction. Herzberg (1966) associated professional autonomy and the freedom to make choices in the work place with responsibility as a strong determinant of job satisfaction. He also believed that responsibility was a motivator and encouraged levels of satisfaction, as opposed to dissatisfaction.

Previously mentioned in the leadership section, transformational leaders who promote intellectual stimulation allow for a shift in power. They encourage their followers to take on greater responsibilities in the workplace as well as engage with key stakeholders to impart educational practice with a higher purpose and meaning (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997; Duignan & Bhindi, 1997a; Begley, 2001). Scholars such as Harris (2004) and Goethals, Sorenson et al. (2004) believe that this style of leadership 'implies inter-dependency rather than dependency' and entails genuine and dependable leaders who focus on a redistribution of power and a shift in authority across and within their organization.

In the work of Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) it was discovered that despite employees being dedicated to their work and enjoying their responsibilities, quite often they asked the question as to whether or not they would be more satisfied working in a more demanding setting. Additionally, it was discovered that school commitment was significantly correlated with higher levels of leadership support and lower levels of role conflict (Billingsley & Cross, 1992).

## **2.11 Leadership and Advancement**

According to job satisfaction theorists Maslow (1970), Herzberg (1964), and Dinham and Scott (2000), advancement is a motivator or intrinsic satisfier leading to higher level needs. Scholars Kim and Loadman (1994), describe advancement opportunities as those which provide individuals with job promotions. For employees to advance within an organization or awarded a job promotion, usually hard work, loyalty and good performance are required (Syptak, Marsland & Ulmer, 1999). Previously, scholars including Herzberg (1966) and Sergiovanni (1967) have connected the opportunity for employee advancement in the work place to job satisfaction.

It was noted across studies that advancement factors were strong determinants of job satisfaction and when employees were rewarded with recognition and advancement as a result of their achievements, higher levels of satisfaction became apparent (Schmidt, 1976). Additionally, recognition by superiors was identified by Johnson (1967) as a factor related to job satisfaction. In his works it was found that one's status was a factor showing a relationship to job dissatisfaction.

Furthermore, while salary was seen as a factor relating to advancement throughout the literature, it was affirmed that salary was not identified as a motivator, nor was it a factor that elicited job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In the works of Kim and Loadman (1994) it was affirmed that unfairness of salary distribution was a factor that led to feelings of unhappiness or job dissatisfaction.

As discussed in the section regarding Locke's (1976) equity theory, employees are more satisfied when they sense fair rewards are consistent with opportunities and when employees are rewarded fairly for the work they do. In relation to the current study, salary as an individual factor is not presented. It was determined that no direct relationship between a leader's behavior or leadership and the salary available to members of staff was significant. This is a result of pre-determined salary rates in the education sector. Advancement on the other hand is purely determined by the head of school, therefore this factor has been included as an individual factor for review.

With these factors in mind, the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction becomes a highly complex set of variables. Political, economic and societal changes have

prompted fundamental shifts in educational policies and the manner in which schools are led. As a result of these changes, principals are expected to comply with the highest moral and ethical standards in their dealings with staff and practices, whilst being responsible for the teachers and students under their care.

In response to the overt pressures, it is understood that some principals may face a multitude of difficulties in their attempts to respond effectively to these challenges. Duignan (2012) also raises concerns regarding the current emphasis on corporate management values, strategies and practices in many educational organizations and the considerable criticism of schools and schooling in the media.

Consequently, teaching and other members of staff may feel the weight of these pressures, which in turn impact on the overall morale, motivation, collegiality and work productivity in the school. Therefore, the significance of leadership in relation to the development of strong, positive relationships between principals and teachers cannot be overstated and the above-mentioned theories and researchers have suggested that respectful, trusting, constructive relationships between principals and teachers are essential for school improvement (Boyer, 1995; Schlechty, 1997; Senge, 2000 and Cotton, 2001).

## **2.12 The Need of Teacher Satisfaction in Schools**

According to Heskett et al (1994), more satisfied teachers, stimulate a chain of positive actions which end in an improved organization performance. In another research it is said that employee satisfaction influenced employee productivity, absenteeism and retention, Derek R. Allen & Merris Wilburn, (2002).

The success of any school is directly link to the satisfaction of the teachers who embody that school, that retaining talented people is critical to the success of any school, Freeman, (2005).job satisfaction is not only about teachers' but is very crucial in any organizational employees. For example, studies shows that businesses that excel in employee satisfaction issues reduce turnover by 50% from the norms, increase customer satisfaction to an average of 95 % & lower labor cost by 12%., Carpitella, (2003).

Judge, et. al, (1993), on the other hand, mentions that employee satisfaction is positively correlated with motivation, job involvement, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational



commitment, life satisfaction, mental health, and job performance, and negatively related to absenteeism, turnover, and perceived stress and identify it as the degree to which a person feels satisfied by his/her job. In contrast, Rousseau (1978) identified three components of employee satisfaction: they are characteristics of the organization, job task factors, and personal characteristics. Human Relations perspective posits that satisfied workers are productive workers (e.g., Likert, 1961; McGregor, 1960). Thus, organizational productivity and efficiency is achieved through employee satisfaction and attention to employees' physical as well as socio emotional needs.

Human relations researchers further argue that employee satisfaction sentiments are best achieved through maintaining a positive social organizational environment, such as by providing autonomy, participation, and mutual trust (Likert, 1961). Additional example to strengthen the concept of teachers' job satisfaction, in a unique study conducted by Harter et al. (2002), based on 7,939 business units in 36 organizations, the researchers found positive and substantive correlations between employee satisfaction-engagement and the business unit outcomes of productivity, profit, employee turnover, employee accidents, and customer satisfaction.

## **2.13 Determinant Variables of Teacher satisfaction**

According to World Global Journal Volume 5, Issue 1 (Sep-Oct. 2012), on Identification of Variables teachers' job Satisfaction and their Impact on the school, the major determinant variables of job satisfaction are mainly categorized in to two broad categories namely: organizational and personal variables. Organizational Variables The organization determinants of job satisfaction play a very important role. The teachers spend major part of their time in school so there are number of organizational variables that determine job satisfaction of the teachers'. The job satisfaction in the organization can be increased by organizing and managing the school variables.

### **2.13.1 School Development and Climate**

School development is an ongoing, systematic process to implement effective change in school. Its objective is to enable the organization in adopting-better to the fast-changing external environment of new markets, regulations, and technologies. It starts with a careful organization wide analysis of the current situation and of the future requirements in other words we can say that school development is the process through which school develops the internal capacity to most

efficiently and effectively provide its mission work and to sustain itself over the long term. This definition highlights the explicit connection between school development work and the achievement of school mission.

### **2.13.2 Policies of Compensation and Benefit**

This is the most important variable for job satisfaction. Compensation can be described as the amount of reward that a worker expects from the job. Teachers should be satisfied with competitive monthly salary and they should be satisfied with it when comparing their pay packets with those of the outsiders who are working in the same organization and profession. A feeling of satisfaction is felt by attaining fair and equitable rewards.

### **2.13.3 Job Security**

Job security is a teachers' confidence that they will keep their current job. Teachers with a high level of job security have a low probability of losing their job in the near future. Certain professions or opportunities inherently have better job security than others; job security is also affected by a worker's performance.

### **2.13.4 Working Environment & Condition**

Teachers are highly motivated with good working conditions as they provide a feeling of safety, comfort and motivation. On contrary, poor working condition brings out a fear of bad health on teachers. The more comfortable the working environment is more productive will be the teachers.

### **2.13.5 Leadership Style**

The satisfaction level on the job can be determined by the leadership style. Job satisfaction is greatly enhanced by democratic style of leadership. It is because democratic leaders promote friendship, respect and warmth relationship among the employees. On contrary, teachers working under authoritarian and dictatorial leaders express low level of job satisfaction.

## **2.14 Strategies to Foster Teachers' Job satisfaction**

### **2.14.1 Teacher Reward and Recognition Programs**

Danish et al., (2010) assert that reward and recognition programs serve as the most contingent factors in keeping teacher self-esteem high and passionate. Tangible incentives are effective in

increasing performance for tasks not done before, to encourage thinking smarter and to support both quality and quantity to achieve goals (Board, 2007).

As the teachers engage in their working activities purposely for their own sake, then they will feel intrinsic motivation in their behaviors as their activities will essentially be enjoyable and satisfactory (Vansteenkiste, 2005).

