

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPALS' DECISION-MAKING STYLES AND TEACHERS' JOB SATISFACTION

Khin Htet Htet Htun¹, Su Su Thwin² and Nwe Thazin Hlaing³

Abstract

The main aim of this research is to study the relationship between principals' decision-making styles and teachers' job satisfaction. The specific aims of this research are to find out the decision-making style that the principals mostly use as perceived by principals and teachers, to investigate the levels of teachers' job satisfaction perceived by themselves, to investigate the variations of the levels of teachers' job satisfaction in terms of their personal factors, and to investigate the relationship between principals' decision-making styles and teachers' job satisfaction. Quantitative and qualitative methods were used in this study. In total, eight principals and 217 teachers from eight Basic Education High Schools in Bago Township, Bago Region were selected as subjects by using the purposive sampling method. The General Decision-making Style (GDMS) Questionnaire and Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) Questionnaire were used. The Cronbach's alpha (α) of the whole scales of decision-making styles was 0.74 and that of the whole scales of teachers' job satisfaction was 0.82. Descriptive statistics, One-Way ANOVA and Pearson correlation, using SPSS version 25 were used. Interviews were conducted with three principals and nine teachers. The results show that the principals mostly used rational decision-making style and the level of teachers' job satisfaction was moderately high. There was no significant difference in the perceived level of overall job satisfaction among the teachers grouped by age, rank, academic qualification, total years of service and years of service in current school. There were significant differences in the perceived level of overall job satisfaction among the teachers grouped by years with current principal. There were significant positive relationships between principals' decision-making styles (rational and dependent) and teachers' job satisfaction. But, there was a significant negative relationship between principals' spontaneous decision-making style and teachers' job satisfaction.

Keywords: principals' decision-making styles, teachers' job satisfaction

Introduction

The school is the basic production centre of educated manpower necessary for the development of the country. Since the school plays an important role in the building of a nation, the principal and teachers who are active participants in the running of the school are also important persons. The center of employee behavior and practice is job satisfaction. It is important for administrators to consider as many factors as possible that affect employee job satisfaction and efficiency. The decisions of principals can have positive or negative impacts on all components of a school. So, the decision-making styles (DMS) of principals are important. Principals can make decisions rationally or intuitively, or they can try to avoid them, however, their decisions ultimately affect teacher motivation and job satisfaction. This study is aimed at determining the relationship between principals' decision-making styles and teachers' job satisfaction.

¹ Senior Teacher, Basic Education High School, Thanatpin Township, Bago Region

² Dr, Professor, Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education

³ Dr, Assistant Lecturer, Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education

Significance of the Study

Education is essential for Myanmar to improve its human resources and to help increase economic growth. In order to enhance an education system, the quality of teachers and their job satisfaction need to be emphasized. Therefore, understanding the important factors affecting teacher job satisfaction is vital to attain the required information to support an education system in its objectives (Perie et al., 2006). However, education standards primarily depend on effective school principals. Teachers who work with principals who share information with them and involve them more in management decisions are more satisfied (Bogler, 2001). Satisfied teachers are more enthusiastic and interested in devoting more energy and time to their job (Nguni et al., 2006). This study makes a contribution in developing a deeper understanding of decision-making styles of principals leading to teacher job satisfaction.

Purposes of the Study

1. To find out the decision-making style that the principals mostly use as perceived by principals and teachers
2. To investigate the levels of teachers' job satisfaction perceived by themselves
3. To investigate the variations of the levels of teachers' job satisfaction in terms of their personal factors
4. To investigate the relationship between principals' decision-making styles and teachers' job satisfaction

Research Questions

1. What decision-making style do the principals mostly use as perceived by principals and teachers?
2. What are the levels of teachers' job satisfaction perceived by themselves?
3. What are the variations of the levels of teachers' job satisfaction in terms of their personal factors?
4. Is there any significant relationship between principals' decision-making styles and teachers' job satisfaction?

Theoretical Framework

In this study, principals' decision-making style includes five dimensions according to Scott and Bruce approach (1995). They are as follows:

- (i) **Rational decision-making style:** Rational decision makers use logical methods when gathering information, determining alternatives and evaluations, and acting on the chosen decision (Yildiz, 2012).
- (ii) **Intuitive decision-making style:** Intuitive decision makers take ideas and events together with their relations and interactions. On this situation, their productivity may be lost and trouble dealing with the system involved in the decision-making process may be found. (Yaslioglu, 2007).
- (iii) **Dependent decision-making style:** Dependent decision makers avoid taking responsibility and need a lot of social support (Girgin & Kocabiyik, 2003). The ideas of others are often required and trusted in place of their own.

