

Investigating the Relationship between Democratic Leadership Style of Managers and Self-Control Level of Employees in Teaching and Training Organization, Alborz, Iran

Hasan Shabaani, Abbas Khorshidi and Maryam Hosseinpour

Department of Management and Educational Planning, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr, Iran

ABSTRACT

Regarding the significance of self-control level of organizational employees to enhance organizational progression, a research was carried out to investigate the relationship between democratic leadership style of managers and self-control level of employees of teaching and training organization, Alborz, Iran. The research is descriptive and correlation. To do so, 210 managers and 310 employees of primary schools were selected randomly among 467 managers and 42895 employees. Samples were selected in school unit and measured by Morgan's sample size table. Data collecting tools included Loutan's leadership style questionnaire, and self-control questionnaire of employees, completed by under-investigation units. Results show that 34.8% of employees had low self-control, 51% average, 12.4% upper-average, and 1.9% high self-control. There is no meaningful statistical relationship between democratic leadership of managers and self-control of employees. Based on the results of other investigations on self-control, it can be said that "employee's self-control not only provide managers with desirable leadership styles, but also depends on other factors such as organizational status, training, enabling, maturity of employees, etc.

KEY WORDS: leadership styles, self-control, humanitarian leadership, task-oriented leadership

INTRODUCTION

To date, traditional forms of organization face undoubtedly with significant problems due to their inflexibility and limitation in innovation. One of the most important needs of futurist organizations is a structure to help them confront unpredicted changes. Hence, making some significant changes in traditional forms of organization is inevitable.

According to Kotter, leadership is about coping with change. Leadership focuses on change and innovation; it focuses on the big picture; it focuses on strategies that take calculated risks; and it focuses on people's values [1].

Participative or democratic style involves the leader including one or more employees in the decision making process (determining what to do and how to do it). However, the leader maintains the final decision making authority. Using this style is not a sign of weakness; rather it is a sign of strength that person's employees will respect [2]. This is normally used when person have part of the information, and his employees have other parts. Note that a leader is not expected to know everything - this is why he employs knowledgeable and skillful employees. Using this style is of mutual benefit - it allows them to become part of the team and allows his to make better decisions.

Self-control realization of employees in organizations is not simple and depends on attending cultures of organizations, self-control training based on organizational culture, adjusting the objectives to coordinate with personal aims in organization, strengthening personal believes inside the organization, etc. A manager is supposed to facilitate employee's relationships and help progression of organization. Since self-control prevents most of challenges and negative conflicts of organization and encourages employees to accomplish their tasks, it also helps them to progress [3].

In a research, Stewart and Manz [4], indicates that controlling people by the use of any kind of power may result in various responses such as assurance, acceptance and resistance. As results of the research represents, using obligatory power mainly results on resistance and non-acceptance, whereas professional power control results in more assurance and acceptance.

The foremost factor in affectivity of self-control is individual's progression and maturity. In another word, it is most suitable when employees are aware, matured and understand objectives and programs of the organization. When responsible and aware people are controlled by external rules, they don't show better efficiency. Therefore, using external control on these people can decrease their motivation, efficiency and blocks organizational efforts to coordinate with changing circumstances. In this case, using force and obligation is necessary [5].

Control method carried on by Kickul and Neuman [6], indicate that job satisfaction, feeling the importance of cooperating, etc. are factors that have significant role on increasing efficiency and self-control, but physical factors didn't have main part.

*Corresponding Author: Maryam Hosseinpour (M.Sc. student). Department of Management and Educational Planning, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr, Iran, Email: sahel_mh_2006@yahoo.com

However, self-control of organizations and a good manager with suitable leadership style that increase self-control of employees is inevitable. In a descriptive correlation research, George [7] analyzed the relationship between sensitive intelligence and leadership style on 39 chief nurses. The results of the study indicated that self-control didn't have any meaningful relation with evolutionary leadership style. In a descriptive correlation research "classroom leadership and its relation with American Rap fan student's self-control", Obiozor *et al.* [8] indicated that there is a positive relationship between student's self-control and training and suitable classroom leadership styles.