Prosperity and survival of the organizations is determined through the human resources and how they are treated and that most organizations have gained immense progress by fully complying with their business strategy through a well-balanced reward and recognition programs for employees (Lawler, 2003). Teachers are definitely closer to their organization as their job becomes the major satisfaction in their life after having a proper rewards and recognition scheme at their job (Ali and Ahmed, 2009). Recognition is a process of giving an employee a certain status within an organization (Danish et al., 2010).

### **2.14.2 Energizing Teacher**

Goel et al. (2012) provides the following ways of energizing teachers which according to them is the power of recognition, increasing their roles and participation in the organization's major activities, providing appropriate designations, involving them in the decision-making process, empathize with teachers and providing succession and career planning opportunities.

### **2.14.3 Implementation of Promotion**

Numerous research findings have reported existence of a moderate positive relationship between promotion and employee satisfaction (Gaertner, 2000). According to Katiyal et al., (2012), teachers seek fair promotion policies and practices, and thus fair chances of promotion according to teacher's ability and skills make teacher more loyal to their work and become a source of pertinent workability for the teacher. Promotion provides opportunities for personal growth; more responsibilities and that teacher are generally promoted on the basis of seniority which often experience employee satisfaction but not as much as on the basis of performance. Instead, they advocate for promotion based on performance evaluation, in-service training programs, education attained, workshops and seminars attended.

#### **2.14.4 Provide a Good Salary Package**

Williams et al. (2000) suggests that satisfaction with the compensation system is a more important input into teachers' judgment of the quality of their exchange relationships with their organizations than is satisfaction with compensation levels like pay level and benefits level satisfaction. Probably the most influential factor in job satisfaction is the remuneration one gets for his job: a reasonable pay which will compensate for many hitches, for example work overload, overtime or even a stressful job (Ayeni et al., 2007). Job satisfaction is directly related to remuneration packages and dissatisfaction mostly comes up when a worker feels that he or she is not being appropriately compensated for the work he/she is doing for the organization.

#### **2.15 Empirical Studies on Leadership Style and Teachers' Job Satisfaction**

The relationship between leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction has been reported in both leadership and management literature. Several studies found a positive relationship the two variables. For instance, Fidler (1996), one of the most respected researchers on leadership has provided recent agreements on the importance of leadership by arguing that the effectiveness of a leader is a major determinant of success or failure of a group, an organization, or even an entire country. Many other researchers such as Lee and Chuang (2009) explain that the excellent leaders not only inspire subordinates' potential to enhance efficiency but also meet their requirements in the process of achieving organizational goals.

In addition, Pradeep and Prabhu, (2011) indicated that effective school require effective leadership and that job satisfaction will suffer in direct proportion to the neglect of this. Hence, from the finding of many studies it is generally accepted that the job satisfaction of any set of people is largely dependent on the quality of its leadership-effective leader behavior facilitates the attainment of the followers' desires, which then results in effective satisfaction.

There are various leadership styles having their own distinct impact on teachers' satisfaction a different situations and environment, in this study the researcher will briefly review relevant review literature related to these three leadership styles; in this regard many researchers have conducted studies about different leadership styles and their effect on the outcome of the employees in different parts of the world.

A study conducted by Nuhu (2010) to find the empirical relationship between the perceived leadership style and its consequence in the teachers' job satisfaction in the school, he found that each leadership style differently affects employees' satisfaction and he concluded that there is positive relationship between democratic leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction. Whereas, the result of autocratic leadership style on the job satisfaction level was opposing to the democratic style.

In addition, a study by Duz, Chielo (2012) on the effect of leadership style of principals on the job satisfaction of staffs in Delta secondary schools of Nigeria conclude that a job satisfaction of staff was found to be more significantly related to democratic leadership style than either autocratic or laissez faire leadership style.

However, according to Kiggundu (1988) who has conducted some empirical study on leadership style in South Africa, has concluded that the dominant style of leadership is authoritarian, personalized, inflexible, insensitive and conservative. Similarly, a study by Peris, M. & Prof, G. (2012) in Kenya states that leaders' behavior in public organization has significant effect on employee's satisfaction and Laissez-faire leadership style is mostly practiced.

In summary, much of the above evidence presented as supporting this claim is either inconclusive or empirically suspect. The limited or inconclusive character of research findings in this area suggests the need to investigate further the nature of the relationship between leadership and teachers' job satisfaction.

## **2.16.Theoretical Framework**

The study is guided by Herzberg two factor theories by Fredrick Herzberg (cited in Okumbe 2007). The theory states that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are caused by different and independent set of factors, the motivators and the hygiene factors. Herzberg found that the factors causing job satisfaction (and presumably motivation) were different from that causing job dissatisfaction. He developed the motivation-hygiene theory to explain these results. He called the satisfiers motivators and the dissatisfies hygiene factors, using the term "hygiene" in the sense that they are considered maintenance factors that are necessary to avoid dissatisfaction but that by themselves do not provide satisfaction. Herzberg theory is related to this study in that just as in

any organization, teacher's job satisfaction is determined by internal factors in the school environment which include the principals' leadership style.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3. INTRODUCTIONS**

This study examined the relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by Sheka zone secondary school teachers. Leadership styles were compared with measures of teacher job satisfaction, including supervision, colleagues, working conditions and work it, advancement. This chapter discusses the methodology used in this study. It describes the research method, sample, instruments, validity and reliability of these instruments and method of data analysis.

### **3.1 Research Design**

According to Ngechu (2001), a research design is a plan showing how problems under investigation are solved. This study focused to investigate the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction. The variables included in this study were leadership styles and job satisfaction. Leadership style was the independent variable and job satisfaction was the dependent variable. This study was correlation research design. The researcher intended to seek out relationships among variables included in the study and survey design was used to collect the data

The study used a quantitative approach that examined leadership styles in relation to a set of job satisfaction variables, including supervision, working conditions, responsibility, work itself and advancement. The use of a quantitative methodology in educational research can be very useful when trying to determine whether or not a claim is true or false. Either as part of a larger project that employs many different methods or as a basis for a complete piece of work, the stronger the research evidence is, the more certain it can be that the knowledge claim is accurate (Creswell, 2002 and Field, 2009).

Combined with the quantitative methodology, a qualitative component was also included. While the weighting of the qualitative section was minimal, and consisted of only one question, it was hoped that by combining and increasing the number of research strategies, the dimensions and overall scope of the project would be broadened (Gay & Airasian, 2000; Creswell, 2002).

Through the use of multiple methods, it was hoped that a deeper and richer understanding of the relationship between leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction would be obtained, thus obtaining deeper insight into core issues.

The aim of the study was to investigate relationships between leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. Correlation research was used to test whether or not relationships existed between given variables, as well as to test the extent of these measures (Gay, 2000 and Field, 2009). Therefore, a co relational research design was the prominent measure used in the study.

### **3.2 Target Population**

According to Ngechu (2004), a population is a well-defined set of people, services, elements, and events, group of things or households that are being investigated. Orodho (2004) defines population as all the items or people under consideration for the study. The target population was

consists of all teachers and principals in all the 16 government secondary schools in Sheka zone. The choice of teachers and principals based on the variables under investigation was particular to them and no other party could provide this information. The target populations for this study were 343, which consists of 16 principals, 7 v/principals and 320 teachers. Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) explain that the target population should have some observable characteristics, to which the researcher intends to generalize the results of the study.

### 3.2.2. Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

Sampling is the process of selecting a subset of cases in order to draw conclusions about the entire set (Orodho, 2004). Wiersma (1995) described a sample is as a small population of the target population selected systematically for the study. Sampling is important because one can learn something about a large group by studying a few of its members thus saving time and money. To determine the sample size, the researcher adapted the recommendation of 10 to 30% of the universe which is seen as representative and can be generalized to the population Mugenda and Mugenda (2003). The researcher used the higher limit of 43% of the teachers. The sample was therefore comprised of the 8 principals and 140 of the sampled/selected schools which is 50% (8) of the 16 schools and 43% (140) of teachers out of 100% (320) teachers.

Purposive sampling was used to identify the sample schools. In order to identify specific principals and V/principals was included in the study, the researcher used purposive sampling. In selecting of teachers from each selected school, the researcher purposively sampled 140 teachers to conducted questionnaire.

**Table.3. 1** Proportional Sample Size of Teachers per School

Categories of the population	Total population	Sample size of the population	Total %	Sampling techniques
Schools	16	7	44	Purposive sampling
school principals	16	8	50	Purposive sampling
v/principals	7	3	50	Purposive sampling
Teachers	320	140	43	Purposive sampling
total respondents	343	159		



Regard to the above table information, the sample size was determined by purposive sampling technique. As described above the table from the total number of 16 secondary schools 44% (7) selected for sample size of the research by using purposive sampling techniques. All 7 schools were sampled based on the knowledge of the researcher's because he knew which school teachers did give more accurate data to address objectives of the study.