- (iv) **Avoidant decision-making-style**: When a decision maker is at the point of deciding, he/she may postpone the task, or delegate the responsibility of making a choice to someone else. The individuals may display high stress levels if the risks are very high, and they need to make decisions under time pressure, (Colakkadioglu, 2013).
- (v) **Spontaneous decision-making style**: Impatient and indecisive people can avoid exploring alternatives, and they might settle on the most immediately pleasing choice rather than taking time to think through the process of decision-making in a logical way (Sardogan, Karahan, & Kaygusuz, 2006).

In this study, teachers' job satisfaction includes nine facets according to Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) by Spector, 1994. They are as follows:

- (i) **Pay** refers to the employees' remuneration and salary (Spector, 2007).
- (ii) **Promotion** refers to the advancement opportunities that exist within a profession (Spector, 2007).
- (iii) **Supervision** refers to the supervisor's ability to provide emotional and technical support and guidance with work-related tasks (Robbins et al., 2003).
- (iv) **Fringe Benefits** refer to the monetary and the non-monetary benefits existing within the employee's position (Spector, 2007).
- (v) **Contingent Rewards** refer to the recognition and the appreciation for the individual's well-done job (Spector, 2007).
- (vi) **Operational Conditions** refer to the governing rules, policies, procedures, and workload including the paperwork that affects employees' job satisfaction (Spector, 2007).
- (vii) **Coworkers** are people and colleagues an employee is working with (Spector, 2007).
- (viii) **Nature of Work** was defined by Spector as the related job tasks and to which degree of enthusiasm the employee enjoys performing these tasks (Spector, 2007).
- (ix) **Communication** is the sharing of information between two or more individuals or groups to reach a common understanding (Reily & Pondy, 1979).

Definition of Key Terms

- (1) **Decision** is a result of a complex social process generally extending over a considerable period of time (Simon, 1965).
- (2) **Decision-making** is a process of selecting the most suitable choice from among a set of rational alternatives to solve a problem (Aydin, 2010).
- (3) **Decision-making style** is a situation which includes the approach, reaction, and action of the individual who is about to make a decision (Phillips, Pazienza, & Ferrin, 1984).
- (4) **Job satisfaction** is a satisfactory or positive emotional state arising from a person's evaluation of their work, or work experience (Locke, 1976).

Operational Definitions

- (1) **Principal's decision-making style** is a principal's response pattern when he or she faces a decision-making situation. It is determined by the mean values of the principals' and teachers' responses to the items of decision-making styles (rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant and spontaneous) in the questionnaire. The decision-making style with the highest mean value is determined as the most prominent decision-making style.

- (2) **Teacher's job satisfaction** is a teacher's positive feeling with regard to his or her job. It is measured by nine dimensions such as pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operational conditions, coworkers, nature of work and communication. It is determined by the mean values of teachers' responses to job satisfaction items in the questionnaire. The higher the mean values of the responses, the higher the levels of teachers' job satisfaction.

Methodology

- (i) **Sample:** According to the purposive sampling method, eight principals and 217 teachers from eight Basic Education High Schools were selected as the sample because the target population in this study was high school principals and teachers with at least one year of experience in existing schools.
- (ii) **Instrumentation:** To enable data collection, the General Decision-making Style Questionnaire (GDMSQ) and the Job Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire (JSSQ) were used. The GDMSQ was developed by Scott and Bruce in 1995 and the JSSQ was developed by Spector in 1994. The GDMSQ was comprised of 25 items with five decision-making styles: rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous. Each style had five items. Each item was rated on five-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, and 5= strongly agree). The JSSQ was comprised of 36 items in nine facets: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operational conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. Each facet had four items. Each item was rated on four-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, and 4=strongly agree). To test the reliability of these questionnaires, the Cronbach's alpha was used. The internal consistency (α) of the GDMSQ was 0.74 and that of the JSSQ was 0.82.