Subject of the presented study as a descriptive and correlation work was investigate the relationship between democratic leadership style of managers and self-control level of employees of teaching and training organization, Alborz, Iran.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research is a descriptive correlation study aimed to investigate the relationship between leadership styles of teaching and training organization managers of Alborz province, and self-control of employees in accomplishing their duties. To do so, 210 managers and 310 employees of primary schools were selected randomly among 467 managers and 42895 employees. Samples were selected in school unit and measured by Morgan's sample size table. Criteria to participate in this study include: A) Be employee in teaching and training organization; B) Be manager or employee of a school.

Data collecting tools include 35-question leadership style questionnaire and 10-question self-control questionnaire. Leadership style questionnaire measures different leadership styles of managers based on humanitarian and task-orientation. 15 questions measures humanitarian leadership styles and 20 questions task-oriented method. They were scored as follow:

1- Comments number 8, 35, 34, 30, 19, 18, 17, 12 were circle

2- "Never" or "seldom" equals to 1

3- Scores of numbers 33, 31, 29, 27, 25, 23, 21, 20, 17, 16, 14, 13, 12, 11, 1, 9, 7, 6, 4, 2 were added. The resulted score indicates inclination of responder to task-oriented leadership style.

4- Scores of numbers 35, 34, 32, 30, 28, 26, 24, 22, 19, 18, 15, 10, 8, 5, 3 were added. The resulted score indicates inclination of responder to humanitarian leadership style. Total score of 0-35 shows the division of managers into two groups: 1) humanitarian or relation-oriented (0-15). They are also divided to high and low humanitarian groups; 2) task-oriented (0-20), they are divided to high and low task-oriented groups.

Self-control questionnaire include 10 questions and are answered with yes/no. Scores of (1-3) show low self-control, 4-5 average self-control, 6-7 upper than average self-control, 8-10 high self-control. Total score was 10. To investigate scientific validity of Loutans questionnaire, content validity method was used. To acquire scientific reliability, content reliability was used. Durability of the tools were confirmed by Cronbach's alpha-coefficient, $r = 0.81$.

Researcher after acquiring authority from under-investigation units became present in research place and introduced himself to samples and explained objectives of the research. Sufficient explanations were given to them to fill the questionnaire. Questionnaires were collected at the same day from under-research units. After collecting them, data were statistically analyzed by SPSS software. Descriptive and deductive statistics were used to analyze data. K2 statistic test and Pierson's correlation coefficient were used in data analyzing.

RESULTS

In this research, manager sample group were divided to two subgroup of high democratic and low democratic leadership style. Based on self-control level of employee, investigated group were divided to 8 sub-groups according to self-control level of employees and democratic leadership style. By calculating amplitude of each sub-group by K2 two-variant square test, relationship between democratic leadership style and self-control was measured. Results are shown in Table 1. Consider to calculated k2 square index (2.396) lower that critical k2 square index with freedom degree (3) and regarding to standard error of 0.05 (7.815), zero hypothesis based ontherelationship betweenDemocraticleadership style of managersand self-control of employeesisconfirmed with confidence limit of 95%.

Findings of the research on self-control of employee represent that most of them have average self-control and less amount of them had high self-control. Research hypothesis: self-control of employees is influenced by democratic leadership style of managers.

