# COLLOQUIA

**Nebojša Pavlovic**
*University of Kragujevac (Serbia)*

# Influence of organizational culture and leadership style of school principal on teachers' satisfaction

**Streszczenie**

WPŁYW KULTURY ORGANIZACYJNEJ I STYLU PRZYWÓDZTWA DYREKTORA SZKOŁY
NA SATYSFAKCJĘ ZAWODOWĄ NAUCZYCIELI

Zadowolenie z pracy staje się uzasadnionym celem organizacji w nowoczesnym społeczeń-stwie. Ze względu na specyfikę i znaczenie pracy szczególnie ważne jest, aby przewidzieć zawodową satysfakcję nauczycieli. Głównym celem tego tekstu było zbadanie wpływu kultury organizacyjnej szkoły i stylu przywództwa na przykładzie zawodowej satysfakcji nauczycieli. Badania przeprowadzono na próbie 109 nauczycieli z 11 szkół podstawowych i średnich w re-gionie Kragujevac w Serbii, zgodnie z zasadą wyboru losowego. Dane zebrano na podstawie ankiet. Jedno z badań przeprowadzono za pomocą ankiety dotyczącej kultury organizacyjnej „Survey on Organizational Culture" (Stephan Robbins) oraz z wykorzystaniem ankiety dotyczącej satysfakcji z pracy „Satisfaction Survey" (Paul Spector). W drugim badaniu użyto modelu sieci lidera Blake-Mouton do badania stylu przywództwa. Wyniki wykazały, że istnieje silna korelacja między kulturą organizacyjną a satysfakcją zawodową nauczycieli. Nie było bezpośredniego związku między stylem przywództwa a satysfakcją z pracy.

**Słowa kluczowe:** zadowolenie z pracy, kultura organizacyjna, styl przywództwa, nauczyciel.

Job satisfaction becomes the legitimate objective of organizations in modern society. Due to specifics and importance of a job, it is especially important to predict satisfaction of school teachers. The main objective of this study was to investigate the influence of organizational school culture and leadership style in the example of teachers' satisfaction. The research was conducted on a sample of 109 teachers from 11 primary and secondary school in Kragujevac

region in Serbia, using the principle of random selection. Data were collected using two surveys. One study investigated organizational culture using Survey on Organizational Culture by Stephan Robbins and job satisfaction using Job Satisfaction Survey by Paul Spector. The second survey used the model of leader network by Blake-Mouton for investigation of leadership style. Results show that there is a strong correlation between organizational culture and teachers' satisfaction with their job. There was no direct connection between leadership style and job satisfaction found. The work is limited to the influence of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction. In order to make more precise prediction of causes of teachers' satisfaction with their job, other independent variables should be investigated. These variables are also present at the school.

This research investigated connections between organizational culture and job satisfaction and between leadership style and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a very broad and complex phenomenon which includes constant investigation, since situations in organizations are very changeable. Also, job satisfaction can be defined as a positive feeling of a person regarding his/her work, which arises from the assessment of characteristics of that job. There is a belief that satisfied teachers will be more productive in their work than dissatisfied teachers. Over 11,000 researchers since 1973 have been explaining the importance of this topic and interest of researchers in the construction of job satisfaction.

Researchers investigated the effects of various factors on job satisfaction. There is no agreement among scholars about key factors which define a worker's satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Each organization has its "own" factors which affect job satisfaction. The same factors will have a different effect on job satisfaction in another organization. Those factors are mostly the basis of organizational culture, so it is important to make a first assessment of the impact of organizational culture on job satisfaction.

A leader is a person who runs the organization and defines its path. The importance of a leader directed the research on the possible correlation between leadership and job satisfaction. Investigation of both of these constructs should provide the possibility of a more precise prediction of job satisfaction.

Limitations in research are related to different situations in which satisfaction can be measured, since each organization is specific in its own way. There is no possibility to make generalizations, so there is no certainty in predicting workers' satisfaction if necessary conditions are provided. The organization can include employees who are satisfied and employees who are not satisfied with their job.

Since satisfaction is an attitude, it is hard to change it among employees. If someone is dissatisfied, he can be always dissatisfied. This problem could be partially mitigated by a prediction of job satisfaction through organizational culture. Although it is difficult, it is possible to change the organizational culture and, therefore, attitudes among people.