Findings

For Research Question (1),

Table 1 Mean Values and Standard Deviations Showing Principals' Decision-making Styles Perceived by Principals and Teachers in Basic Education High Schools (N=225)

No.	Decision-making Style (DMS)	N	Mean	SD
1.	Rational	225	4.20	.40
2.	Intuitive	225	3.08	.84
3.	Dependent	225	3.77	.43
4.	Avoidant	225	2.24	.70
5.	Spontaneous	225	2.79	.60

As shown in Table 1, the mean value of rational decision-making style as perceived by principals and teachers was the highest (\bar{X} =4.20), followed by the mean value of dependent decision-making style (\bar{X} =3.77), intuitive decision-making style (\bar{X} =3.08), spontaneous decision-making style (\bar{X} =2.79), and avoidant decision-making style (\bar{X} =2.24). These values indicated that according to the perceptions of principals and teachers, the principals mostly used rational decision-making style.

For Research Question (2),

Table 2 Mean Values and Standard Deviations Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Basic Education High Schools (N=217)

No.	Variables	N	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	Pay	217	2.30	.41	Moderately Low
2.	Promotion	217	2.38	.46	Moderately Low
3.	Supervision	217	3.27	.46	High
4.	Fringe Benefits	217	2.40	.45	Moderately Low
5.	Contingent Rewards	217	2.64	.46	Moderately High
6.	Operational Conditions	217	2.41	.41	Moderately Low
7.	Coworkers	217	3.10	.41	Moderately High
8.	Nature of Work	217	3.15	.43	Moderately High
9.	Communication	217	2.92	.41	Moderately High
	Overall Job Satisfaction	217	2.73	.23	Moderately High

Scoring Direction: 1.00-1.75=Low 1.76-2.50=Moderately Low 2.51-3.25=Moderately High
3.26-4.00=High

As shown in Table 2, the overall mean value of teachers' job satisfaction was 2.73 that showed the level of teachers' job satisfaction was moderately high.

For Research Question (3),

Table 3 Mean Values and Standard Deviations Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Age (N=217)

Variables	Age	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall JS	20-29 years	2.73	.40	Moderately High
	30-39 years	2.78	.20	Moderately High
	40-49 years	2.73	.23	Moderately High
	50-59 years	2.71	.22	Moderately High

Scoring Direction: 1.00-1.75=Low 1.76-2.50=Moderately Low 2.51-3.25=Moderately High
3.26-4.00=High

As shown in Table 3, all four groups of teachers perceived as having moderately high level of satisfaction grouped by age.

Table 4 One-Way ANOVA Results Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Age

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Overall Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	.211	3	.070	1.337	ns
	Within Groups	11.179	213	.052		
	Total	11.390	216			

ns=not significant

As shown in Table 4, there was no significant difference in the perceived level of overall job satisfaction among the teachers grouped by age.

Table 5 Mean Values and Standard Deviations Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Rank (N=217)

Variable	Rank	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Job Satisfaction	PT	46	2.74	.22	Moderately High
	JT	101	2.73	.24	Moderately High
	ST	70	2.72	.23	Moderately High

Scoring Direction: 1.00-1.75=Low 1.76-2.50=Moderately Low 2.51-3.25=Moderately High 3.26-4.00=High

As shown in Table 5, all three groups of teachers perceived as having moderately high level of satisfaction grouped by rank.

Table 6 One-Way ANOVA Results Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Rank

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Promotion	Between Groups	1.599	2	.800	3.893	.022*
	Within Groups	43.957	214	.205		
	Total	45.556	216			
Supervision	Between Groups	2.818	2	1.409	7.002	.001**
	Within Groups	43.055	214	.201		
	Total	45.873	216			

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

As shown in Table 6, there were significant differences in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding promotion ($df=2$, $F=3.893$, $p < .05$) and supervision ($df=2$, $F=7.002$, $p < .01$) among the teachers grouped by rank.

Table 7 Tukey HSD Results Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Rank

Dependent Variable	(I) rank	(J) rank	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Promotion	PT	JT	.158	ns
		ST	-.022	ns
	JT	ST	-.180*	.030*
Supervision	PT	JT	-.073	ns
		ST	.186	ns
	JT	ST	.259*	.001**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, ns=not significant

As shown in Table 7, junior teachers group differed significantly from senior teachers group at $p < .05$ in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding promotion and at $p < .01$ in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding supervision among the teachers grouped by rank.

Table 8 Mean Values and Standard Deviations Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Academic Qualification (N=217)

Variable	Academic Qualification	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Job Satisfaction	BA or BSc or others	144	2.74	.22	Moderately High
	BEd	63	2.73	.26	Moderately High
	MA or MSc	4	2.59	.13	Moderately High
	MEd	6	2.70	.17	Moderately High

Scoring Direction: 1.00-1.75=Low 1.76-2.50=Moderately Low 2.51-3.25=Moderately High
 3.26-4.00=High

As shown in Table 8, all four groups of teachers perceived as having moderately high level of satisfaction grouped by academic qualification.