### **3.3 Data collection tools/ Instruments**

The tool for data collection was questionnaire. A questionnaire was a research instrument that gathers data over a large sample (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). Questionnaires were used to gather information or data from the 140 sampled teachers.

Data were collected using a survey combining two instruments and comprising four sections: a demographic survey; types of leadership style being practiced, the Leadership styles Questionnaire (LSQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) and an adapted Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) developed by Lester (1987). The third section of the questionnaire required teachers to fill out the Leadership styles Questionnaire (LSQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) which consists of 35 items. The fourth deals with The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) (Lester & Bishop, 1997).

The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) is a 35-items questionnaire based on the research of Maslow and Herzberg and developed by Lester (1987) to measure the job satisfaction of teachers working predominantly with principal in the schools. Whilst there are many methods for measuring job satisfaction, Liker questionnaires (Likert, 1932) are the most frequently used method to determine satisfaction within job dimensions (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Field, 2009).

The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ), developed by Lester (1987) contains items relating to supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility and work itself (Lester & Bishop, 1997).

As represented above, the TJSQ instrument has measures of job facets applicable to most schools (such as working conditions, advancement, colleagues and pay), although the items in general relate specifically to teaching, educational organizations and the typical school environment (Holdaway, 1978; Lester, 1987; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; De Nobile, 2007).

### **3.4. Validity and Reliability of the Instruments**

Validity means ascertaining the accuracy of the instruments by establishing whether the instruments focus on the information they are intended to collect (Borg and Gall, 1989). Reliability as a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated tests when administered a number of times (Mugenda, 2003). To enhance the reliability of the instruments a pilot study was conducted. The researcher used test retest method where the instrument was administered to the respondents.

Questionnaire was adapted and its reliability was calculated in Cronbach alpha in order to check the appropriateness of the instrument in the current research by applying SPSS V20. A questionnaire for Leadership Styles and teacher's job satisfaction was pilot tested on 30 teachers in two different secondary schools for teacher by the researcher himself. To analyze the reliability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient for this questionnaire was analyzed with the help of specific method to analyze the reliability in SPSS version 20. The reliability with Cronbach alpha was ranged based on (Hinton et al, 2004).

Hinton et al have suggested four cut-off points for reliability, which includes excellent reliability (0.90 and above), high reliability (0.70-0.90), moderate reliability (0.50-0.70) and low reliability (0.50 and below). The reliability of this questionnaire was 0.8. To seek the validity of the questionnaire experts' opinion were taken into account. Present questionnaire was also pilot tested on 30 teachers in two different secondary schools and the Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient for this questionnaire was 0.9.

### **3.5. Data Collection Procedures**

After presentation of the research proposal the researcher wrote letters to the principals, Vice principals and teachers to be permitted to do the study. The researcher was visited the selected schools, create relationship with the respondents, explain the purpose of the study and administered the questionnaires. The respondents were assured about the confidentiality of their identities. The questionnaires were administered and collect immediately after they complete it.

### 3.7. Data Analysis

Kombo and Tromp (2006) define data analysis as the interpretation of collected raw data into useful information. The researcher first checked on the data collected for completeness. The data were categorized and code for easy processing. All the data entered into and analyze by the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS Version20).Prior to statistical analysis, data cleaning and handling of missing values was perform and typing errors corrected. Pearson moment correlation coefficient used to determine the relationships between principals leadership styles and teachers job satisfaction. Quantitative data analyzed using t-test and other statistics tools. Statistics are indices that describe a given sample, for example, measures of central tendency and measures of dispersion and qualitative data was analyzed thematically and in a narrative form. In this study, mean and standard deviation used to compute quantitative analysis. In this case the quantitative data were presented in the form of tables't-test, mean value and standard deviations were used.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### 4. DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

#### INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents data analysis, presentation and interpretation. In the first part the demographic information/background profile of the respondents was discussed. Next part was focused on main body of the study. In next part, the data collected based on the relationship between style of leadership and teachers' job satisfaction in government secondary schools of Sheka zone was analyzed.

#### 4.1 Demographic Information of Respondents

This part presents general information of the participants.

Table 1: Demographic information of respondents

Demographic information of respondents		Frequency	Percentage %
Gender	male	101	72
	female	39	28

	<b>total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100</b>
Age	20-25 years	5	3.5
	26-30 years	60	42.8
	30-35 years	45	32
	above 35 years	30	21.7
	<b>total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100</b>
Service years	0-3 years	20	14
	4-7 years	55	39
	8-15 years	35	25.3
	above 15 years	30	21.7
	<b>total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100</b>
Educational background	Diploma in teaching	----	-----
	BA degree in teaching with PGDT	125	89
	MA degree	15	11
	Above MA degree	---	----
	<b>Total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100%</b>

As shown in table 1, the total number of respondents (teachers) participated in this study is 140 out of which 101(72%) are male and 39(28%) are female. Regard to their age 20-25 years were 3(3.5%), 26-30 years were 60(42.8%), 30-35 years were 45(32%) and above 35 years were 30(21.7%). When we look at their service year, 20(14%) respondents have experience of 0-3 years, 55(39%) have 4 to 7 years, 35(25.3%) have 8 to 15 years and the rest 30(21.7%) more than 15 years of experience. When we look at their educational background, 125(89%) of the respondents are BA degree holders, 15(11%) of the respondents are MA degree holders. Based on data analyzed and obtained from the above table, the majority of the respondents are male and majority of their age group is under 26-30 years and more than 80% of the respondents are BA degree holders. Next to this based on the collected data the leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction was analyzed and discussed as follow.

## 4.2 Leadership Styles and Teachers' Job Satisfaction

The collected data were analyzed by using different statistical techniques such as, Mean, Standard deviation, Pearson correlation coefficient and regression analysis. As sample of the study were consisted on 140 secondary school teachers. Hence, statistical analysis of data was conducted on

140 secondary school teachers. To identify the leadership styles of principals in secondary schools as perceived by teachers, number of teachers for each leadership style mean and standard deviation are also calculated.

### 4.3 Teachers’ perceptions about their Principals’ Leadership Styles

Table 2: Mean and Standard deviation of Teachers’ perceptions falling in different Leadership Styles

Leadership style	N	mean	SD
Democratic/transformational	92	3.50	.399
transactional leadership	18	2.46	.556
Laissez faire	30	2.58	.435

Table 2 reflects the frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation of teachers’ perceptions falling in different leadership styles. On the basis of their perceptions, 18 teachers (M=2.46, SD=.556) agreed that their principals are practicing transactional leadership styles in their schools. On the other hand, 92 teachers (M= 3.50, SD=.399) agreed that their principals are practicing democratic/transformational leadership style in their schools, whereas 30 teachers (M=2.58, SD=.435) agreed that their principals are practicing laissez faire leadership style. Mean values among these three leadership styles also shows that democratic/transformational leadership style (M=3.50, SD=.399) is the most practiced style. So, the perceptions of teacher’s shows that democratic leadership style is the most practiced leadership style in secondary schools of Sheka zone, while autocratic style is less practiced.

### 4.4 Leadership Characteristics

Table 3: Leadership Characteristics

No	Leadership Characteristics	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Inspirational Motivation (TF)	3.74	1.06

2	Idealized Behavior (TF)	3.69	1.02
3	Idealized Attributes (TF)	3.25	1.24
4	Intellectual Stimulation (TF)	2.92	1.13
5	Individual Consideration (TF)	2.88	1.21
6	Management-by-Exception (active) (TA)	3.08	.93
7	Contingent Reward (TA)	3.02	1.14
8	Management-by-Exception (passive) (TA)	2.60	1.06

Falling under the I leadership style, inspirational motivation (M=3.74, SD 1.06) and idealized behavior (M=3.69, SD 1.01) were reported as being the highest contributing leadership characteristics of this leadership style. Idealized attributes (M=3.25, SD 1.24) and intellectual stimulation (M=2.92, SD 1.13) scored below the average mean for this leadership style, signifying that these characteristics had less impact as perceived by participants. Individualized consideration (M=2.88, SD 1.21) was perceived as having the lowest contributing score.

Analysis of the leadership characteristics showed much lower scores on average. It was determined that management-by-exception (active) (M=3.08, SD.93) was the highest contributing characteristic of transactional leadership. Next was contingent reward (M=3.02, SD 1.14) and management-by-exception (passive) (M=2.60, SD 1.05). Laissez-faire (M=2.39, SD 1.10) had the lowest represented scores of the transactional leadership style.