If this research can prove that organizational culture influences job satisfaction, then familiarity with organizational culture could lead to a prediction of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction among workers. Such knowledge could help leaders to make favourable changes in organizational culture in the right time.

## Literature review

### Job satisfaction

Developed societies should be concerned with production and material indicators of living and the quality of living. Researchers claim that the satisfaction is a legitimate objective of each organization (Judge et al. 2001).

Job satisfaction is an attitude rather than behaviour. Definition of job satisfaction had a visible evolution during the time, and people mostly believe that job satisfaction is related to a positive affective reaction (Vorrell 2004). Although there are misalignments, job satisfaction can be described as a positive feeling of a person about his/her job, which originates from assessment of characteristics of that job (Robins & Judge 2009).

Interest in job satisfaction started with the works of Fisher & Hanna (1931), which explain that job dissatisfaction is followed by emotional unconformity. Hoppock (1935) concluded that emotional conformity is clearly different in satisfied or dissatisfied workers. Veitz (1952) argued that workers have different answers although they are not satisfied with their job. Smith (1955) explained that dissatisfied workers are more subjected to monotony. Locke (1976) offered the most precise definition of job satisfaction. According to him, job satisfaction is a pleasant and positive emotional feeling which arises from the assessment of the job and the job experience.

According to these standard definitions, job satisfaction can be explained as an affective condition of conformity or hostility which arises when teacher evaluates his/her working role (Domovic 2004).

Consequences for an organization are visible when employees like or dislike their jobs. When they are satisfied, people do not want to leave the organization. Dissatisfied employees would like to leave (Judge et al. 2002). Also, dissatisfied workers can raise their voice against such situation. They passively observe the situation and do not let the situation get worse (Robbins & Judge 2009). Satisfaction can affect the job (Lee & Ahmad 2009) and work in the school (Filak & Sheldon 2003). However, there is no substantial acceptance among researchers and consultants that increased job satisfaction can result in better job performance. Greater job satisfaction can sometimes decrease job performance (McNamara 2005). Teachers claim that for them most satisfaction lies in teaching and working with students. It is also confirmed by research results which explain that job satisfaction is more related to intrinsic than extrinsic rewards (Domovic 2004).

### Organizational culture

People are surrounded by culture. Each organization has its own life, specifics, and it is easily recognizable regarding other organizations. Also, organizational culture is a central dimension and frame of organizational ambience. Organizational culture is a reliable mechanism for controlling behaviour by influencing our thinking and interpreting events (Schein 2010). The concept of organizational culture is considered a valuable tool for the understanding of fundamental meanings and characters of organizational life. Culture is manifested through norms, shared values and underlying tacit assumptions, which are developed at different abstraction levels (Hoy & Miskel 2013).

Defining organizational culture is not a simple task, and it includes numerous definitions. There is an assumption that the term 'organizational culture' is related to a system of meanings which is common to all members of the organization and which differentiates it from other organizations. The common condition for all definitions is that employees should understand the "know-how" principles (Deal & Kennedy 2000).

Organizational culture (OC) is described as a system of values and assumptions which direct the way of organizational business (Schneider & Reicher 1983). Organizational culture is the soul of the organization and purpose of its existence (Gutknecht & Miller 1990). Robbins and Coutler (2005) claimed that the culture is a system of common understanding and beliefs of organizational members which mostly defines actions of employees. Edgar Shine (2010) defined

organizational culture as a "resume of important conclusions which are discovered and developed by particular group while it was facing with problems of outer adaptation and interior integration, well formulated to be regarded as valuable for transferring it to new members of the organization as a good way of perception, thinking and feeling for same problems."

OC is related to the way how employees together perceive characteristics of an organization (Robbins & Coutler 2005). It is expected that individuals at different levels in the organization (school principal and teachers) have similar understanding of OC (Frost et al. 1991). OC, as a job satisfaction, is evaluated by investigating attitudes of employees (Robbins 1996).

## Organizational culture and job satisfaction

Hoppock (1935) claimed that OC affects job satisfaction. Goris (2006) argues that some elements of OC, especially communication, have a positive effect on employees' satisfaction. Bad culture will decrease employees' satisfaction and their efficiency and productivity (McHugh 1993). Jiang and Klein (2000) claim that employees support culture which enhances satisfaction of employees. Strong organizational culture has a positive effect on job satisfaction, according to Amos and Weathington (2008). Chang and Lee (2007) highlight the importance of culture for job satisfaction if different groups in an organization are dedicated to achieving the same OC.