Table 1. K2 two-variant square test

		Democratic leadership style			K2 statistic test		
		High	Low	Total			
Self – Control Level	Low	Observed frequency	37.0	36	73	Pierson's correlation coefficient	2.396
		Extended frequency	41.0	32.0	73		
	Average	Observed frequency	61.0	46	107	Freedom degree	3
		Extended frequency	60.1	46.9	107		
	Upper-average	Observed frequency	17	9	26	Significant level	0.494*
		Extended frequency	14.6	11.4	26		
	High	Observed frequency	3.0	1	4	Total	118
		Extended frequency	2.2	1.8	4		
	Total	Observed frequency	118	92	210	* = $p < 0.05$	
		Extended frequency	118	92	210		

Table 2. Frequency distribution and employee percentage of sample group based on self-control level

Self-control Level	Sample group 1		Sample group 2	
	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
Low	73	34.8	40	32.5
Average	107	51.0	68	55.3
Upper-average	26	12.4	12	9.8
High	4	1.9	3	2.4
Total	210	100	123	100

Table 3. A summary of one-way variance analysis

Change Source	Total Square	Freedom Degree	Mean Square	F
Intra-group	23.111	3	7.704	1.299*
Inter-group	1221.370	206	5.929	
Total	1244.481	209		

*: Significant level

Regarding the fact that calculated F index (1.299) is less than critical F(0.05) by free levels of 3 and 206 (2.65), we can certainly support the assumption that there is no relationship between democratic leadership style of managers and self-control of employees. Therefore, leadership style scores of 4 sub-groups of democratic leadership style were measured and their mean score was calculated, as it's shown in Table 2. Using variance analysis method, we compared these four means (Table 3). Results show that there is no meaningful statistical difference between these four means. Therefore, self-control of employees is not influenced by democratic leadership style of managers.

Although calculated K square index is less than level 3 critical K square indexes (2.396), regarding 5% errors, we prove there is no relationship between democratic leadership style of managers and self-control of employees.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this research was to determine the effect of leadership style and its relation with self-control of employees of teaching and training organization, Alborz. Results suggest that most of the managers had task-oriented leadership style and this method had no effect on accomplishing their duties.

According to self-control level of employees, sample group of employees were divided to 4 sub-groups of low, average, upper average, and high self-control level. To test the above mentioned hypothesis, average score of democratic leadership style of managers of these groups were measured and compared with each other by variance analysis test.

Regarding the fact that calculated F index (1.299) is less than critical F (0.05) by free levels of 3 and 206 (2.65), we can certainly support the assumption that there is no relationship between democratic leadership style of managers and self-control of employees. Results show that there is no meaningful statistical difference between these four means.

Although calculated K square index is less than level 3 critical K square indexes (2.396), regarding 5% errors, we prove there is no relationship between democratic leadership style of managers and self-control of employees.

Lewin et al. [9] stated that the democratic leadership style favors decision-making by the group. Such a leader gives instructions after consulting the group. They can win the cooperation of their group and can motivate them effectively and positively. The decisions of the democratic leader are not unilateral as with the autocrat because they arise from consultation with the group members and participation by them [10]. In a research, Argyris [11] showed that democratic leadership style can affect self-control level of employees when, 1) everyone has its own responsibility, 2) managers let the employees to progress in their work. He believes managers encourage employees to be inactive, so they became immature. Researches of Morgeson [12] also indicated that people can be self-motivated and self-controlled when they are motivated enough, consequently, managers should not directly control them instead they should try to reveal their inner abilities. We can conclude that not only democratic leadership style is important, but considering maturity, encouragement, freedom, and using potential abilities of people are also important. Findings of the researches related to leadership style and democracy is in agreement with the results of the present study [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17].

Douglas McGregor [18] always viewed as having made a major contribution to our understanding of how leaders should be, think, and act so they can motivate others. He found that leadership needs practices which demands true and accurate understanding of human nature and its motivation. He consequently defined controversy of x theory, and called it y theory. A manager should recognize potential ability of people and activate it. And help its employee to progress and have more self-control on their practices.

Zimmerman [1] suggest four level of self-precept for its PhD students: observation, imitation, self-control, and self-adjustment

- 1) By observation, students can learn. He defines characteristics of a good teacher as: tolerance, understand, believing in God, pride and honor to student's success
- 2) Students then do their homework by imitating teacher and learning new experiences.
- 3) Students should internalize their learning to be self-controlled
- 4) Students should represent their special learned behaviors in self-adjustment level.