Whilst these results would indicate that participants perceived their leaders as being more democratic/transformational than other leadership styles in their leadership style, neither style of leadership was more prominent than the other. This was the result of overlapping scores across the leadership styles: for example, some transactional leadership characteristics, such as management-by-exception (active) (M=3.07, SD 0.93) and contingent reward (M=3.02, SD 1.13) scored greater means than transformational leadership characteristics, such as intellectual stimulation (M=2.9, SD 1.13) and individualized consideration (M=2.88, SD 1.20). These results suggest a greater deviation and variance of scores across the transformational style of leadership and thus explain why the standard deviation for transformation leadership (SD 1.03) is more than double that of transactional leadership (SD .49).

#### 4.5 Teachers' Job Satisfaction Results

Statistical tools were used to analyze to determine how participants rated their perceived levels of job satisfaction. Pearson Chi-Squares were calculated to determine whether patterns emerged between perceived job satisfaction and categorical variables such as leadership styles or a participant's teaching position. Additionally, t-tests for independent means and standard deviation scores were calculated to determine if there was a correlation between perceptions of job satisfaction and continuous variables such as supervision, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, advancement and recognition.

The analysis demonstrates the mean and standard deviation scores for job satisfaction as perceived by participants. Using 3.00 as a cut-off point on a Likert-scale of 1-5 (strongly disagree to strongly agree), participants were asked to indicate how satisfied they were in their jobs. The job satisfaction scores were determined by combining a series of satisfaction measures from the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester & Bishop, 1997).

**Table 4: Teachers' Job Satisfaction**

Category	Mean	standard deviation
Teachers' job satisfaction	3.46	.62

Shown in Table 4 is a mean score of 3.46, which suggests that participants scored above the 3.00 cut-off score and were, on average, satisfied in their teaching jobs ( $M=3.46$ ,  $SD 0.62$ ). This score ( $M=3.46$ ,  $SD 0.62$ ) was then used in SPSS to further analyses the various measures of job satisfaction as perceived by participants.

Table 5: Teacher's job Satisfaction measures

Job Satisfaction Measures	Mean	standard deviation
Responsibility	4.36	0.41
Colleagues	3.57	0.79
Work itself	3.59	0.50
Work conditions	3.34	0.54
Supervision	3.18	1.13

Recognition	2.93	0.58
Advancements	2.85	1.07

It was determined that responsibility (M=4.36, SD 0.41) was the highest contributing factor of job satisfaction. Next, colleagues (M=3.57, SD 0.79) and the work itself (M=3.59, SD 0.50) were also strong contributors to one's satisfaction, whilst working conditions (M=3.34, SD 0.54) scored moderately.

It was suggested that supervision (M=3.18, SD 1.13), recognition (M=2.93, SD 0.58) and advancements (M=2.85, SD 1.07) had lower contributing scores of job satisfaction. In summary, these results indicate that responsibility, colleagues and the work itself have a high influence on teachers' job satisfaction. Measures such as advancement, recognition and supervision, on the other hand, influenced lower levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

#### 4.6 Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction Combined

For research question three, "What is the relationship between school principals' leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction? Findings from Leadership styles Questionnaire and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire were combined and analyzed. Chi-Square testing was used to examine the overall relationship between perceived leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. Correlations and multiple regressions using a standard enter procedure were then used to analyse a breakdown of the seven job-satisfaction measures against the nine leadership factors.

**Table 6: Pearson Chi-Square testing of TJSQ (35-item)**

Leadership Styles	Teacher's Job Satisfaction (item-35)		
	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total
Democratic/Transformational	80	14	94
Transactional	18	12	30
Laisser-faire	6	10	16



Total	104	36	140
Pearson Chi-Square	Value:76.761 df:1 sig(2-sided):.000		

The results show a highly significant association between teacher job satisfaction and leadership style  $\chi^2(1) = 76.76, p < 0.001$ . This represents the fact that based on the odds ratio; the odds of a teacher being satisfied were 26.12 times higher if they were led by a transformational leader than if they were led by a transactional leader.

Having determined that transformational styles of leadership were significantly related to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction  $\chi^2(1) = 76.76, p < 0.001$  and transactional leadership styles significantly related to lower levels of teacher job satisfaction, a breakdown of each of the leadership characteristics and job satisfaction variables was conducted to identify where strengths and weaknesses occurred between the two sets of variables.

#### 4.7 Pearson Correlations for LSQ and TJSQ Variables

Presented in Table 7 below, Pearson correlation coefficients were determined for all of the individual leadership characteristics and job satisfaction variables. Drawing from the work of Jacob Cohen (1988), the correlations below have been interpreted using his scale of magnitudes. The interpretation of this scale is that anything greater than 0.5 is large/high, 0.5-0.3 is moderate/medium, 0.3-0.1 is small/low, and anything smaller than 0.1 is classified insubstantial, trivial or otherwise not worth reporting (Cohen, 1988).

Table 7: Pearson Correlations for LSQ and TJSQ Variables

Components of Leadership Styles									
Teachers satisfaction	Idealized Attributed	Idealized behavior	Inspirational Motivational	Intellectual stimulation	Individualized Consideration	Contingent reward	Management Be active	Management Be passive	Laissez-faire
Supervision	.84**	.73**	.73**	.84**	.85**	.82**	-.38**	-.67**	-.74*
Colleagues	.53**	.52**	.44**	.48**	.45**	.45**	-.28**	-.37**	-.48*

Work conditions	.58**	.57**	.53**	.53**	.56**	-.56**	-.19**	-.43**	-.48*
Responsibility	.22**	.26**	-.31**	.25**	.22**	-.22**	-.07**	-.26**	-.29*
Work itself	.53**	.56**	.53**	-.58**	.54**	.54**	-.30**	-.38**	-.47*
Advancement	.55**	.54**	.48**	.59**	.57**	.57**	-.25**	-.46**	-.50*
Recognition	.54**	.46**	.46**	.51**	.52**	.52**	-.22**	-.35**	-.46*
Job satisfaction	.74**	.70**	.66**	.74**	.77**	.72**	-.33**	-.57**	-.66*

\*\* p < 0.01 level \* p < 0.05 level (2-tailed).

## Supervision

As can be seen in Table 7, significant relationships can be found between supervision and all leadership characteristics. High correlations such as these could be a result of the underlying characteristics of supervision dealing primarily with school leadership, leadership support and the leader's general relationships with staff. It can be expected that supportive, inspirational, encouraging and authentic leadership behaviors would be positively related to greater satisfaction with supervision, and vice-versa. The following paragraphs analyses the data in greater detail.

In particular, high correlations were found between supervision and individualized consideration ( $r=0.85$ ), idealized attributes ( $r=0.84$ ) and intellectual stimulation ( $r=0.84$ ). These correlations are logical because leadership characteristics such as these are consistent with the positive aspects of supervisory behavior and the supervision of others. It is reasonable to consider, therefore, that these variables would have a high positive relationship with job satisfaction, and vice-versa.

Supervision also correlated very highly with contingent reward ( $r=0.82$ ); however, contingent reward behaviors are predominantly consistent with transactional styles of leadership. These findings, therefore, would indicate that leadership styles traverse; they are interrelated, and different styles of leadership behaviors overlap. In relation to research question three, which presumed a negative association between job satisfaction and styles of leadership, these results suggest that where policies, compliance and managerial expectations are required, leaders need to adopt a combination of styles to get the job completed successfully. In light of the occasional need for intervention, all leaders must be prepared to address unprofessional conduct and poor performance among teaching staff if standards are to be maintained and the interest of learners protected. Therefore, to meet such requirements a transformational leader may need to

display transactional characteristics. These results show that when styles of leadership are used in the correct context, increased levels of job satisfaction can occur under this style of leadership.

Supervision had a very high negative correlation with laissez-faire leadership ( $r=-0.74$ ). Laissez-faire leadership falls under a transactional style of leadership and is consistent with avoidance of urgent matters, issues, decision making and being absent when needed. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider that higher levels of laissez-faire leadership would be related to lower levels of satisfaction with supervision. These behaviors offer support to research question 3, which presumed a negative association between job satisfaction and transactional styles of leadership.