## Leadership style

According to Northouse (2008), leadership is a process in which an individual provides effect to a group (followers) in order to achieve a common goal. Leaders and their followers are always analysed in the frame of mutual relationships.

In the case of leadership, a leader is focused on tasks while leadership is focused on relationships. Effective leadership is usually related to the way how a leader balances between these two behaviours (Blake & Mouton 1985).

Manager network which was used for research developed in the early 1960s and was modified several times (Blake & McCanse 1991; Blake & Mouton 1964, 1978, 1985). It was developed to explain how managers help organizations to fulfil their purpose using two factors: concern for tasks and concern for people. Concern for tasks is related to the way how a leader performs organizational tasks, while concern for people is related to the way how a leader treats

employees in the organization while they are trying to achieve its goals (Blake & Mouton 1985).

Manager network connects concern for tasks and concern for people into a model with two-intersecting axes. The horizontal axis is a leader's concern for tasks while the vertical axis is his/her concern for people. Each axis includes a scale with nine points, where one point is minimum, and nine points are maximum care. Connection between results from both axes can provide different leadership styles (Northouse 2008). According to Northouse, leaders' network can provide five main leadership styles: Authority-compliance management (9,1), Country club management (1,9), Impoverished management (1,1), Middle of the road management (5,5) and Team management (9,9).

*Authority-compliance management*. This leadership style includes strong emphasizing of tasks while the role of people is less highlighted. Communication with employees is not principally involved. This style is motivated by results while people are considered as a working tool. This leader likes to control, he/she is demanding, authoritative and energetic.

*Country club management*. This style includes lack of concern for tasks while there is a stronger concern for human relationships. It considers feelings of people relevant and provides fulfilment of personal and social needs of individuals. These leaders create a positive atmosphere; they are cooperative and ready to help and comfort.

*Impoverished management*. It includes the leader who does not care about tasks nor about human relationships. This leader is uninterested, undetected and without initiative.

*Middle of the road management*. Leaders of this style are ready for compromises. They are moderately interested in tasks and people. Also, they find balance in concern for people while still maintaining tasks. This leader mitigates misunderstandings and highlights middle solutions.

*Team management*. This kind of leader is concerned with tasks and people. High level of participation and teamwork are crucial. This leader encourages involvement, has excellent responses, clears out the priority, follows the situation. Also, this leader is open for cooperation, suggestions and enjoys his/her work (Northouse 2008).

There is no agreement as to which leadership style is the best. Some researchers suggest that managers with maximum concern for tasks and people are the most active (Blake & McCanse 1991). Other researchers prove that there is no complete connection between maximum results and effectivity in all situations (Yukl 1994).

### Leadership style and job satisfaction

Lashbrook (1997) explained that leadership style plays a vital role in affecting job satisfaction in employees. Some researchers claimed that different leadership styles will create different working environments and, therefore, different effect on job satisfaction (Bogler 2000; Timothy & Ronald 2004). Felfe and Schyns (2006) argued that leadership styles are in positive correlation with satisfaction of employees. Castaneda and Nahavandi (1991) noted that employees are mostly satisfied when leaders are focused on style-oriented tasks. On the other hand, Miles (2010) claimed that there is no connection between leadership style of principals and employees.

## Method

### Model

Inspiration for research arises from interest of authors to check if investigation is aligned with results of previous authors, who investigated the problem of job satisfaction.

Research would be considered as Basic Research, Correlational Method, provided for investigation and better understanding of connections between organizational culture, leadership style and job satisfaction.

The main limitation of correlational approach lies in the fact that it confirms only the connection between two variables while there is a plan to discover the cause of teachers' behaviour. Therefore, the third variable is included – leadership style of the school principal – in order to make more precise prediction of teachers' behaviour (in this case – job satisfaction).

### Research questions

1.  Organizational Culture (OC) and its components are related to job satisfaction and its components.
2.  Leadership style is related to job satisfaction and its components.

## Respondents

Research was conducted on a sample of 109 teachers from 11 primary and secondary schools in the county of Kragujevac (Serbia), by the principle of random selection. The sample includes 55% of respondents who work in primary school and 45% of respondents who work in secondary school. 90% of respondents are in permanent employment while other 10% are employed for a defined period.