In final stage, Zimmerman [1] told his students: "you are graduated as self-adjusting expert, and your university occupations are started." He was observing them and supporting them, even with an encouraging word. Therefore, Zimmerman achieved acceptable results.

In a research in Washington, called "using working and automatically adjusting groups", Scarr[5] divided school to 4 separate teams by organizing central office employees, managers, supporting personnel, and he achieved success in school. He, then, suggested managers should change their Bureaucracy and autocratic style to non-intensive style. And organize team work while they are focused on the results.

CONCLUSION

According to the results of the present study on relationship between democratic leadership style and self-control of employees in accomplishing their task, and based on previous studies on self-adjusting working teams or self-control training, it's suggested to investigate the ways of self-control training to employees, relationship between working teams and employee's self-control, and preventing factors in self-control of employees.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The presented study financially assisted in part by Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr Branch, Iran. It was summarized from Master Thesis project with grant number awarded 2011. The authors are grateful to Dr. Hasan Shabaani and Dr. Abbas Khorshidi, associate professors of Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Islamic Azad University of Islamshahr Branch for their technical and statistical assistance related to current study.

REFERENCES

1. John P. Kotter. 1990. Force for Change: How Leadership Differs From Management. New York: Free Press.
2. Schriesheim, Chester A. The Great High Consideration: High Initiating Structure Leadership Myth: Evidence on its Generalizability. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, April 1982, 116, pp. 221-228.
3. Mc Helen, M. 2010. The Calm and Alert Class: Using Body, Mind and Breath to Teach self-Regulation of Learning Related Social Skills (ED511066), Online Submission, Reports – Research Test/Questionnaires.
4. Stewart, G.L. and Manz, C.C. 1995. Leadership for self-managing work teams: A typology and integrative model. *Human Relations*, 48, 747 – 770
5. Scarr, L.E. 1992. Using Self-Regulating Work Teams, *Educational Leadership*, 50(3): 68-70.
6. Kickul, J., Neuman, G. 2000. Emergence leadership behaviors: The function of personality and cognitive ability in determining teamwork performance and KSAs. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15, 27-51.
7. George, J.M. 2000. Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence, *Human Relations* 53 (2000), pp. 1027–1055
8. Obiozor, W.E. 2010. The Use of Music to Teach Life Skills to Students with Emotional Disabilities in the Classroom, *Journal Articles; Reports – Evaluative*, Online Submission, *US-China Education Review* 1: 17-26
9. Argyris, C. 1976. *Increasing Leadership Effectiveness*, Wiley, New York, 1976 (even though published in 1976, this still remains a "standard" reference text)
10. Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., White, R.K. 1939. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology* 10: 271–301.
11. Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Ilies, R. and Gerhardt, M.W. 2002. Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765-780.
12. Morgeson, F.P. 2005. The External Leadership of Self-Managing Teams: Intervening in the Context of Novel and Disruptive Events. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 497-508.
13. Avolio, B.J., Sosik, J.J., Jung, D.I. and Berson, Y. 2003. Leadership models, methods, and applications. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 12. (pp. 277–307): John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
14. Zaccaro, S.J., Rittman, A.L. and Marks, M.A. 2001. Team leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12(4), 451-483.
15. Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Harding, F.D., Jacobs, T.O. and Fleishman, E.A. 2000. Leadership skills for a changing world solving complex social problems. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(1), 11-35.
16. Fisher, J.L. et al. 1988. Leadership Behaviors of Effective Colleague Presidents, Reports- Resaearch; Speeches/Meeting Papers; Tests/Questionnaires.
17. Fleishman, E.A., Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Levin, K.Y., Korotkin, A.L., and Hein, M.B. (1991). Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behavior: A synthesis and functional interpretation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(4), 245-287.
18. McGregor, D. 1960. The Human Side of Enterprise. *REFLECTIONS*, 2: 1, 3-20.