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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the diversity of education manager’s leadership approaches in relation to teacher job contentment & dynamism at the secondary level in public secondary schools in Rahimyar Khan. The independent variables were managerial approaches. The dependent variable was the teacher’s job contentment and dynamism which was measured by the use of the Teacher Job Contentment Questionnaire (TJCQ). The reliability alpha coefficient for the Education Manager’s managerial Approach Questionnaire (EMMQ) was found to be 0.943 and 0.944 for the teacher questionnaire (TJCQ) respectively. Teacher job contentment was measured using eight factors of job contentment: encouraging functioning atmosphere, supervision, synchronization, accountability, performance, job wellbeing, gratitude & trustworthiness. The target population for the study was 10 education managers, 40 teachers and 200 students from the ten public secondary schools selected from rural and urban areas equally. Comparative teacher contentment and dynamism differences results showed that teachers were highly contented & dynamic in egalitarian approach, mostly in realization oriented approach and then in contingency approach but least contentment under laissez-faire and dictatorial managerial approaches. A major implication of the study was that education manager’s leadership approach has a substantial association with teacher job contentment, therefore education managers should endeavor to use leadership approaches that give enhanced teachers’ contentment and dynamism.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The potential positive impact of education manager approaches teachers and learning in schools has been widely admitted. The consistent interventions are the result of an internal deriving force called contentment (Corey & Stephen, 1957). The approach affects contentment and contentment is linked with dynamism. Contentment is only a topic for consideration in this research but least considered in this technological, virtual and mechanized era. Students are primarily accelerated through teachers' approaches and teachers are affected by education managers' approaches. Approach modification of education manager is the utmost need for education manager’s training in Pakistan. In recent years, the use of managerial approaches and strategies in teaching and learning has become a central goal in the field of educational psychology.

The importance of extrinsic and intrinsic variables of contentment on teacher’s dynamism little is known. This research aims to explore the effects on the dynamism of teachers in secondary schools. Intrinsic and extrinsic contentment is necessary for job dynamism (Bennell & Akyeampong, 2007). According to Din (2008) the teacher who intrinsically content undertakes tasks satisfactorily. According to Fook (2004) the education managers who are sensitive to managerial approaches greatly impress school staff members. According to De. Grauwe (2017) quality of education depends upon the managerial approaches of the institutes are managed and the capacity of the institute to enhance learning depend upon managerial approaches of leadership than on resources.

Excellent institute heads generate a harmonious atmosphere for enhanced teacher dynamism. A workplace better in hygiene and dynamism gives contentment. Ramaiah. A. & Balasundran (2002) exposed that the success of the institute is the accountability of the education manager. Heads are the motivators for their teams.

Shields (2004) opines that the education manager is the role model to perform functional duties and inspiration for the staff. Bush (2003) exposed that education managers are recommended to apply leadership that is transparent, motivating and is based on humanistic values. Today’s institute leadership field is more complex, dynamic than in the past for producing committed teachers. Nelson (2003) asserts that contentment is reacted correlate with job dynamism. Thus, the objective of a teacher is working with hopes, desires and wishes that can be met in his workplace. Every activity happening in the institute occurs under the supervision of the education manager. An effective and excellent institute has an effective education manager (Ubben, Hughes, & Norris, 2001). All management strategies could not be applied uniquely in any situation by the education manager of any school. As management research initiated, questions began to arise concerning the interactions, managerial role and contentment of the individual within the organization. Managerial technique’s use is the prime need of time because humans are the social animals and are affected by sentiments, affiliations and affections. Thomas Bateman (2013) argues that in the time of challenges contentment keeps on the way of success.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Objectives of the study were:

- To analyze the impact of education managers’ managerial approaches on teacher's job contentment and dynamism at the secondary institute level.
To recommend appropriate strategies for effective managerial approaches of education managers at the secondary level.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study was descriptive and a survey approach was adopted. The study was descriptive in nature and a survey approach was adopted. The population of the study was comprised of education managers, secondary institute teachers and students of secondary classes. The sample of the study consisted of 250 respondents including; 10 education managers, 40 secondary institute teachers and 200 students of secondary classes with an equal ratio from urban and rural areas.

Table 1: Sample distribution of five management approaches of education manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Education manager</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictatorial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (1) represents the distribution of the sample selected based on five managerial approaches of education managers.

Education managers were selected on basis of their repute of managerial style by a discussion with senior staff members and management of the institute education department. The researcher also visited concerned institutes to verify the mode of management of education managers and filling the observation sheets. A random sampling technique was adopted for data collection. The questionnaire was used as a research tool for data collection based on a collection based on eight themes: encouraging functioning atmosphere, supervision, synchronization, accountability, performance, job wellbeing, gratitude & trustworthiness. The Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was found 0.943. After the validity and reliability of the research tools, the desired data was collected.