The working experience of respondents is in the range of 1 to over 25 years. Most of the respondents (i.e. 17.3%) have between 10 and 15 years of working experience.

Frequencies distribution by years of employment is similar to uniform distribution. In other words, there is a similar number of respondents in all categories of employment.

The sample includes 43% of men and 57% of women.

## Instruments

This research used two surveys to measure attitudes of teachers and principals to job and job aspects. First survey included 52 items of Likert scale with five values which are ranged from – "Totally agree" to "Totally disagree." In this study, items were divided into two groups: 1) 23 items which included nine components for evaluation of OC by *Survey on Organizational Culture* based on Stephan Robbins's Theory (Zamani et al. 2012); 2) 29 items which included eleven elements for evaluation of job satisfaction *Job Satisfaction Survey* based on Paul Spector (Spector 1997). Items of organizational culture were divided into nine components: 1. Innovation and risk; 2. Leadership; 3. Integrity; 4. Support to management; 5. Control; 6. Identity; 7. Rewarding; 8. Conflict and 9. Communication. Items for job satisfaction were divided into eleven components: 1. Communication; 2. Satisfaction; 3. Carrier; 4. Innovativity; 5. Assessment; 6. Management; 7. Cooperatives; 8. Teamwork; 9. Equality; 10. Safety and 11. Job dissatisfaction.

For the measurement of job satisfaction, this research included the *method of one global rate* beside summary result obtained from several job aspects (Robbins & Judge 2009). This method includes setting of an item such as: "Considering

everything, I am satisfied." Like for all other items, respondents marked a number on the scale from one to five for this item. We marked this item as *Item 27*.

The second survey was used for the measurement of leadership style. This instrument was modified by Northouse (2008) using a survey on leadership style known as "leaders network" (Blake & McCanse 1991). This survey included 18 items of Likert scale with five values in the range from "never" to "always."

Cronbach α coefficient was used for testing the internal consistency of surveys items. Internal consistency of the scale for measuring organizational culture for Cronbach α is 0.75. consistency of the scale for measuring job satisfaction for Cronbach α is 0.79.

## Procedure

The data were collected in 11 primary and secondary schools in Kragujevac county. The sample was random and all respondents participated on a voluntary basis. The survey was filled up with instructions of researchers. Surveys were conducted at schools with the approval of school principals.

## Data Analysis

The connection between components of organizational culture and components of job satisfaction was investigated using Spearman coefficient for the correlation of ranges. Mainly investigated item was: "Considering everything, I am satisfied." with components of organizational culture and total organizational culture. Total organizational culture and total job satisfaction were investigated using Pearson coefficient of correlation. Connections between principals and job satisfaction in teachers were verified using Pearson's point B serial coefficient of correlation. In order to determine the correlation of components of job satisfaction and *Item 27* with leadership style, Pearson coefficient of contingency was applied.

All data were analysed using statistic software SPSS 20.

# Result

## Organizational Culture (OC) and its components are related to job satisfaction and its components

Table 1. Organizational culture and job satisfaction

| | | Innovations and risk | Leadership | Integrity | Support to management | Control | Identity | Rewarding | Conflict | Communication | OC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Communication-job satisfaction | $r_S$ | 0.28 | −0.01 | 0.38 | 0.56 | 0.36 | 0.19 | 0.38 | 0.57 | 0.10 | 0.64 |
| | p | 0.00 | 0.93 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.00 |
| Satisfaction | $r_S$ | 0.22 | −0.11 | 0.40 | 0.58 | 0.16 | 0.11 | 0.30 | 0.57 | 0.03 | 0.56 |
| | p | 0.02 | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 0.00 |
| Carrier | $r_S$ | 0.35 | −0.10 | 0.34 | 0.37 | 0.22 | 0.05 | 0.31 | 0.50 | 0.05 | 0.49 |
| | p | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.58 | 0.00 |
| Innovativity | $r_S$ | 0.09 | −0.15 | 0.23 | 0.33 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.27 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 0.44 |
| | p | 0.33 | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| Assessments | $r_S$ | 0.33 | 0.06 | 0.29 | 0.55 | 0.41 | 0.20 | 0.44 | 0.56 | 0.13 | 0.65 |
| | p | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.00 |
| Management | $r_S$ | 0.37 | 0.05 | 0.36 | 0.67 | 0.33 | 0.21 | 0.42 | 0.67 | 0.03 | 0.74 |
| | p | 0.00 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 0.00 |
| Cooperators | $r_S$ | 0.31 | −0.04 | 0.35 | 0.47 | 0.30 | 0.13 | 0.35 | 0.64 | 0.13 | 0.61 |
| | p | 0.00 | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.00 |
| Team work | $r_S$ | 0.27 | −0.02 | 0.19 | 0.38 | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.55 | 0.14 | 0.47 |
| | p | 0.01 | 0.82 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.54 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| Equality | $r_S$ | 0.34 | −0.07 | 0.31 | 0.51 | 0.25 | 0.14 | 0.39 | 0.53 | 0.05 | 0.59 |
| | p | 0.00 | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.64 | 0.00 |
| Safety | $r_S$ | 0.23 | −0.07 | 0.48 | 0.59 | 0.27 | 0.19 | 0.32 | 0.50 | 0.07 | 0.62 |
| | p | 0.01 | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.48 | 0.00 |
| Job dissatisfaction | $r_S$ | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.29 | 0.09 | 0.21 | 0.31 |
| | p | 0.52 | 0.50 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.03 | 0.00 |