## **Colleagues**

A high correlation was found between colleagues and idealized attributes ( $r=0.53$ ) and individualized consideration ( $r=0.53$ ). These relationships are logical because both variables may be interpreted in terms of collegial support. It makes sense that, in an environment where collegiality is fostered and leaders go beyond self-interest for the good of others, this type of leadership would be relative to higher levels of job satisfaction in terms of collegiality. Colleagues correlated moderately with contingent reward ( $r= 0.45$ ) despite contingent reward falling under the transactional style of leadership.

This suggests that when principals provide colleagues with assistance in exchange for their efforts, when they make expectations clear and express satisfaction when expectations are met, levels of satisfaction are increased. A moderate negative correlation was found between colleagues and laissez-faire ( $r=-0.48$ ). This indicates that when a leader is consistently absent, response to urgent matters is delayed and staffs are not involved in decision-making processes, collegiality breaks down. The negative associations between collegiate relationship and transactional styles of leadership offer support to hypothesis 3, which presumed levels of job

satisfaction, would be decreased when led by transactional styles of leadership.

### **Working Conditions**

Working conditions had a high correlation with leadership characteristics such as idealized attributed ( $r=0.58$ ), idealized behavior ( $r=0.57$ ) and contingent reward ( $r=0.56$ ). In support of hypothesis 3, the working conditions factor of job satisfaction is increased when these transformational styles of leadership are being implemented. In particular, when the working conditions involve a collective sense of mission amongst staff, principals aspire to meet the needs of their employees and define their policies clearly, then transformations are taking place and working conditions are improved. Laissez-faire ( $r= -0.48$ ), management-by-exception (passive) ( $r= -0.43$ ) and management-by-exception (active) ( $r= 0.19$ ) characteristics of transactional leadership on the other hand reported having negative correlations with the working conditions factor of job satisfaction.

### **Responsibility**

The only leadership characteristic to be correlated even moderately with responsibility was inspirational motivation ( $r=0.31$ ). Inspirational motivation relates to leaders expressing a sense of empowerment and confidence in their staff, articulating a compelling vision of the future and expressing what needs to be accomplished. Responsibility refers to the extent to which staff members felt responsible for planning and shaping their own work. It makes sense, therefore, that a low correlation across the leadership characteristics was found in relation to this variable, given its autonomy. When staff felt as though responsibility for their own work was lacking, levels of satisfaction and motivation were decreased.

### **Work Itself**

The Work itself factor of job satisfaction had significantly high correlations with intellectual stimulation ( $r=0.58$ ), intellectual consideration ( $r=0.58$ ) and idealized behavior ( $r=0.56$ ). It is understood that when a leader promotes a collective sense of mission, staff participation is encouraged and they spend time to develop a person's strengths, it could be expected that the

person's levels of job satisfaction would be raised. These results provided support for research question 3, as it is plausible that higher satisfaction with the work itself is related to higher levels of support from one's leader. Significant negative correlations with work itself were consistent with laissez-faire ( $r=-0.47$ ), management-by-exception (passive) ( $r=-0.38$ ) and management-by-exception (active) ( $r=-0.30$ ). Reflective of the above results, when these elements are present, a negative response to one's job satisfaction is fostered.

### **Advancement**

Advancement was significantly related to intellectual consideration ( $r=0.64$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $r=0.59$ ), and idealized attributed ( $r=0.55$ ). These results show that when a leader is supportive of promotion and provides colleagues with opportunities to advance, levels of job satisfaction are raised, and vice-versa. Apart from contingent reward ( $r=0.57$ ), all other transactional characteristics of leadership showed significant negative relationships with job satisfaction in terms of one's advancement.

These results suggest that principals who display laissez-faire ( $r=-0.50$ ), management-by-exception (passive) ( $r=-0.38$ ) and management-by-exception (active) leadership characteristics are not supportive of workplace advancement, and as a result medium-to-high negative associations with job satisfaction concerning this factor become evident.

### **Recognition**

High-to-moderate correlations were found between recognition and transformational leadership characteristics. Of particular interest, individualized consideration ( $r=0.55$ ), idealized attributed ( $r=0.54$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $r=0.51$ ) and contingent reward ( $r=0.52$ ) all had high significant positive relationships with recognition. These scores tell us that participants perceive recognition as an important factor of job satisfaction, and that leader who display individualized consideration and idealized attributed characteristics are the best facilitators of this factor. Participants indicated that leaders who displayed leadership characteristics such as laissez-faire ( $r=-0.46$ ), management-by-exception (passive) ( $r=-0.35$ ) and management-by-exception (active) ( $r=-0.22$ ) were ineffective in providing recognition where due, which resulted in significantly moderate negative correlations in terms of job satisfaction.

## 4.8 Discussion

Understanding the effect of working conditions on the teachers' day-to-day professional activities will have the power to provide precise, explicit, and measurable goals to work toward (Chang, et al., 2010:1). In addition, as countries (such as Ethiopia) experience educational reforms which may influence the teachers' satisfaction, it is imperative to explore the views of the teachers on their working conditions, and the impact of these conditions on their job satisfaction. The teachers' job satisfaction has implications for the quality education they provide. This information could assist education leaders, program implementers and significant others to make evidence-based decisions about how best to design the school working environment and maximize positive outcomes for children, teachers and relevant others.

The results revealed that participants (n=140) rated their leaders as being more democratic transformational (M=3.30, SD 1.03) in their leadership style than transactional (M=2.78, SD 0.49). A breakdown of leadership characteristics determined the weighting of behaviors in terms of transformational and transactional characteristics. Participants perceived their leaders as being more transformational in their leadership style in terms of inspirational motivation (M = 3.74, SD 1.06), idealized behavior (M=3.69, SD 1.01) and idealized attributes (M =3.25, SD 1.24). These findings support the literature, whereby transformational leaders are said to be visionary and authentic, and use transforming methods of leadership to change and improve organizations (Yukl, 2009).

As found in the current study, they do promote inspirational motivation, idealized behaviors and idealized attributes (Bass, 1990). Participants perceived their leaders as being less transactional particularly in terms of characteristics such as management-by-exception (passive) (M=2.60, SD 1.05), and laissez-faire (M=2.39, SD 1.10). These findings indicate that the implementation of negative forms of leadership is less utilized.

Interestingly, it was also revealed that the leadership characteristics pertaining to intellectual stimulation (M=2.92, SD 1.13) and individualized consideration (M=2.88, SD 1.21) were

considerably low. While these characteristics are pivotal to the transformational or democratic style of leadership, teachers suggested that transactional styles of leadership, including management-by-exception (active) ( $M= 3.08$ ,  $SD=0.93$ ) and contingent reward ( $M=3.02$ ,  $SD 1.14$ ) were more prominent.

It was clear from these results, therefore, that leadership styles traverse, and that no leader is entirely either transformational or transactional. These results support the works of Bass (1985), who contended that transformational and transactional leadership are distinct processes, but neither is mutually exclusive. He suggests that transformational leadership complements the effects of transactional leadership.

As discussed earlier in relation to the Great Man Theory, while theoretically dissimilar, both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors are highly important and valuable for a diverse range of needs. This implies that successful leadership in educational settings and other organizations occurs when these behaviors can be demonstrated in various strengths by the same leader depending on the situation, task, or the group's needs.

The findings for the descriptive results signified the majority of participants ( $n= 140$ ) rated their leaders as being more transformational ( $M=3.29$ ,  $SD=1.02$ ) than transactional ( $M=2.78$ ,  $SD=0.49$ ) in their leadership style. Thus, this research question was supported. This research question supports the original implication that the leadership being practiced by principals in independent primary schools would be predominantly transformational, where the emphasis of maintaining quality education and ensuring educational excellence was a priority. This could also provide insight into reasons for the nation-wide increase in student enrolments across the independent school sector. Finally, it could be implied leadership autonomy allows principals greater control over matters that establish successful learning communities.

The mean and standard deviation scores for the overall perceived teacher job satisfaction ( $M=3.46$ ,  $SD=0.62$ ) suggest the majority of participants, had scores of greater than 3.0, implying that more than two-thirds of participants in the study were satisfied in their jobs.

A breakdown of the job satisfaction factors (not relating to leadership style) suggested that responsibility ( $M=4.36$ ,  $SD 0.41$ ), colleagues ( $M= 3.57$ ,  $SD 0.79$ ), the work itself ( $M=3.59$ ,  $SD 0.50$ ) and work conditions ( $M = 3.34$ ,  $SD 0.54$ ) were the main contributors to higher job satisfaction, as these factors all scored above the average mean score. Supervision ( $M=3.18$ ,  $SD 1.13$ ), recognition ( $M = 2.93$ ,  $SD 0.58$ ) and advancements ( $M =2.85$ ,  $SD 1.07$ ) on the other hand,

had lower contributing scores of job satisfaction and thus contributed to job dissatisfaction. These results indicate that participants found responsibility, colleagues and the work itself influenced higher levels of job satisfaction. On the other hand, variables such as advancement, recognition and supervision were contributors to job dissatisfaction.