Table 9 One-Way ANOVA Results Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Academic Qualification

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Pay	Between Groups	1.299	3	.433	2.673	.048*
	Within Groups	34.502	213	.162		
	Total	35.801	216			
Supervision	Between Groups	2.884	3	.961	4.762	.003**
	Within Groups	42.989	213	.202		
	Total	45.873	216			

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

As shown in Table 9, there were significant differences in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding pay ($df=3$, $F=2.673$, $p < .05$) and supervision ($df=3$, $F=4.762$, $p < .01$) among the teachers grouped by academic qualification.

Table 10 Tukey HSD Results Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Academic Qualification

Dependent Variable	(I) Academic Qualification	(J) Academic Qualification	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Pay	BA or BSc or others	BEd	-.024	ns
		MA or MSc	.556*	.035*
		MEd	-.069	ns
	BEd	MA or MSc	.579*	.029*
		MEd	-.046	ns
	MA or MSc	MEd	-.625	ns
Supervision	BA or BSc or others	BEd	.238*	.003**
		MA or MSc	.224	ns
		MEd	.307	ns
	BEd	MA or MSc	-.014	ns
		MEd	.069	ns
	MA or Sc	MEd	.083	ns

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, ns=not significant

As shown in Table 10, "MA or MSc" degree holders group differed significantly at $p < .05$ from "BA or BSc or others" degree holders group and "BEd" degree holders group in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding pay. And, "BA or BSc or others" degree holders group differed significantly at $p < .01$ from "BEd" degree holders group in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding supervision among the teachers grouped by qualification.

Table 11 Mean Values and Standard Deviations Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Total Years of Service (N=217)

Variables	Total Years of Service	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Job Satisfaction	1-10 years	21	2.75	.35	Moderately High
	11-20 years	79	2.74	.20	Moderately High
	21-30 years	44	2.73	.24	Moderately High
	31-40 years	73	2.71	.21	Moderately High

Scoring Direction: 1.00-1.75=Low 1.76-2.50=Moderately Low 2.51-3.25=Moderately High
3.26-4.00=High

As shown in Table 11, all four groups of teachers perceived as having moderately high level of satisfaction grouped by total years of service.

Table 12 One-Way ANOVA Results Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Total Years of Service

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Overall Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	.050	3	.017	.310	ns
	Within Groups	11.340	213	.053		
	Total	11.390	216			

ns = not significant

As shown in Table 12, there was no significant difference in the perceived level of overall job satisfaction grouped by total years of service.

Table 13 Mean Values and Standard Deviations Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Years of Service in Current School (N=217)

Variables	Years of Service in Current School	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Job Satisfaction	below 10 years	2.73	.23	Moderately High
	10-19 years	2.71	.21	Moderately High
	20-29 years	2.78	.23	Moderately High
	above 29 years	2.69	.25	Moderately High

Scoring Direction: 1.00-1.75=Low 1.76-2.50=Moderately Low 2.51-3.25=Moderately High
3.26-4.00=High

As shown in Table 13, all four groups of teachers perceived as having moderately high level of satisfaction grouped by years of service in current school.

Table 14 One-Way ANOVA Results Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Years of Service in Current School

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Overall Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	.105	3	.035	.659	ns
	Within Groups	11.285	213	.053		
	Total	11.390	216			

ns=not significant

As shown in Table 14, there was no significant difference in the perceived level of overall job satisfaction among the teachers grouped by years of service in current school.

Table 15 Mean Values and Standard Deviations Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Years with Current Principal (N=217)

Variable	Years with Current Principal	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Job Satisfaction	1-2 years	145	2.75	.23	Moderately High
	3-4 years	45	2.74	.21	Moderately High
	5-6 years	27	2.62	.25	Moderately High

Scoring Direction: 1.00-1.75=Low 1.76-2.50=Moderately Low 2.51-3.25=Moderately High
3.26-4.00=High

As shown in Table 15, all three groups of teachers perceived as having moderately high level of satisfaction grouped by years with current principal.