| Job satisfaction | $r_s/r$ | 0.34 | –0.08 | 0.46 | 0.58 | 0.29 | 0.16 | 0.46 | 0.66 | 0.06 | 0.58 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | p | 0.00 | 0.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.00 |
| *Item 27* | $r_s$ | 0.29 | –0.03 | 0.39 | 0.61 | 0.19 | 0.02 | 0.34 | 0.56 | –0.01 | 0.56 |
| | p | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0.00 |

Component of OC – *Innovations and risk* is statistically significantly and moderately correlated with *job satisfaction*, $r_s(108) = 0.34$, $p = 0.00$ and weakly connected with the item: "Considering everything, I am satisfied" (in further text – *Item 27*), $r_s(108) = 0.29$, $p = 0.00$ (Table 1).

Component of OC – *Leadership* is not statistically significantly connected with components of *job satisfaction* and *Item 27* (Table 1).

Component of OC – *Integrity* and risk is statistically importantly and moderately connected with *job satisfaction,* $r_s(108) = 0.46$, $p = 0.00$ and with *Item 27*, $r_s(108) = 0.39$, $p = 0.00$ (Table 1).

Component of OC – *Support to management* is statistically significantly and strongly connected with *job satisfaction*, $r_s(108) = 0.58$, $p = 0.00$ and *with Item 27*, $r_s(108) = 0.61$, $p = 0.00$ (Table 1).

Component of OC – *Control* is statistically significantly and weakly connected with *job satisfaction*, $r_s(108) = 0.29$, $p = 0.00$ and with *Item 27*, $r_s(108) = 0.19$, $p = 0.04$ (Table 1).

Component of OC – *Identity* is not statistically significantly connected with *job satisfaction* and *Item 27* (Table 1).

Component of OC – *Rewarding* is statistically significantly and moderately connected with *job satisfaction*, $r_s(108) = 0.46$, $p = 0.00$ and with *Item 27*, $r_s(108) = 0.34$, $p = 0.00$ (Table 1).

Component of OC – *Conflicts* is statistically significantly and strongly connected with *job satisfaction*, $r_s(108) = 0.66$, $p = 0.00$ and with *Item 27*, $r_s(108) = 0.56$, $p = 0.00$ (Table 1).

Component of OC – C*ommunication* is not statistically significantly connected with *job satisfaction* and *Item 27* (Table 1).

Organizational culture is statistically significantly and strongly connected with *job satisfaction*, $r_s(108) = 0.58$, $p = 0.00$ and with *Item 27*, $r_s(108) = 0.56$, $p = 0.00$ (Table 1).

All statistically relevant correlations are positive, which indicates that increase in the value of one variable causes increase in the value of the other variable.