Participants considered that opportunities for advancement were limited, delegation was high, recognition for a job well done was minimal and supervision at times was considered authoritarian or dictatorial. Participants expressed feeling 'belittled' and undervalued', all of which are high contributing factors to low job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Johnson, 2003; De Nobile & McCormick, 2006). Other factors of job satisfaction pertaining to working conditions, the work itself and responsibility were featured less in the qualitative section and were, comparatively, representative of the quantitative findings.

There was a significant association between the style of leadership and teachers' job satisfaction  $\chi^2(1) = 76.76, p < 0.001$ . This represents the fact that based on the odds ratio, the odds of a teacher being satisfied was 26.12 times higher if they were led by a democratic or transformational leader than if they were led by a transactional leader. This result supports hypothesis 3, which predicted a positive association between democratic or transformational leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction.

Further testing was carried out to determine if there were any similarities and differences between the 1-item score and the 35-item score. Firstly, a breakdown of participants who perceived themselves as being satisfied or dissatisfied in their jobs was carried out. It was indicated that close to half (72%) the participants ( $n = 101$ ) perceived themselves as being satisfied in their jobs.

Finally, these results represented a significant positive relationship in the Teacher Job Satisfaction (1-item) mean scores and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (35-item) mean scores ( $r = 0.475, p < 0.001$ ). These results offer greater confidence that the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (35-item) is reliable and the results indicated by participants are accurate.

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for all of the individual Leadership Style



(LSQ) and Teacher Job Satisfaction (TJSQ) 35-item variables. Results indicated that all job satisfaction variables had positive correlations with transformational styles of leadership, and negative correlations with transactional styles of leadership. Contingent reward, however, was the only characteristic from the transactional leadership styles that scored all positive correlations with the job satisfaction variables.

The literature discusses contingent reward as a constructive form of transactional leadership whereby a leader clarifies expectations and offers recognition when goals are achieved (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Contingent positive reinforcement could be as simple as a leader's praise. Praise could be given when individuals complete a task on time, ahead of time, or when working at a good pace towards completion. Contingent negative reinforcement could involve handing out punishments for underperformance, such as suspensions when goals or tasks take longer than expected or are not met at all.

A breakdown of leadership styles and job satisfaction variables indicated that supervision (TJSQ) had very strong correlations across all the leadership variables, ranging from positive correlations with individualized consideration ( $r=0.85$ ) to negative correlations with laissez-faire ( $r=-0.74$ ) variables. On average, advancement ( $r=0.56$ ), work itself ( $r=0.55$ ) and working conditions ( $r=0.55$ ) scored high positive correlations with transformational styles of leadership, whilst responsibility ( $r=0.25$ ) had lower positive correlations with transformational styles of leadership.

Advancement ( $r=-0.40$ ), work itself ( $r=-0.38$ ) and colleagues ( $r=0.38$ ) scored high negative correlations with transactional styles of leadership, and responsibility ( $r=-0.21$ ) again scored lower negative correlations with transformational styles of leadership. This result could be owing to the fact that responsibility in one's job in many cases may not have a direct association with a principal's style of leadership.

Management-by-exception (active) and laissez-faire variables have the highest negative associations with job satisfaction. Consistent with the correlation analysis, these results are reflective of transactional leadership styles pertaining to lower levels of satisfaction, or job dissatisfaction.

Chi-Square results indicated that satisfaction in one's job:  $\chi^2(1) = 76.76$ ,  $p < 0.001$  was 26.12

times higher when led by a principal using a transformational style of leadership. Pearson correlation coefficients indicated that the main transformational leadership characteristic contributing to job satisfaction with a significantly positive relationship was individualized consideration, ( $r=0.77$ ), thus strongly supporting research question 3. Laissez-faire( $r=-0.66$ ), a transactional style of leadership, on the other hand, was strongly negatively related, thus again supporting hypothesis 3.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations**

This chapter discusses the summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations for further study.

#### **5.1 Summary**

This section provides a summary of the findings as presented in chapter 4 and discusses conclusions that can be drawn from these findings. The findings and conclusions are organized with reference to each research question and its related hypotheses. The quantitative results revealed that participants ( $n=140$ ) rated their leaders as being more transformational ( $M=3.30$ ,  $SD 1.03$ ) in their leadership style than transactional ( $M=2.78$ ,  $SD 0.49$ ).

A breakdown of leadership characteristics determined the weighting of behaviors in terms of transformational and transactional characteristics. Participants perceived their leaders as being more transformational in their leadership style in terms of inspirational motivation ( $M = 3.74$ ,  $SD 1.06$ ), idealized behavior ( $M=3.69$ ,  $SD 1.01$ ) and idealized attributes ( $M = 3.25$ ,  $SD 1.24$ ). These findings support the literature, whereby transformational leaders are said to be visionary and authentic, and use transforming methods of leadership to change and improve organizations (Yukl, 2009).

As found in the current study, they do promote inspirational motivation, idealized behaviors and idealized attributes (Bass, 1990). Participants perceived their leaders as being less style of transactional particularly in terms of characteristics such as management-by-exception (passive) ( $M=2.60$ ,  $SD 1.05$ ), and laissez-faire ( $M=2.39$ ,  $SD 1.10$ ).

Interestingly, it was also revealed that the leadership characteristics pertaining to intellectual stimulation ( $M=2.92$ ,  $SD 1.13$ ) and individualized consideration ( $M=2.88$ ,  $SD 1.21$ ) were considerably low. While these characteristics are pivotal to the transformational or democratic style of leadership, teachers suggested that transactional styles of leadership, including management-by-exception (active) ( $M= 3.08$ ,  $SD=0.93$ ) and contingent reward ( $M=3.02$ ,  $SD 1.14$ ) were more prominent.

It was clear from these results, therefore, that leadership styles traverse, and that no leader is entirely either transformational or transactional. These results support the works of Bass (1985), who contended that transformational and transactional leadership are distinct processes, but neither is mutually exclusive. He suggests that transformational leadership complements the effects of transactional leadership.

As discussed earlier in relation to the Great Man Theory, while theoretically dissimilar, both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors are highly important and valuable for a diverse range of needs. This implies that successful leadership in educational settings and other organizations occurs when these behaviors can be demonstrated in various strengths by the same leader depending on the situation, task, or the group's needs.

The findings for the descriptive results signified the majority of participants ( $n= 140$ ) rated their leaders as being more transformational ( $M=3.29$ ,  $SD=1.02$ ) than transactional ( $M=2.78$ ,  $SD=0.49$ ) in their leadership style. Thus, this research question was supported.

A breakdown of the job satisfaction factors (not relating to leadership style) suggested that responsibility ( $M=4.36$ ,  $SD 0.41$ ), colleagues ( $M= 3.57$ ,  $SD 0.79$ ), the work itself ( $M=3.59$ ,  $SD 0.50$ ) and work conditions ( $M = 3.34$ ,  $SD 0.54$ ) were the main contributors to higher job satisfaction, as these factors all scored above the average mean score. Supervision ( $M=3.18$ ,  $SD 1.13$ ), recognition ( $M = 2.93$ ,  $SD 0.58$ ) and advancements ( $M =2.85$ ,  $SD 1.07$ ) on the other hand,

had lower contributing scores of job satisfaction and thus contributed to job dissatisfaction. These results indicate that participants found responsibility; colleagues and the work itself influenced higher levels of job satisfaction. On the other hand, variables such as advancement, recognition and supervision were contributors to job dissatisfaction.

There was a significant association between the style of leadership and teachers' job satisfaction  $\chi^2(1) = 76.76, p < 0.001$ . This represents the fact that based on the odds ratio, the odds of a teacher being satisfied was 26.12 times higher if they were led by a democratic or transformational leader than if they were led by a transactional leader. This result supports hypothesis 3, which predicted a positive association between democratic or transformational leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction.

Further testing was carried out to determine if there were any similarities and differences between the 1-item score and the 35-item score. Firstly, a breakdown of participants who perceived themselves as being satisfied or dissatisfied in their jobs was carried out. It was indicated that close to half (72%) the participants ( $n = 101$ ) perceived themselves as being satisfied in their jobs.