Table 16 One-Way ANOVA Results Showing the Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction Grouped by Years with Current Principal

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Supervision	Between Groups	1.597	2	.798	3.859	.023*
	Within Groups	44.276	214	.207		
	Total	45.873	216			
Contingent Rewards	Between Groups	1.769	2	.885	4.238	.016*
	Within Groups	44.677	214	.209		
	Total	46.446	216			
Operational Conditions	Between Groups	1.710	2	.855	5.336	.005**
	Within Groups	34.288	214	.160		
	Total	35.998	216			
Overall Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	.384	2	.192	3.737	.025*
	Within Groups	11.005	214	.051		
	Total	11.390	216			

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

As shown in Table 16, the analysis was found to be statistically significant ($df=2$, $F=3.737$, $p<.05$) in the perceived level of overall job satisfaction. Specifically, there were significant differences in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding supervision ($df=2$,

$F=3.859$, $p<.05$), contingent rewards ($df=2$, $F=4.238$, $p<.05$) and operational conditions ($df=2$, $F=5.336$, $p<.01$) among the teachers grouped by years with current principal.

Table 17 Tukey HSD Results Showing the Level of Job Satisfaction of Teachers Grouped by Years with Current Principal

Dependent Variable	(I) Years with Current Principal	(J) Years with Current Principal	Mean Difference (I-J)	<i>p</i>
Contingent Rewards	1-2 years	3-4 years	.042	ns
		5-6 years	.279*	.011*
	3-4 years	5-6 years	.237	ns
Operational Conditions	1-2 years	3-4 years	-.023	ns
		5-6 years	.262*	.006**
	3-4 years	5-6 years	.285*	.011*
Overall Job Satisfaction	1-2 years	3-4 years	.00978	ns
		5-6 years	.12928*	.019*
	3-4 years	5-6 years	.11950	ns

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, ns=not significant

As shown in Table 17, there was significant difference among the group of teachers who had 1-2 years with current principal and the group of teachers who had 5-6 years with current principal at $p<.05$ in overall job satisfaction. Specifically, group of teachers who had 1-2 years with current principal differed significantly from group of teachers who had 5-6 years with current principal at $p<.05$ in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding contingent rewards and at $p<.01$ in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding operational conditions. Moreover, group of teachers who had 3-4 years with current principal differed significantly at $p<.05$ from group of teachers who had 5-6 years with current principal in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding operational conditions among the teachers grouped by years with current principal.

For Research Question (4),

Table 18 Pearson Correlation Matrix between Principals' Decision-making Styles and Teachers' Job Satisfaction

		Rational	Intuitive	Dependent	Avoidant	Spontaneous
Overall Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.264**	.066	.146*	-.085	-.144*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.330	.032	.210	.034

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$

As shown in Table 18, there was a significant positive relationship between principals' rational decision-making style and teachers' job satisfaction ($r=.264$, $p<.01$). There was also a significant positive relationship between principals' dependent decision-making style and teachers' job satisfaction ($r=.146$, $p<.05$). But, there was a significant negative relationship between principals' spontaneous decision-making style and teachers' job satisfaction ($r=-.144$, $p<.05$).

Responses to Open-ended Questions

There are three open-ended questions for principals and six open-ended questions for teachers. Principals' and teachers' responses to open-ended questions are summarized and briefly described.

The question (1) for principals and teachers is **"Whom does the principal allow to participate in making the school-related decisions?"** 100% of principals (n=8) responded that they allowed to participate teacher leaders in each grade, School Board of Trustees and School Disciplinary Committee in making the school-related decisions. 83% of teachers (n=181) answered that their principals allowed to participate teacher leaders in each grade, experienced teachers and the respective teachers in making the school-related decisions. The question (2) for principals and teachers is **"How does the principal make important decisions?"** 50% of principals (n=4) responded that they collected the right facts, observed the source of problem, and decided carefully to have very little mistakes, and then discussed with others. 86% of teachers (n=186) stated that their principals consulted with teacher leaders in each grade, School Board of Trustees and School Disciplinary Committee when they make important decisions. The question (3) for principals and teachers is **"How does the principal solve the school-related problems?"** 75% of principals (n=6) answered that they consulted with members of School Disciplinary Committee and then solved the problem. 73% of teachers (n=158) stated that their principals consulted with teacher leaders in each grade and School Disciplinary Committee and then solved the problem.

