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Abstract

This article assumes that a school principal is the most important figure in every school. It also assumes that principal style of leadership is significant factor affecting teachers’ happiness at school and their job satisfaction. Based on these assumptions, the article examines the impact of principal leadership style on teachers’ happiness and through this variable on their self-efficacy. The study examines the influence of each of the three major leadership styles: transformational, rewarding and avoiding on teachers’ happiness. Teachers’ happiness is measured through the commitment of a teacher to the school objectives, where commitment is measured through his/her compliance with the school goals, identification with the school staff and internalization of the school values. Finally, self efficacy is measured through the degree of success in realizing the school goals and missions. The findings of the study point to a positive impact of the transformational and to a less extent rewarding leadership styles on teachers’ happiness and self efficacy.

Keywords

Principal leadership style, Teachers’ Happiness at school, Job satisfaction, Self-efficacy

1. Introduction

This article analyzes the cause-effect relationship between principal leadership style (independent variable), teacher’s happiness at school (intervening variable), and self-efficacy of teachers (dependent variable). The leadership style of a school principal is highly significant factor for creating efficient schools and raising students’ educational accomplishments. The necessity of school reformation and the endeavors to make prolific teachers requires researchers to champion a profound comprehension of how principals should function inside a school system, in light of the fact that doing so is viewed as fundamental to the nature of educators’ work and students’ learning. Scholars in the field of education
however disagree over how to move toward the inquiry of principal leadership-style and its overall effect on teachers’ happiness and self-efficacy. This article asserts that a school principal plays a central role in every school and his/her leadership style is key to understanding teacher’s happiness and consequently self-efficacy.

The principal’s position had turned out to be progressively perplexing over the previous few decades. A decline of central guidelines and an expanded independence of schools had broadened the principal’s duties and at the same time increased the tasks and the executive duties that s/he needs to deal with. Despite the fact that the principal needs to make decisions in collaboration as a team with various consultative bodies, s/he is considered accountable for all of these choices, their executions and repercussions. A school principal today should function as a businessperson, an individual of vision, and one who is ready to stimulate, engage and spur his/her staff. In any case, ongoing reports on disappointment, heavy burden and overburden of school principals may show that a significant number of the present principals feel that they do not have the capabilities to satisfy the current guidelines that have been set, that they have such a large number of various assignments to finish their duties, and additionally that there is little help from the surrounding society and institutions wherein the school and it’s principal need to work. Such pressure from various sides on school principals precipitate their pace rate of burnout and consequently affect the degree of happiness among the school teachers, who are also subject to a similar stress and pressure from students, parents and society as a whole.

In this regard, few scholars have utilized quantitative methodology, while others have moved toward examining the link between these variables by utilizing field research, such as interviews. Quantitative methodologies evaluate school principals’ leadership styles and provide correlations that open one course to comprehend the impact of principals’ activities on teachers’ satisfaction, happiness and self-efficacy. Qualitative methodologies, however, that are usually based on interviews open a door for analysts to go beyond the numbers and better comprehend the characteristics and practices of principals who are valued, looked for, or despised by educators. Regularly, mixed research methodologies can shed more light on the subject and lead to a more noteworthy comprehension of it.

2. Analysis of the Variables

2.1 Principal Leadership Styles

There are some scholars who categorize principal leadership styles into bureaucratic, manager and educational leader. The bureaucratic leader manages the school in an ordinary and dull manner, without any specific or unique vision. First, the bureaucratic principal seek to comply with the rules, regulation and requirements of the education ministry and is preoccupied with paperwork. Second, the manager principal is preoccupied with financial affairs, managing the staff and teachers, setting the curriculum, and is sensitive to outcomes and the image of the school. And third is the educational principal who is concerned about the happiness of students and teachers and is ready to flip every stone to create an educational and inspiring environment at the school (Engels et al., 2008; Bush, 2003).
Other scholars identify the styles of transformational, rewarding and avoiding (Griffith, 2004; Hallinger, 2003). The style of transformational leadership has stimulated extraordinary enthusiasm among scholars. For some, an efficient manager is one who is able to make cultural changes in communicating with teachers, and characterizes the transformational manager as an individual who is sensitive to the needs of his employees, activates their potentials to addresses the issues at stake. A transformational manager comprises of four segments including, Idealized Influence, Encouraging Incentive, Intellectual Encouragement, and individualized Thought. (a) Idealized Influence: It speaks to the solid vision and mission assurance of the transformational manager. Such a manager is a good role-model for the employees and his practices are glorified by them. (b) Encouraging incentive: Transformational manager defines main objectives, creates team cooperation, eagerness and always encourages and propels his/her employees to achieve them. A transformational manager produces unique and original thoughts and support business enterprise and initiate changes in the organization. (c) Intellectual encouragement: Transformational leader encourage his employees to be imaginative, investigative and innovative. Such a leader consistently energizes his/her employees to initiate new thoughts and to generate innovative answers to new or existing problems. (d) Individualized Thought: Transformational managers, see the potential of teamwork, think about the wants and needs of the employees, and help them to be effective and prosperous. In this unique situation, a transformational manager has an exceptional enthusiasm of every employee, considering each particular needs and interests. Transformational leader is thought as a basic approach as far as school organizational advancement in education is considered. Transformational principal enhances educators’ scholarly improvement and instil eagerness for reforms. Transformational principal can make a positive hierarchical atmosphere, realize objectives more effectively and increment the degrees of teachers’ happiness.