**Leadership style is related to job satisfaction and its components**

Table 2. Leadership style and job satisfaction(correlation)

|  | Leadership style | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | $\chi^2$ | df | c | $r_{pb}$ | p |
| Communication-job satisfaction | 5.79 | 5 |  |  | 0.33 |
| Satisfaction | 8.79 | 6 |  |  | 0.19 |
| Carrier | 5.84 | 6 |  |  | 0.44 |
| Innovativity | 1.28 | 3 |  |  | 0.73 |
| Assessments | 4.56 | 5 |  |  | 0.47 |
| Management | **12.89** | 5 | 0.33 |  | **0.02** |
| Cooperatives | 10.65 | 6 |  |  | 0.10 |
| Team work | 0.39 | 2 |  |  | 0.82 |
| Equality | **7.45** | 2 | 0.25 |  | **0.02** |
| Safety | 2.08 | 2 |  |  | 0.35 |
| Job dissatisfaction | 0.20 | 1 |  |  | 0.65 |
| Job satisfaction |  |  |  | 0.01 | 0.88 |
| *Item 27* | 1.04 | 2 |  |  | 0.59 |

The connection between leadership style and the job satisfaction component – *Management* is significant, $\chi^2 (5,108) = 12.89$, $p = 0.02$. Statistically, leadership style is significantly connected with job satisfaction component – *Management*, C(108) = 0.33, $p = 0.02$ (Table 2).

The connection between leadership style and the job satisfaction component – *Equality* is significant, $\chi^2 (2,108) = 7.45$, $p = 0.02$. Statistically, leadership style is significantly connected with the job satisfaction component – *Equality*, C(108) = 0.25, $p = 0.02$ (Table 2).

## Discussion

One of the main objectives of the study was to predict job satisfaction when it is under the influence of organizational culture (OC) and leadership style. First investigating question on the connection between OC and job satisfaction is

established. Results obtained by testing of the other research question, which explains the effect of leadership style on job satisfaction, indicated that this second question is not confirmed.

## Organizational Culture (OC) and its components are related to job satisfaction and its components

Data analysis shows that there is strong, moderate and weak or none connection between OC and job satisfaction.

Component of OC – *Support to management* – is strongly connected with components of job satisfaction: *Assessment, Management, Equality and Safety*. If the principal listens to problems which his/her employees are faced with, if he/she supports their efforts and activities and if they can get help from the principal when they make a mistake, then the following can be predicted: within such school, the principal asks for responsibility of employees for their work. Employees know what is expected from them, they accept rewards for their work and feel that their position in the school is good. The school performs its duties on a high level and the principal helps the employees to promote and achieve their ideas. The relationship between the principal and the employees is good. The school provides equal conditions for all employees. The teachers feel safe at the school.

Component of OC – *Conflicts* – is strongly connected with most of the job satisfaction components: *Communication, Satisfaction, Carrier, Assessment, Management, Cooperatives, Teamwork, Equality, Safety*. If the principal concentrates on other opinions (even if he/she disagrees with them) and if problems at the school are solved without confrontation and ineffective manner, it can be predicted that employees are going to feel like they are informed about changes at the school, while these changes are interesting for them. Employees will know what is happening at the school and will be able to see the connection between school objectives and their job. Teachers will start to feel satisfaction, the job will be a challenge for them and conditions of work will be good. Also, teachers will intend to make professional promoting and progress within the school. Such school can be innovative and provide actions at a high level. The school principal demands from employees to be responsible for their work. Teachers know what is expected from them. They accept rewards and the principal monitors their progress. Relationship between the principal and employees is good and the principal is trying to promote ideas of his/her teachers. Employees feel that their

position at the school is good. Atmosphere of the school board is good, and it provides performing at a high level. Teachers are focused on performing at a high level and searching for mistakes in their work while not blaming the others. Employees make efforts to change processes at the school. Collaboration between employees is good. Teachers respect each other. Management provides equal conditions for all employees in order to make them feel safe at the school.

*Total organizational culture* is strongly connected with most of the job satisfaction components: Communication, Satisfaction, Assessment, Management, Cooperatives, Equality, Safety.

Also, there is a strong connection between total organizational culture and total job satisfaction. Research results indicated that the organizational culture can be used for prediction of satisfaction of teachers at the school. Similar results were obtained by Hansen and Wernerefelt (1989), Jiang and Klein (2000), Chang and Lee (2007), Sabri et al. (2011), Dinc and Aydemir (2014).

Regarding *Item 27*: "Regarding everything, I am satisfied.", there is a strong connection with components of organizational culture: *Support to management* and *Conflicts*. Also, there is a strong relationship between *Total organizational culture* and *Item 27*. Therefore, the theory developed by Wanous et al. (1997) that result of job satisfaction can be obtained by a simple question: "Considering everything, are you satisfied with the job?" is confirmed. As it can be seen, Table 1 shows correlation coefficients which are almost equal among *Total organizational culture* and *Total job satisfaction* and *Item 27*.

