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ABSTRACT

The aim of this research was to study the relationship between Charles Handy’s management styles and quality of working life. This study was practical due to its objectives, and was descriptive due to its methodology. The statistical society included all 283 employees of Iranian Organizations in west of Iran among whom the researchers selected 116 persons randomly and by means of Kukran table. In order to collect the data needed, the researchers used, in addition to library researches (used for the part of literature review), two questionnaires which were consisted of the questions about the styles of management and about quality of working life. To be sure about the validity of the questionnaires, scholars and professors in the university evaluated them and then confirmed it. The researchers used Cronbach Alpha to evaluate the reliability of the questionnaires. The alpha coefficient for quality of life’s questionnaire was 0.92 and for Handy’s model was 0.75 which were accepted. Moreover, the researchers used SPSS and software (version 16) to analyse the data. Finally, the result showed that there is a negative but significant relationship between country club style of management and employees’ understanding. Moreover, there is a positive and significant relationship between management style of roles and quality of working life.
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INTRODUCTION

Todays, managing big and developed organizations is due to managers’ efforts who are well qualified and aware and who use the managerial knowledge and skills in this procedure. Managers, to reach objectives, use different managerial styles and approaches that can get into employees’ mind and then inspire themselves to be accompanied with organizational goals. Moreover, because of the reason that management styles used in organizations are the very important for organization itself and quality of working life, therefore, the study of relationship between management styles and quality of working life becomes very important. One of the most challenging discussions in all organizations is quality of working life. It is very important for each organization to have the high levels of quality of working life; this is because of the reason that organizations use QWL (quality of working life) to attract and then keep employees and therefore organization itself. Currently, paying attention to QWL and identifying the factors influencing on are mostly considered by managerial scientists. By identifying QWL, we can conclude that when employees have control on their working aspects, they do not feel that they are useless and consequently they try more and more to reach organizational objectives.

Management is the central point in the existential of any organization. It is not only managing and controlling the activities. It is something more than these certain tasks and goes beyond ordinary attitudes. Management means working with and by individuals and groups to reach goals. In order to reach the objectives, no manager can act separately. He/she should act in groups and participate in social and communicational activities.

Leadership is one of the most important managerial activities. The success of any organization is dependent on its style of management and leadership. Leadership means having influence on individuals in a way that they act and try based on their own wills. The style of management refers to the behavioral pattern of that person at the moment of participation in others’ activities according to the others’ understanding about his/her behavior. In other words, it is about the howness of leaders’ cooperation with their subordinates under the influence of their managerial styles.
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“Managers in societies can play different roles as the leaders of the organizations. A manager in an organization can create and motivate mentality and inspiration in employees and therefore increases job satisfaction” (Nasiri Pour 2009, p. 18). But, in spite of the fact that the “leadership theory” has been established and proved, today many organizations treat their employees as they are “machines” (Shafritz and Ott 2001).

The quality of life refers to a philosophy in all organizations that wants to increase the value of employees. The value based system of the quality of life considers human resources as the best variables to be invested in strategic management. This means that “meeting the employees’ needs results in efficiency and productivity of organization in a long term” (Khoshbakhti and et al 2005, p. 130).

Those who support the quality of life theory are in search of finding new assistants for employees to give them a chance to establish a kind of balance in their lives. Harvey believes that the key point in global business is to have proper human resource and also skilled managers. Therefore, “the important point to direct human resource is to consider and pay attention to mental and physical health” (Shahbazi and et al 2009, p. 70).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Management Styles: Charles handy in his book under the title of “Gods of Management: The Changing Work of Organizations” introduced four mythological gods of Zeus Apollo, Athena, and Dionysius as four management style of club, role, task, and existential. He, respectively, identified the level of power for each of them as center, core, in layer, and in individuals one by one. He related each of these gods to a philosophical school of management or an organizational culture. In his view, management of “club” is the “simple and mutual bureaucracy”, management of “role” is the “machinery bureaucracy” along with “monopoly” and having no “competition”, management of “task” is the “professional bureaucracy”, and management of “existential” is, to some extent, the “individual or system” based “democracy” (Handy 1995, p. 10-11).

Management Style of Country Club: Zeus is the leader and one of the symbols of a charismatic and strong leader. He is the sign of country club culture. An organization running by such a style is organized based on the organization’s objectives and products. This is a kind of patriarch style of management and is depended upon the mutual trust between managers and employees. Exchange and selection are very important in this style of management.

Management Style of Roles: Apollo is the sign of cultural roles. It is supposed that human being is a rational creature. Moreover Apollo is considered as the god of regulation. An organization which uses this kind of culture is organized based upon professional tasks or products. This is a kind of patriarchal style of management and is depended on the mutual trust between manager and employees. “Selection and replacement” are very important in this kind of organization (Handy 1995, p. 10).

Management Style of Responsibility: Athena is the symbol of working culture or team working. In this culture, management is considered as the procedure of solving using a logical way. In this culture, “Proficiency” is considered as the principle and the core of “power” (Handy 1995, p. 11).

Management Style of Existential: Dionysius is the symbol of existentialism which believes ours control on our fates. On the whole, in three previous styles of management, the person is depended upon the organization, while in this style it is vice versa. It is the “organization” which tries to “satisfy the individual” (Handy 1995, p. 11).