Finally, these results represented a significant positive relationship in the Teacher Job Satisfaction (1-item) mean scores and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (35-item) mean scores ( $r = 0.475, p < 0.001$ ). These results offer greater confidence that the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (35-item) is reliable and the results indicated by participants are accurate.

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for all of the individual Leadership Style (LSQ) and Teacher Job Satisfaction (TJSQ) 35-item variables. Results indicated that all job satisfaction variables had positive correlations with transformational styles of leadership, and negative correlations with transactional styles of leadership. Contingent reward, however, was the only characteristic from the transactional leadership styles that scored all positive correlations with the job satisfaction variables.

The literature discusses contingent reward as a constructive form of transactional leadership

whereby a leader clarifies expectations and offers recognition when goals are achieved (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Contingent positive reinforcement could be as simple as a leader's praise. Praise could be given when individuals complete a task on time, ahead of time, or when working at a good pace towards completion.

A breakdown of leadership styles and job satisfaction variables indicated that supervision (TJSQ) had very strong correlations across all the leadership variables, ranging from positive correlations with individualized consideration ( $r=0.85$ ) to negative correlations with laissez-faire ( $r=-0.74$ ) variables. On average, advancement ( $r=0.56$ ), work itself ( $r=0.55$ ) and working conditions ( $r=0.55$ ) scored high positive correlations with transformational styles of leadership, whilst responsibility ( $r=0.25$ ) had lower positive correlations with transformational styles of leadership.

Advancement ( $r=-0.40$ ), work itself ( $r=-0.38$ ) and colleagues ( $r=0.38$ ) scored high negative correlations with transactional styles of leadership, and responsibility ( $r=-0.21$ ) again scored lower negative correlations with transformational styles of leadership. This result could be owing to the fact that responsibility in one's job in many cases may not have a direct association with a principal's style of leadership.

Management-by-exception (active) and laissez-faire variables have the highest negative associations with job satisfaction. Consistent with the correlation analysis, these results are reflective of transactional leadership styles pertaining to lower levels of satisfaction, or job dissatisfaction.

## **5.2 Conclusion**

The current study determined the relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by secondary school teachers in Sheka zone. An extensive review of the literature suggested that democratic/transformational and transactional leadership styles may be related to job satisfaction, therefore, the focus of this study was to examine whether or not relationships existed between principals' leadership styles and primary school teachers, as perceived by teachers themselves.

Teachers perceived their principals as both transformational ( $M = 3.29$ ) and transactional ( $M = 2.28$ ) in their practice of leading their schools. They also rated their job satisfaction most of them shows mean value above 3.00 This shows that school principals in Sheka zone government secondary schools practiced transformational leadership moderately. That means they were not engaged in motivating, inspiring to share vision, establish trust among their staff, provide personalized attention to teachers and support them to the highest expected. Regarding the relationship between principal transformational leadership and teachers' job satisfaction strong correlation was observed ( $r=.74$ ). This indicates a positive increase in principals' practice of these leadership styles which leads to substantial increase in teachers' job satisfaction. Furthermore, the analysis between transformational leadership and teachers' job satisfaction

showed that most of the variance in teachers' job satisfaction was explained by the principals' transformational leadership. This finding has implication for the principals in directing their attention on leadership practices towards increasing their teacher's job satisfaction. On top of that, it was found that from the dimensions of transformational leadership, idealized behavior" and „individualized consideration" dimensions were the most predictors of teachers' job satisfaction. One dimension of transactional leadership, contingent reward, also predicted teachers' job satisfaction. Thus, it can be concluded that when principals use both transformational and transactional leadership styles together, it will have important impact on teachers' job satisfaction.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study the following were the recommendations.

1. The study recommends that the principals should actively improve leadership style and give feedback on inquires on a timely basis and improve on job appraisal practices to be competitive and fair in order to enhance teachers' job satisfaction.
2. The in service training should be given the school principals to improve and reform leadership because majority of the principals practice autocratic and democratic leadership style is at infant stage.
3. The school leadership should listen and take suggestions from the teachers and promote the school goal, mission and vision together.
4. The school leadership should effectively evaluate and supervise the teaching learning materials and environment.
5. The school leadership should work together with Woreda and Zonal education experts to build recreational place and tea room in the school for the teachers.
6. The school leadership should work together with teachers, students and PTA to improve the working conditions of teachers in order to enhance teachers' job satisfaction.

7. Regard to the work relationship with in the school among stakeholders is too poor. Therefore, school principals, teachers and other bodies such as PTA, Kebele education training members should improve their working relationship.
8. School leadership should be supported and used by all principals in their administrative responsibilities rather than autocratic or laissez faire style. This was evident in the findings of this study that democratic leadership style as being significantly related with teachers' job satisfaction in secondary schools. In this regard, principals of secondary school teacher should continue to use the democratic leadership style by delegating authority to staff in order to facilitate or enhance better job satisfaction among teachers in their schools.
9. In general, there is need for school administration to come up with modalities of improving job satisfaction so that teachers' job satisfaction can be enhanced. Principals should also enhance their supervisory support to enhance teachers' job satisfaction.

## **References**

- Achua, R. (2001). This complex thing, leadership, in police leadership in the twenty first century. Winchester: Waterside press
- Ajuoga, M.A. (2000). Impact of instructional materials on the job satisfaction of selected schools in Kisumu District in Kenya. An unpublished master's dissertation, Makerere University: Kampala.
- Bass B., and Riggio, R.E. (2009). Transformational leadership (2nded) Mahwah, Nj Lawrence Ev/baum.
- Bass, B.M & Yammarino, F.J. (2009). Adding to contingent reward behavior. The augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. Group and organizational studies, vol.15.Pp 381-394.
- Bush & Oduro, (2006). New principals in Africa: Preparation, induction and practice. Journal of educational administration, 44 (4), 359-375.
- Charlton, G. (2000). Human habit of highly effective organizations. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.



- Chen, K. J. & Chen, S. I. (2008). Personal traits and leadership styles of Taiwan's higher educational institution in innovative operations. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge* vol. 12, No 2, pp 145-150.
- Choon, K.L. (2001). Gender differences in leadership styles and job satisfaction perceptions of principals and teachers. Malaysia: International Islamic University.
- Ciulla, J.B. (2004). Leadership and the problems of bogus empowerment in ethics, the heart of leadership. Edited by Praeger. Page 59-82.
- Cole, G. (2002). *Organizational behavior; theory and practice*. p. 143 UK: TJ International, Pads tow, Cornwall.
- Dinham, S. & Scott, C. (2006). Teacher satisfaction, motivation and health: phase one of the Teacher 2000 Project. paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York. NY.
- Dinham, S. & Scott, C. (2008). An international comparative study of teacher satisfaction, motivation and health: Australia, England and New Zealand. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Diego, C.A.
- Hallinger, P. & Leithwood, J. (2004). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals: elementary school journal, 86 (2), 217-247.
- Herzberg, F, Mausner, B and Snyderman, BB (1959). *The motivation to work* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2000). *The effects of different source of leadership on student engagement in school*. New York, N.Y. Falmer, London, Groom Helm.
- Maicibi, N.A. (2005). Pertinent issues in employee's management. M Kampals P.K. Graphics (4) Ltd. Management training manual 2006. Guidelines to enhance the governance and management of schools in Uganda Kampala: Ministry of Education and Sports.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). "A Theory of Human Motivation." *Psychological Review* 50(4): 370-396.
- McCormick, E.J. & Ilgen, D. (2005). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. London, Unwin Hyman.
- McCormick, J. (2007). "How to be a successful principal." *The Australian Educational Leader*(17): 47-48.

- Modley, F & Lurochelle, D.R. (1995). Transformational leadership and job satisfaction. *Nursing Management* 26 (a), 64-68.
- Mosedegh Rad, A.N. & Yarmohammadian, M.H. (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. *Leadership in health services*, vol 19. No. 2 pp xi-xxviii.
- Mugenda, K., (2003). *Research methods; Quantitative and qualitative approach*. Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Mumo, D.K. (2000). *Job satisfaction of tutors in technical training institutes in Nairobi province*. M.ED Thesis Kenyatta University.
- Mutie, E.K. (2003). *Facet and overall satisfaction of secondary school administration and teachers in Kitui County Kenya*. Unpublished Med Thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon Canada.
- Mwangi, W.J. (2013). *Leadership effectiveness of headteachers and how it affect the performance of secondary schools in Gatanga Division, Thika County*. Unpublished MEd. Kenyatta University.
- Ngalyuka, J.M. (2005). *An investigation of job satisfaction of the mathematics and science teachers in secondary schools in Muranga County* Unpublished Thesis Kenyatta University
- Norwthouse, P.G. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice (3rd ed)* California: Sage publication, Inc.
- Oyetunyi, C.O. (2006). *The relationship between leadership styles and school climate: Botswana secondary schools*. Unpublished PhD. Thesis University of South Africa.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (2002). *Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Leadership*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Sherman, W., Beaty, D., Crum, K., et al. (2010). "Unwritten: young women faculty in educational leadership." *Journal of Educational Administration*. 48(6): 741-754.
- Silins, H.C. (2004). "Leadership characteristics and school improvement." *Australian Journal of Education* 38: 266-281.
- Simic, I. (2008). "Transformational Leadership - The key to successful management of transformational organizational changes." *Economic and Organization* 1(6): 49-55.