The most interesting findings in the weak connection between OC and job satisfaction are concluded in Innovations. Although, innovations should be implemented in the school, results show that teachers are not excited with innovations. They mostly rely on traditional methods of work. Similar results are provided by Deal and Peterson (1994). *Control* is weakly correlated with job satisfaction, which was expected since teachers are not prone to controlling and self-valuing. It is interesting that the component of OC – *Rewarding* is not correlated with *job satisfaction*. It means that investigated schools do not include *rewarding* for good work and achieved results. It should be investigated if rewards are obtained depending on friendly relationships with the school principal.

**Leadership style is related to job satisfaction and its components**

During the investigation of the correlation between leadership style and job satisfaction, interesting results were developed. Leadership style is connected with

two components of job satisfaction: management and equality. It can be assumed that increased concern for people or tasks will increase performance at the high level of the school and that principal will help teachers to make progress at the school. Also, the relationship between principal and employees will be better, and principal will be concerned with ideas from employees. Increasing concern for people and tasks will improve and provide equality for all employees.

Since no significant relationship was registered among other connections, it can be assumed that leadership style does not have a significant effect on job satisfaction. It is considered that the leader influences job satisfaction via changes in organizational culture. Deal and Peterson (1996) obtained similar results in their research. Similar conclusion can be drawn from a study by Miles (2010), who claimed that there is no direct connection between leadership style of principals and employed teachers. Some researchers obtained different results. Lashbrook (1997) claimed that the style of principals plays a vital role in the impact on employees' satisfaction. Timothy and Ronald (2004) concluded that principal will create different environments depending on the style and that these circumstances will influence job satisfaction.

No significant correlation was discovered in the connection between *leadership style* and *Item 27*. Relationship between leadership style and job dissatisfaction did not show a significant connection.

## Conclusion

Among all factors which influence job satisfaction, Organizational Culture (OC) is one the most important elements in this process. Research results show that there is a strong connection between OC and satisfaction of teachers. Since a change in attitudes among people is very difficult, and knowing that OC is partially composed of attitudes, and that job satisfaction is an attitude, it can be concluded that it is hard to change OC and job satisfaction. First, OC should be changed in order to change job satisfaction.

On the other hand, results show that the style of the school principal is not connected with the satisfaction of employees. A change in leadership style of the school principal will not increase the satisfaction of teachers. There is a different way. Leadership style needs to influence a change of OC and after that, OC will be able to affect job satisfaction. It means that leadership style

has mediate effect on job satisfaction, and it plays a role in creating teachers' attitude regarding job satisfaction.

At first, analysis of more aspects of work in the survey should provide a more accurate job satisfaction rate. Research did not confirm this assumption. One of rare instances is that simplicity can be as functional as complexity. Comparison of grades obtained by method of one question with more complex method of several job aspects indicated that the first method is equally effective as the second method. It showed that one item: "Considering everything, I am satisfied" can embrace the essence of job satisfaction.

Research showed the entire complexity of the problem regarding job satisfaction in teachers. There are no two the same organizational cultures, so it is not possible to generalize obtained results within any environment.

# Bibliography

Amos E.A. & Weathington B.L. 2008. An analysis of the relation between employee organization value congruence and employee attitudes, *The Journal of Psychology*, 142(6), pp. 615–631.

Blake R.R. & Mouton J.S. 1985. *The managerial grid III: The key to leadership excellence*, Golf Publishing, Houston.

Blake R. & McCanse A. 1991. *Leadership dilemmas—Grid solutions*, Blake/Mouton Grid Management and Organization Development Series, New York.

Bogler R. 2002. Two profiles of schoolteachers: A discriminate analysis of job satisfaction, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 18, No. 6, pp. 665–673.

Castaneda M. & Nahavandi A. 1991. Link of manager behavior to supervisor performance rating and subordinate satisfaction, *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 16, pp. 357–366.

Chang S. & Lee M.S. 2007. A study on the relationship among leadership, organizational culture, the operation of learning organization and employees' job satisfaction, *Learning Organization*, 14(02), pp. 155–185.

Deal T.E. & Peterson K.D. 1994. *The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Dinc M. & Aydemir M. 2014. The Effects of Ethical Climate and Ethical Leadership on Employee, *International Journal of Management Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 9, pp. 391–405.