The question (4) for teachers is **"Which factors make you satisfied in your job?"** 52% of teachers (n=113) answered that they felt satisfied when they did the instructional tasks. 25% of teachers (n=56) stated that they felt satisfied when their students had unity, attended the school regularly, followed the disciplines, respected to the teachers, were hard-working and had willingness to learn. The question (5) for teachers is **"Which factors make you dissatisfied in your job?"** 81% of teachers (n=175) stated that they felt dissatisfied when their students were absent frequently, disobeyed the disciplines, paid no attention to the lessons, paid no respect to teachers, and fought with each other. 28% of teachers (n=61) answered that the non-instructional tasks like paperwork and the insufficient teaching period made them dissatisfied. The question (6) for teachers is **"How do you feel for working in this school?"** 83% of teachers (n=180) responded that they were happy and proud of being a teacher in this school and 8% of teachers (n=17) stated that they were unhappy.

Conclusion and Discussion

First of all, this study was conducted to find out what decision-making style the principals mostly use as perceived by principals and teachers. According to the perceptions of principals and teachers, the principals mostly used rational decision-making style. According to the principals' and teachers' interview responses, it can be concluded that 100% of principals (n=3) mostly used rational decision-making style and they rarely used avoidant decision-making style. This finding was in line with the finding of Dincer Olcum and Osman Titrek (2015) which revealed that administrators mostly use rational decision-making style and they rarely use avoidant decision-making style.

Secondly, the result of the levels of teachers' job satisfaction would be discussed. It was found that the level of overall job satisfaction of teachers was moderately high. According to teachers' interview results, it can be concluded that 78% of teachers (n=7) were not satisfied with their salary but 22% of teachers (n=2) were satisfied with their salary. Moreover, 100% of teachers (n=9) were satisfied with their principals' supervision because they treated equally, friendly and warmly to all staff. Additionally, 78% of teachers (n=7) had too much workload because of non-instructional tasks but 22% of teachers (n=2) did not feel sense of workload because they were familiar with their tasks. This study confirmed the finding of Hariri (2011) which revealed that the teachers reported the greatest satisfaction in coworkers, nature of work, supervision, and communication; while, they were least satisfied with pay, promotion, fringe benefits and operational conditions. It seemed that teachers were likely to demand higher pay, better promotion, much better welfare and operational conditions.

Thirdly, the variations of teachers' job satisfaction in terms of their personal factors would be discussed. It was found that there were significant differences in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding promotion and supervision among the teachers grouped by rank. Based on Tukey HSD test, junior teachers group differed significantly from senior teachers group in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding promotion and supervision. Therefore, it can be noticeable that a group of senior teachers was higher than that of junior teachers in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding promotion. It seemed that senior teachers were likely to have higher advancement. It can also be regarded that a group of junior teachers was higher than that of senior teachers in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding supervision. It seemed that academic qualifications of senior teachers were likely to be the same as those of their principals.

There were significant differences in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding pay and supervision among the teachers grouped by academic qualification. Based on Tukey HSD test, it can be regarded that "MA or MSc" degree holders group was lower than "BA or BSc or others" degree holders group and "BEd" degree holders group in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding pay. It seemed that teachers with higher academic qualifications were likely to have higher demands for improvement but they might not get what they expected. Moreover, it can be noted that "BA or BSc or others" degree holders group was higher than "BEd" degree holders group in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding supervision. It seemed that academic qualifications of "BEd" degree holders were likely to be the same as those of their principals and they were likely to criticize their principals' guidance. This finding was supported by Hariri (2011) finding which revealed that teachers with lower degrees appear to be more satisfied with their job than those with higher degrees.

All three groups of teachers had moderately high level of job satisfaction. The analysis was found to be statistically significant in overall job satisfaction. Specifically, there were significant differences in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding supervision, contingent rewards and operational conditions among the teachers grouped by years with current principal. Based on Tukey HSD test, it can be regarded that the group of teachers who had 1-2 years with current principal was higher than the group of teachers who had 5-6 years with current principal in the perceived level of overall job satisfaction. More specifically, the group of teachers who had 1-2 years with current principal was higher than the group of teachers who had 5-6 years with current principal in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding contingent rewards and operational conditions. And, the group of teachers who had 3-4 years with current principal was

also higher than the group of teachers who had 5-6 years with current principal in the perceived level of job satisfaction regarding operational conditions. It seemed that teachers with less years with their principal were likely to be given more recognition, appreciation and rewards by their principal for their well-done job. And, it seemed that teachers with more years with their principal were likely to be more familiar with their principal and be given more workload by their principal. This finding was not consistent with Hariri (2011) finding which revealed that teachers with more years with their principal tend to be more satisfied.