Rewarding principals, however, recognize essentially assignments of the teachers, build up the educational framework, and highlight plans for forthcoming work. Teachers are compensated or rebuffed to accomplish the school’s objectives. Characteristics of rewarding principals include: (a) Contingent prize: The essential point of transactional principal is to accomplish school targets. In this unique situation, the principal gives different incentives to improve the improve productivity of his/her teachers. His/her teachers can get the reward only when each of them performs the principal’s instructions. (b) Management – By-Exception: It is implemented in two different ways, involved or uninvolved. If the principal is involved, s/he rights the errors of the teachers by following their work. In case that the principal is uninvolved, s/he holds up until the development of errors by the teachers. Based on this management style, the principal pursues execution as issues emerge, then they raise instructions to address them.

Furthermore, one study asserts that rewarding and transformational leadership styles by a principal are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but the connection between the two leadership styles is one of mutually reinforcing each other. In this manner, a considerable bundle of the administrative qualities of the rewarding style must be available before transformational traits can even develop. These studies
present the four transformational factors mentioned above: Idealized Influence, Encouraging Incentive, Intellectual Encouragement, and individualized Thought. These factors loan themselves to examining school managerial related-styles and to teachers’ reports of transformational management characteristics.

Finally is the avoiding management style. Bass (1990) characterizes avoiding style as a methodology where there is no leadership, and no connection between the managers (principal) and his employees (teachers). Such a principal does not deal with necessities and advancements of his/her subordinates and wishes to keep things fixed. The principal rejects obligations, postpones choices, does not give input, and employs no pressure to address the issues concerning his/her employees. In this atmosphere, there is a negative connection between the happiness, fulfillment, execution and inspiration of teachers and the avoiding principal.

It has always been validated in our era of post-modernism and globalization that the ability of school principals in creating and changing the education system and to realize the school’s objectives is firmly identified with the nature of the school’s human capital, that is teachers. The teacher in school should be happy and be valued. Teachers in this sense, do not merely convey knowledge to students, or instill social moral values in them, but teachers constitute a role model for students and their main task is to inspire students to think for themselves and to forge their own opinion and perspective of the world. in the era of post-modernism, where there are multiplicity of opinions and without hierarchy among the world cultures, the role of the teacher turns into analyzing and discussing the complexity of the issues at stake with students and leaving the latter to shape their own opinion and perspective. Such skills require the shaping of a new prototype of a teacher and principal. Meeting these goals requires the principal to bestow more autonomy on teachers.

At the personal level, teachers’ happiness and satisfaction would permit individuals to contribute to the school in a positive manner and simultaneously feel fulfilled by the organization. An organization where workers are happy, high productivity and the organization’s ends are accomplished. The school effectiveness is conceivable on the base of teacher’s activity of fulfillment and their readiness to act as per the school’s goals. The degree of teachers’ happiness may influence their physical and emotional wellbeing at the workplace and productivity. Guaranteeing happiness of the teachers at school is one of the most significant undertakings of the school principal. The individual who can produce innovative arrangements inside the school, decide on the strategies of the foundation and make fundamental enhancements in the guidelines is the principal. Transformational principals enhance the degree of happiness of the teachers by creating shared vision and spurring their motivation.

A teacher who has an elevated level of happiness and responsibility is expected to satisfy the objectives of the school. Studies on ways of dealing with school management and school functions show that principal has an extraordinary duty in raising the commitment of teachers to their school. Three measurements are needed in order to maintain such commitment:

Compliance is the fundamental phase of commitment. A teacher should be expected for reward or
penalty in order to comply with the school obligations. Second is identification of the teacher with the school should develop a feeling of being valued by the school principal. In identification, people acknowledge the impacts of others on the pace of self-articulation and the chance to keep up connection with others. The third phase of commitment is internalization. It alludes to the shared agreement of the individual and school qualities. The teacher acknowledges the school’s qualities and standards as his/her own, without compulsion.