Domović V. 2004. *Školsko ozračje i učinkovitost škole*, II izdanje, Naklada Slap, Zagreb.

Felfe J. & Schyns B. 2006. Personality and the perception of transformational leadership: The impact of extraversion, neuroticism, personal need for structure, and occupational self-efficacy, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 36, pp. 708–741.

Filak V. & Sheldon K. 2003. Student psychological need satisfaction and college teacher-course evaluations, *Educational Psychology*, 23, pp. 235–247.

Fisher V.E. & Hanna J.V. 1931. *The Dissatisfied Worker*, Macmillan, New York.

Goris J.R. 2006. Effect of satisfaction with communication on the relationship between individual job satisfaction congruence and job performance satisfaction, *Journal of Management Development*, 33(1), pp. 64–96.

Gutknecht D.B. & Miller J.R. 1990. *The Organizational and Human Sourcebook,* 2ⁿᵈ ed., University Press of America, New York.

Hansen G. & Wernerefelt B. 1989. Determinants from performance the relative impact of economic and organizational factors, *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(3), pp. 399–411.

Hoppock R. 1935. *Job satisfaction*, Harper and Row, New York, NY.

Hoy W.K. & Miskel C.G. 2013. *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 9ᵗʰ edition, McGraw-Hill, New York.

Jiang J.J. & Klein G. 2000. Supervisor support and career anchor impact on career satisfaction of the entry level information system, *Journal of Management Information System*, 16 (3), pp. 219–240.

Judge T, Thoresen C.J., Bono E. & Patton G. 2001. The job satisfaction – job perfomance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review, *Psychological Bulletin*, pp. 376–407.

Judge T., Hellar D. & Mount K. 2002. Five factor model of personality and job satisfaction: Meta-analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, pp. 530–554.

Lashbrook W. 1997. Business performance, employee satisfaction, and leadership practices, *Performance Improvement*, Vol. 36, No. 5, pp. 29–33.

Lee H.Y. & Ahmad K.Z. 2009. The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behaviour and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 53–86.

Locke E.A. 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In: Dunnette M. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297–1349), Rand McNally, Chicago, IL.

McHugh M. 1993. Stress at work: Do managers really count the costs? *Employee Relations 15*(1), pp. 18–32.

McNamara C. 2005 (n.d). *Job satisfaction*, available online at http://www.managementhelp.org/prsn_wll/job_stfy.htm#anchor306642 (accessed 14.07.2014).

Miles W.L. 2010. *Correlational study of leadership style and teacher job satisfaction in two Head Start programs*, Capella University.

Northouse P. 2008. *Liderstvo*, IV izdanje, Data Status, Beograd.

Robbins S. & Judge T. 2009. *Organizacijsko ponašanje*, 12 izdanje, Mate, Zagreb.

Robbins S .1996. *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*, Prentice Hall, NY.

Robbins S. & Coutler M. (2005), *Menadžment*, Datastatus, Beograd.

Sabri P., Ilyas M. & Amjad Z. (2011), Organizational culture and its impact on the job satisfaction of the university teachers of Lahore, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 2, No. 24, Special Issue – December, pp. 121–128.

Schein E. 2010. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 4th edition, John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Schneider B. & Reicher A.E. 1983. On the etology of climates, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 36, pp. 19–37.

Smith P.C. 1955. The prediction of individual differences in susceptibility to industrial monotony, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 39, pp. 322–329.

Spector P.E. 1997. *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Timothy A.J. & Ronald F.P. 2004. Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89, No. 5, pp. 755–768.

Wanous J., Reichers E. & Hudy M. 1997. Overall job satisfaction: how good are single-item measures?!, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, pp. 247–252.

Weitz J. 1952. A neglected concept in the study of job satisfaction, *Personnel Psychology*, 5, pp. 201–205.

Worrell T. 2004. *School Psychologists' Job Satisfaction: Ten Years Later*, available online at: http://www.scholar.lib.vt.edu/.../Travisdiss.pdf (accessed November 2012).

Zamani F., Ghorbanpanah H., Nabavi S., Saboordavoodian A. & Farvardin Z. 2012. A Survey on Organizational Culture Based on Stephan Robbins's Theory (Case Study), *International Conference on Management and Artificial Intelligence IPEDR*, Vol. 35, IACSIT Press, Singapore.