- Singh, K. & Billingsley, B.S. (2006). "Intent to stay in teaching: teachers of students with emotional disorders versus other special educators." *Remedial and Special Education* 17(1): 37-47.
- Singh, K. & Billingsley, B.S. (2006). "Professional Support and Its Effects on Teachers' Commitment." *The Journal of Educational Research* 91(4): 229-239.
- Spector, P.E. (2000). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Research and Practice*. New York, John Wiley & Sons.
- Spector, P.E. (2008). *Industrial and Organizational Behavior*. Hoboken, NJ, Wiley.
- Starnaman, S.M. & Miller, K.I. (1992). "A Test of a Causal Model of Communication and Burnout in the Teaching Profession." *Communication Education* 41(1): 40-55.
- Stefkovich, J.A. & Begley, P.T. (2007). "Ethical School Leadership: Defining the Best Interests of Students." *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 35(2).
- Tucker, M.L. (2011). "Higher education leadership: transformational leadership as a predictor of satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 52(3): 773A.
- Weiner, B. (2002). *Human Motivation: Metaphors, Theories and Research*. Newbury Park, CA, Sage Publications.
- Weiss, H.M. (2002). "Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences." *Human Resource Management Review* 12(2): 173-194.
- Winfrey, D. (2009). *How teachers perceive their job satisfaction is influenced by their principals' behaviors and attitudes related to race and gender*. An Arbor, MI, ProQuest.
- Wofford, J.C. (2011). "The Motivational Bases of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance." *Personal Psychology* 24(501-518).
- Yammering, F. & Bass, B.M. (1990). "Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis." *Human Relations* 43(10): 975-995.
- Yukl, G. (2009). "An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories." *Leadership Quarterly* 10(2): 285-305.
- Yukl, G. (2009). *Leadership in Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

## **Appendix A**

Jimma University

College of Education and Behavioral Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaires to be filled by Teachers

Dear respondents! I am undertaking a research on the ‘assessment of relationship between Principals’ Leadership Styles and Teachers Job Satisfaction in government Secondary Schools of Sheka zone. The success of this study will highly depend on the quality of your response and I hope you will give accurate and honest responses to the items presented. Your response will be kept confidential and used only for this academic purpose. I would like to express my heartfelt thanks and appreciation for your time and sincere cooperation to fill this questionnaire.

**Thank you in advance!**

**General direction**

- ✓ No need of writing your name
- ✓ No need of writing unconcerned issues
- ✓ Please circle your choice from the given alternatives which suit your background information

**Part 1: Demographic Information of the respondents'**

1. Gender: A/ male B/ female
2. Age: A/ 20-25 years B/ 26-30 years C/ 30-35 years D/ 36-40 years E/ above 40 years
3. Service year in your professional area:  
A/ 0-3 years B/ 4-7 years C/ 8-13 years D/ 14-17 years E/ above 18 years
4. Educational background:  
A/ Diploma in teaching B/ BA degree in teaching with PGDT C/ MA degree D/ above MA degree  
If any other specify .....

**Part 2: Leadership Styles Questionnaire (MSQ)**

Please indicate by putting a tick  $\surd$  in appropriate column to which the following statements will apply to your leadership behavior in your school. Use the following rating scales for your answer.

Key) 1, strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) Undecided 4) agree 5) strongly agree

No	The principal I am rating: -	1	2	3	4	5
1	Provide me with assistance in exchange for my efforts					
2	Fails to interfere until problems become serious					
3	Avoid getting involved when important issues arise					
4	Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs					
5	Talks optimistically about the future					

6	Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems					
7	Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets					
8	Waits for things to go wrong before taking action					
9	Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose					
10	Spends time in supervision and coaching					
11	Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved					
12	Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group					
13	Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group					
14	solicits suggestions from teachers before making decisions about a school plan					
15	discusses his/her plans on co-curricular activities with students before introducing them					
16	understand teachers' viewpoints though holding divergent view point with them					
17	Patient and encourages staff to frankly and express fully view points					

18	Genuinely shares information with staff members and encourages staff members to openly express their feelings					
19	Imposes decisions against the will of the teachers					
20	Does not accept suggestions that will alter his/her decisions					
21	Does not encourage teachers and other bodies to act creatively or think for themselves					
22	Allows little or no input from the school members					
23	Does not show any concern for the day-to-day activities of the school					
24	Does not supervise what teachers do in class or in the staffroom					

25	Less concerned about group performance towards attainment of school goals					
26	Governs the teacher and other bodies through non-intervention in what they are doing					
27	Has no belief in self and others attaining quality performance towards attainment of school goals					
28	Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes and failures					
29	Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decision					
30	Display a sense of power and confidence					
31	Keep tracks of all mistakes					
32	Delay responding to urgent questions					
33	Emphasizes the importance of having the collective sense of missions					
34	Increase my willingness to try harder					
35	Is effective in meeting organization requirements					

### **Part 3: Questionnaires on the Principal leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire**

Please indicate by putting a tick  $\surd$  in appropriate column to which the following Statements. Using the scale shown below, rate your level of satisfaction with the following aspects of your job.

Key 1) strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) Undecided 4) agree 5) strongly agree

No	Level of your principal's and job satisfaction: -	1	2	3	4	5
1	My work provides me with an opportunity to advance professionally					

2	My work provides me with an opportunity to use a variety of skills					
3	The principal turns one teacher against another					
4	No one tells me that I am good at my job					
5	My work consists of routine activities					
6	I am not getting a head in my present teaching position					
7	Working condition of this school can be improved					
8	I receive recognition from the principals					
9	I do not have the freedom to make my own decision					
10	I get along with my colleagues					
11	The administration in my school doesn't clearly define its policies					
12	The principal gives assistance when I need help					
13	Working conditions in my schools are comfortable					
14	My work provides an opportunity to help students learn					
15	I like the people with whom I work					
16	My work provides limited opportunity for advancement					
17	The principal does not back me up					
18	My work is interesting					
19	My work discourages originality					
20	My work does not provide me the chance to develop new methods					
21	The principal treats everyone equally					
22	My colleagues stimulate me to do better work					
23	Am provided with opportunities for promotion					
24	Am responsible for planning my work each day					
25	The physical surroundings in my school area are unpleasant					
26	My colleagues provide me with suggestions or feedback about my teaching					
27	My work encourages me to be creative/imaginative					



28	The principal is not willing to listen suggestions					
29	I receive too many meaningless instructions from the principal					
30	my principal makes available the resources I need to do my best					
31	I have made lasting friendships among my colleagues					
32	The principal makes me feel uncomfortable					
33	I try to be aware of the policies of my school					
34	The principal explains what is expected of me					
35	The principal praises good work by staff					

How do you feel about the administrative support at your school?-----

-----

How do you experience the recognition you get from education leaders?-----

-----

-----

How do you experience the leadership practices at your school?

-----

-----

-----

Thank You for your cooperation!

**Appendix B**

Jimma University

College of Education and Behavioral Science

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Jimma University School of Graduate Studies

Interview to be replied by school Principals

Dear interviewer! I am undertaking a research on the ‘assessment of relationship between Principals’ Leadership Styles and Teachers Job Satisfaction in government Secondary Schools of Sheka zone. The success of this study will highly depend on the quality of your response and I hope you will give accurate and honest responses to the items presented. Your response will be kept confidential and used only for this academic purpose. I would like to express my heartfelt thanks and appreciation for your time and sincere cooperation to reply this interview.

1. How do you perceive your leadership styles?
2. Please briefly describe the factors in your school environment that give your teachers the most satisfaction?
3. Please briefly describe the factors in your school environment that dissatisfies your teachers the most?
4. How do you feel about the different responsibilities you have at school to encourage teachers?
5. How do you describe your relationship with your school teachers and other bodies?
6. What are the strategies you and others are using to tackle factors affect teachers’ job satisfaction?