Maslowski defines the school culture as “the basic assumptions, norms and values, and cultural artefacts that are shared by school members, which influence their functioning at school” (Maslowski, 2001). The degree of teachers’ commitment and their job performance are the identifiable characteristics of schools that are a function of the degree of its healthy organisational and the teachers’ happiness. Several studies point to a crucial influence of school principals on school culture, and through school culture on teachers’ happiness that affect teachers’ commitment and performance (Engels et al., 2008).

Engels at al. define five elements of school culture that are directly related to the principal and his/her leadership style. These elements include: objective orientedness: the degree to which the school goals are obviously detailed by the principal and shared by the teaches and all staff members; participative decision making: the degree to which educators excluded or take part in making decisions at the school; Openness: the degree to which educators are open towards inserting and incorporating changes in the system; Leadership: the degree to which educators see the principal as supporting and engages in creating a teamwork; collaboration among instructors: the degree of formal and casual collaboration among the teachers.

A transformational leader is able to influence educators’ conduct and motivation by inspiring them and by being a role model. Yet, in recent years, the leadership style of rewarding also started to gains some significance, as complementary to the transformational style. At any case, there is no straightforward formula for effective school principal leadership. Certainly, personality traits, environmental and other components influence a principal’s position and practices.

2.2 Teachers’ Happiness at School

The positive side of happiness at work incorporates work satisfaction and enthusiasm about one’s occupation/job. Work satisfaction can be characterized as work fulfilment and a response to a vocation that emerges from an individual’s examination of existing results with those that are wanted, envisioned or merited (Salas-Vallina et al., 2018). As per Lawler’s feature satisfaction approach, in general work satisfaction is an accumulation of sentiments of fulfillment on an assortment of aspects, such as the amount of tasks, working conditions, proficient connections, income, and status and so forth (Wanous & Lawler, 1972; Engels et al., 2008). Occupation eagerness goes past that. It is characterized as a positive satisfying, business-related state of mind that is portrayed by power, commitment and retention.

Throughout the past, the theme of happiness at work has not been much investigated. More research
concentrated on unhappiness that includes sadness, tension, stress, and passionate disorder, depression and anxiety. In recent years, the examinations of subjective wellbeing has been on the rise, where subjective wellbeing is utilized as an equivalent word for happiness (Januwarsono, 2015). Contrasted and workers who are unhappy, happy workers are all the more ready to help coworkers and clients, have better productivity, have the option to accomplish a greater amount of the work independently, has a high reliability to the workplace (Gyeltshen & Beri, 2018). When a worker feels unhappy in one thing at the workplace, s/he does not simply feels decline in that specific zone, but regularly gets depressed in general. S/he becomes persuaded that one of the impasse of way is proof that every single other way may likewise be an impasse. At that point, this defenselessness began to permeate all regions of their working lives, and frequently saturates their own lives, and wild. The final product of this pessimism is a declining their performance at work. The following question is whether happy workers who carry out their responsibility positively affect the overall productivity of the organization? One study shows that happy workers yielded higher productivity at work. Likewise, they demonstrated that a happy worker is increasingly delicate to the open positions in the work environment, and is progressively open and help colleagues, and progressively hopeful and self-confident.

By all means, personality is a prominent determinant of happiness as opposed to income, connections, working conditions, entertainment, religion, or other outside factors. Different scholars have researched the relationship of personality characteristics with happiness and came out with reliable conclusions. The characters of extraversion has been over and again seen as the most grounded indicator of the degree of happiness. Different researchers noticed that extrovert people are also happy. The constructive outcomes of happiness were effectively to associate and cooperating with others. The point of this study is to investigate the determinants of happiness and whether teachers’ happiness is impacted by the leadership style of the principal at school.

Happiness at school in this sense means the circumstance at school when the teacher is happy teaching, effective and accomplish the defined objectives of the school. Happiness in this sense is shaped by one’s perspective than by outside conditions. Happiness at work is the condition when somebody reacts to and appreciate what he does at work. Happy workers are more happy with their occupations than workers who dislike their job. A worker might be happy to confront the positive and negative conditions in his work. In the event that the worker is making the most of his activity he will figure out how to achieve the assignment much under the most requesting circumstances and testing. In the event that a worker is happy and appreciate the work, even the most troublesome circumstances can be taken care of easily.