Finally, according to Pearson correlation, it was found that there were significant positive relationships between principals' decision-making styles (rational and dependent) and teachers' job satisfaction. There was a significant negative relationship between principals' spontaneous decision-making style and teachers' job satisfaction. This finding was supported by Dincer Olcum and Osman Titrek (2015) finding which revealed that job satisfaction was positively affected by rational decision-making style, intuitive decision-making style and dependent decision-making style while it was negatively affected by avoidant decision-making style and spontaneous decision-making style.

Recommendations

Based on the analyses of research findings, the following facts are recommended for enhancing teachers' job satisfaction and making right decisions.

- Principals should use much more rational decision-making style and dependent decision-making style and much less spontaneous decision-making style in order to enhance teachers' job satisfaction.
- Principals should use different decision-making styles that respond better to each situation in order to make right decisions.
- Principals should provide a safe and pleasant working condition and help teachers develop professionally in order to enhance teachers' job satisfaction.
- The government should concentrate on providing adequate salaries and better benefits for teachers in order to enhance teachers' job satisfaction.
- The government and principals should develop the governing rules, policies and procedures to be more flexible in order to enhance teachers' job satisfaction.
- The government and principals should concentrate on reducing teachers' workload and stress that are faced in their workplace in order to enhance teachers' job satisfaction.
- In principalship training programs, principals' problem-solving skills should be more emphasized for enhancing their capacity to solve the problems and to lead the school effectively.

Need for Further Research

This study was geographically limited to Bago Township, Bago Region. Thus, this research should be done in other townships, states, and regions. The principals and teachers were selected as participants from eight Basic Education High Schools. Thus, further studies should also be made in primary schools, middle schools, private schools, universities and other organizations. Moreover, further studies should be made by including variables such as gender, school position (rural, urban) and socio-economic status of teachers. Finally, further researchers are recommended to conduct field observation.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we would like to express our respectful thanks to Dr. Aye Aye Myint (Rector, Yangon University of Education), Dr. Pyone Pyone Aung (Pro-Rector, Yangon University of Education) and Dr. Kay Thwe Hlaing (Pro-Rector, Yangon University of Education)

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to Dr. Daw Htay Khin (Professor, Head of Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education) for her invaluable support and continuous encouragement for the completion of this study.

Further, we would acknowledge to the responsible persons from Basic Education High Schools who participated in this study.

References

- Aydin, M. (2010). *Education Management* (9th ed.). Ankara: Hatiboglu Printing.
- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational administration quarterly*, 37(5), 662-683.
- Colakkadioglu, O. (2013). The reliability and validity study of adolescent decision making questionnaire for the high school students. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 9(19), 387-403.
- Hariri, H. (2011). *Leadership styles, decision-making styles, and teacher job satisfaction: an Indonesian school context* (Doctoral dissertation, James Cook University). Retrieved July 12, 2018, from <http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/22095>
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, Publishers.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). *The nature and causes of job satisfaction* (M. D. Dunette, Ed.). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 17(2), 145-177.
- Olcum, D., & Titrek, O. (2015). The effect of school administrators' decision-making styles on teacher job satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1936-1946.
- Perie, M., & Baker, D. P. (1997). *Job Satisfaction among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation*. Statistical Analysis Report.
- Phillips, S. D., Pazienza, N. J., & Ferrin, H. H. (1984). Decision-making styles and problem-solving appraisal. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31(4), 497-502.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55(5), 818-831.
- Simon, H. A. (1965). Administrative decision making. *Public Administration Review*, 31-37.
- Spector, P. E. (1994a, 8 October 2001). Job satisfaction survey, JSS. Retrieved July 14, 2018, from <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jssovr.html>
- Spector, P. E. (1994b, 9 December 1999). Instructions for scoring the job satisfaction survey, JSS. Retrieved July 13, 2018, from <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jssscore.html>
- Spector, P. E. (1994c, 27 December 2007). Interpreting satisfaction scores with the job satisfaction survey. Retrieved July 12, 2018, from <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jssinterpretation.html>
- Spector, P. E., Allen, T. D., Poelmans, S. A., Lapierre, L. M., Cooper, C. L., MICHAEL, O. D., ... & Brough, P. (2007). Cross-national differences in relationships of work demands, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions with work-family conflict. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(4), 805-835.