Management Style of Quality of Working Life: Greenberg and Baron believed that quality of life is one of the most well-known alternatives for organizations in the procedure of performance and is designed through participating individuals and members in decision makings.

Richard Walton in 1974 introduced an eight-dimension pattern to explain quality of life which is as the follows:

1) Justified Payment: The same payment for all members of organization according to their levels and positions.
2) Rule Obedience: Freedom of speech and the dominancy of rules over mastery.
3) Growth Opportunity and Continual Security: Providing opportunities and situations for individuals to improve personal skills and then to use these skills.
4) Social Dependence: Employees’ Understandings about social responsibility.
5) **Personal Development**: Providing situations to be dependent and self-controlled at work and accessing and using different skills.

6) **Total Working Condition**: It is to create a balance between working life and employees working life.

7) **Environment Security**: Providing secure working condition physically and determining logical working hours.

8) **Social Unification**: Providing proper working mood in which employees feel the sense of “belonging to organization” and the sense that they are “needed” by organization (Hatami and et al 2011, p. 27).

In a research, in 2005 Rahimi investigated the influences of management styles of rule oriented and relationship oriented on employees’ job satisfaction and concluded that there is a very significant relationship between the styles of management and employees’ job satisfaction. Moreover, Shirin Mohammadi in her thesis studied the relationship between quality of working life and human resource efficiency in Lorestan Tamin Etemaece Hospital and concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between the variables.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The research can be considered as practical due to its objectives, and also it can be deduced as descriptive due to its methodology. Moreover, it is going to study the relationship between Charles Handy’s management styles and quality of working life (QWL). The statistical society for this research consists of all 283 employees of Iranian Organizations which is located in west of Iran. Among the statistical society, the researchers select 116 persons randomly and by means of Kukran table and then consider them as sample group.

There are two ways used in this study to collect the data needed. One is using library sources. The researchers use library sources to complete the part of background and the review of literature. The second one is to use two questionnaires. One questionnaire belongs to Handy’s styles of management and the other one belongs to quality of working life. To evaluate the validity of the questionnaires, the scholars and professors in the university review them and after confirmation, they are distributed among the sample group. For reliability of the questionnaires, Cronbach Alpha test is used. The alpha coefficient for quality of life’s questionnaire was 0.92 and for Handy’s model was 0.75, and consequently they both are accepted. Besides, the researchers used SPSS software (version 16) to analyse the data.

**FINDINGS**

In this research we used SPSS software version 16. There are 4 alternative hypotheses.

**The hypotheses are as following:**

**The First Hypothesis**: The relationship between management of club and employees’ understandings of QWL.

**The null hypothesis**: There is no significant relationship between management of club and employees’ understandings of QWL.

**The Alternative hypothesis**: There is a significant relationship between management of club and employees’ understandings of QWL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>(The relationship between management of club and employees’ understandings of QWL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 1, the significance and correlation coefficient, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant but negative relationship between management of club and employees’ understandings of QWL.
The Second Hypothesis: The relationship between management of roles and employees’ understandings of QWL.
The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between management of roles and employees’ understandings of QWL.
The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between management of roles and employees’ understandings of QWL.

Table 2 (The relationship between management of roles and employees’ understandings of QWL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Significancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>+0.318</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 2, the significance and correlation coefficient, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between management of roles and employees’ understandings of QWL.

The Third Hypothesis: The relationship between management of responsibility and employees’ understandings of QWL.
The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between management of responsibility and employees’ understandings of QWL.
The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between management of responsibility and employees’ understandings of QWL.

Table 3 (The relationship between management of responsibility and employees’ understandings of QWL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Significancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>+0.003</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 3, the significance and correlation coefficient, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between management of responsibility and employees’ understandings of QWL.

The Fourth Hypothesis: The relationship between management of existential and employees’ understandings of QWL.
The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between management of existential and employees’ understandings of QWL.
The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between management of existential and employees’ understandings of QWL.

Table 4 (The relationship between management of existential and employees’ understandings of QWL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existential</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>Significancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 4, the significance and correlation coefficient, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between management of existential and employees’ understandings of QWL.

Finally, according to the results obtained, there is a significant relationship for two variables and no significant relationship for two variables.

CONCLUSION

From many years ago, the concept of job satisfaction in work and especially for employees was very important. Managers all around the world and in all eras wanted to satisfy their employees. This was because of the reason that they believed by doing so they can improve performance and therefore benefits. All managers used different ways and styles of management to improve job satisfaction.
In recent years, Charles Handy, a management theorist, tried to introduce some new ways and styles of management to provide job satisfaction. He, therefore, introduced four mythological gods of Zeus Apollo, Athena, and Dionysius as four management style of club, role, task, and existential. He, respectively, identified the level of power for each of them as center, core, in layer, and in individuals one by one.

According to such a theory, the focus of this study was to investigate the relationship between Charles Handy’s styles of management and quality of working life. This study was practical due to its objectives, and was descriptive due to its methodology. The statistical society included all 283 employees of Iranian Organizations in west of Iran among whom the researchers selected 116 persons randomly and by means of Kukran table. In order to collect the data needed, the researchers used, in addition to library researches, two questionnaires. Moreover, the researchers used SPSS and software to analyse the data. Finally, the result showed that there is a negative but significant relationship between country club style of management and employees understanding. Moreover, there is a positive and significant relationship between management style of roles and quality of working life.
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