At the school level, the viability of the endeavors to improve school functioning profoundly relies upon the leadership style of the principal, school culture, educator responsibility, and the development conduct of educators. Thus, in view of the findings of past researches, one study attempted, first, to locate the relationship between working environment happiness and the conduct of instructors innovativeness, and second, to show the impact of work environment happiness on the conduct of
instructors innovative ability (Abdullah et al., 2016). According to this study, there are five components that match with the work circumstance of educators at schools that include: the educator’s commitment, school atmosphere, educators mutual trust, educators’ involvement and their beliefs. Ordinary individuals erroneously tend to think that once we perform well at work, we will feel happy. When completing our work and performing it well, it fills us with happiness. Yet, one study has indicated that happiness starts things out and happiness ushers in the accomplishments at work (Tomer, 2011).

While the components of educators’ inclusion additionally clarifying that instructors can’t work with the full contribution at schools except if the educator feels happy at his/her work. Involvement clarifies the greater part of the ideas, practices, and inspirations that influence the general commitment of instructors to work in their school. At the point when educators are focused on and committed to their work, they will be clear about why they need to carry out a responsibility in full. Their relationship with the principal could be a crucial element for them to keep working until they accomplish the objectives of the school.

Another study has investigated about the relationship between the principals’ creative conduct and teachers’ happiness (Soleimani & Tebyanian, 2011). This study found a significant positive correlation between each of the four variables of creativity (entrepreneurship at school (initiating a new project), resilience, incentive, tolerate) and teachers’ happiness. Happy schools make pupils happy. Yet, making such a happy climate is nevertheless made feasible and possible by school principals’ personality, style of leadership, innovativeness. Inventive, adaptable, inspiring and enduring principals can give happy condition in schools to teachers and through teachers to students (Pryce-Jones, 2011). Giving happiness in school will prompt better inspirations among teachers and will impact their productivity. Teachers will pass their happiness to their students. The consequences of this examination uncover that there is a positive correlation between principals’ innovativeness and institutional happiness at 95 percent significance (Soleimani & Tebyanian, 2011).

To clarify the outcome of their research, the authors express that principals’ initiative conduct are the most significant elements influencing any indolence, laziness of teachers in school. The outcome of study show that the more conventional a school is, the less appealing school condition will be. School principals could achieve new thoughts and advancements so as to cross the unwanted limits and make schools more happier institution for both teachers and students. Innovative ideas and a transformational style of leadership will initially prompt breaking standards and customs and will concentrate on proactive initiatives.

2.3 Self-Efficacy of Teachers

Self-efficacy alludes to confidence in one’s abilities to activate inspiration, intellectual assets and strategies to fulfill given situational requirements. People with high self-efficacy are certain that they can adapt themselves to the mission at hand (Judge & Bono, 2001). Some studies affirm the positive connection between self-efficacy and employment satisfaction and happiness at work.
Since people with high self-efficacy are able to cope more successfully with challenges and to continue with their mission despite disappointments on the way, they are bound to accomplish esteemed results and accordingly get more satisfaction from their work. In short, outcomes of several studies show that self-efficacy has significant correlation with both job-satisfaction and accomplishment. In this study, the assumption is that self-efficacy is directly affected by happiness of the teacher at work, while happiness is affected among other things by the principal’s style of leadership.

2.4 Findings

According to Aydin et al. (2013), the link between transformational leadership and job satisfaction is 0.81. This points out that transformational leadership impacts job satisfaction positively at a high level. The correlation between rewarding style of leadership and job satisfaction is measured at 0.56. Thus, as transactional style of leadership of school principals rises, the teachers’ job satisfaction shores up too. Finally, the correlation of the avoiding style of leadership on job satisfaction is negative at 0.15. Transformational style of leadership becomes significant for the element of identification and internalization which show a deep commitment. School principals’ style of transformational leadership highly impact teachers more easily and direct them to realize the school goals. Further, according to some studies, some elements of rewarding leadership are needed as well as transformational style leadership for an effective school management.

3. Conclusion

The findings of this study leave no mistake about the dominant role played by school principals in affecting teachers’ happiness and their self-efficacy. It was found that the leadership styles of transformative and rewarding are not mutually exclusive and could be employed alternately. Second the transformative leadership style is more congruent with our era of globalization post-modernism, where in free movement of information across borders combined with the multiplicity of narratives, have altered the role of teachers. The role of teachers in not confined to conveying knowledge or instilling society’s values in the minds of students, but to expose students to the various narratives and allowing them to think for themselves. This new era requires school principals to provide a space for teaches to express their subjectivity and to allow students to fulfil themselves.
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