3.1. Data Analysis and Interpretation of the Findings

The collected data were analyzed by SPSS-21 through relevant statistical formulas as; frequency, percentage, mean score and standard deviation. The researcher converted open-ended questions into themes and such themes were converted into specific codes. The researcher fed data into datasheets for analysis.
4. FINDINGS

4.1. Encouraging Functioning Atmosphere

Table (2) represents an encouraging functioning atmosphere under education managers. According to data analysis, 51.2 % (36+15.2) of the respondents agreed with the statements about encouraging a functioning atmosphere under education managers, while 24 % (22.4%+19.2%) of the respondents disagreed, whereas 7.2% of the respondents undecided. Collectively most of the education managers 51.2 % (36+15.2) apply encouraging functioning atmosphere under their control. The Value of the standard deviation (S.D) 1.199 and the Mean value 2.69 supported the statements. Whereas Table (3) & Figure (1) represents the comparative percentage of the agreed respondents under egalitarian heads 89.58%, under realization oriented heads 81.25%, under contingency heads 66.66%, under lassies-lair heads 10.41%, under dictatorial heads, 08% agreed about encouraging functioning atmosphere under education managers. Synchronization, accountability, performance, job wellbeing, gratitude & trustworthiness.

Table 2: Education managers’ managerial approaches and teacher’s contentment and dynamism towards the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging atmosphere</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair supervision</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronization</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance,</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job wellbeing</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Results</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Frequency; bPercentage; cStrongly Disagree; dDisagree, eUndecided; fAgree; gStrongly Agree; hStandard deviation

Table 3: Teacher’s Contentment & Dynamism under Miscellaneous managerial approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education manager Approaches</th>
<th>Egalitarian</th>
<th>Dictatorial</th>
<th>Laissez-faire</th>
<th>Realization</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging atmosphere</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>89.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair supervision</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronization</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79.16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance,</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job wellbeing</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>89.58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gratitude & Trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gratitude</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>77.08</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>18.75</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>64.58</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>60.41</th>
<th>118</th>
<th>49.16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72.91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39.58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>52.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Results</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>26.82</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>56.76</td>
<td>49.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Comparative teacher contentment & dynamism in miscellaneous managerial approaches.

4.2. Fair Supervision

Table (1) represents education managers have fair supervision. According to data analysis, 51.2% (30.4+20.8) of the respondents agreed with the statements that education managers have fair supervision, while 39.6% (23.2%+16.4%) of the respondents disagreed, whereas 9.2% of the respondents undecided. Collectively most of 51.2% (30.4+20.8) education managers have fair supervision. The value of the standard deviation (S.D) 1.15 and the mean value 2.505 supported the statements.

Whereas Table (3) & Figure (1) represent the comparative percentage of the agreed respondents under egalitarian heads 91.66%, under realization oriented heads 75%, under contingency heads 58.33%, under laissez-faire heads 20.83%, under dictatorial heads mostly agreed that education managers have fair supervision separately.

4.3. Synchronization

Table (2) represents the education managers’ synchronization. According to data analysis, 46.8% (26.8%+20%) of the respondents agree with the statements about education managers’ synchronization, while 39.6% (20.8%+18.8%) of the respondents disagreed, whereas 13.6% of the respondents undecided. Collectively most of the education managers’ 46.8% (26.8%+20%) management is synchronized. The Value of the standard deviation (S.D) 1.136 and the mean value...
2.32 supported the statements. Whereas Table (3) & Figure (1) represents the comparative percentage of the agreed respondents under egalitarian heads 79.16%, under realization oriented heads 64.58%, under contingency heads 58.33%, under laissez-faire heads 12.5%, under dictatorial heads, 16.66% agreed that education managers’ management is synchronized separately.

4.4. Accountability

Table (2) represents education managers are accountable. According to data analysis, 48 % (24.8%+23.2%) of the respondents agree with the statements that the education manager is accountable, while 37.2 % (20%+17.2%) of the respondents disagreed, whereas 14.8% of the respondents undecided. Collectively most of the education managers 48 %( 24.8%+23.2%) are trustworthy. The Value of the standard deviation (S.D) 1.144 and the mean value 2.356 supported the statements. Whereas Table (3) & Figure (1) represent the comparative percentage of the agreed respondents under egalitarian heads 36%, under realization oriented heads 66.66%, under contingency heads 45.83%, under laissez-faire heads 45.83%, under dictatorial heads, 37.55% agreed that education manager is accountable separately.

4.5. Performance

Table (2) Represents teachers’ performance under the management of education managers. According to data analysis, 47.20 % (27.20%+20%) of the respondents agreed with the statements about performance under the management of education managers, while 42 %( 24%+18%) of the respondents disagreed, whereas 10.8% of the respondents undecided. Collectively most of the teachers 47.20 %( 27.20%+20%) perform management of the education managers. The value of the standard deviation (S.D) 1.262 and the mean value 2.56 supported the statements. Whereas Table 3 & Figure (1) represents the comparative percentage of the agreed respondents under egalitarian heads 83.33%, under realization oriented heads 56.25%, under contingency heads 45.83%, under laissez-faire heads 29.16%, under dictatorial heads, 20.83% agreed with teachers’ performance under the management of education managers separately.

4.6. Job Wellbeing

Table (2) Represents Job wellbeing under education managers’ control. According to data analysis, 48.4 %( 30%+18.4%) of the respondents agree with the statements about Job wellbeing under education managers’ control, while 38.4 %( 24%+14.4%) of the respondents disagreed, whereas 13.20% of the respondents undecided. Collectively most of the teachers 48.4 %(30%+18.4%) consider Job wellbeing under education managers’ control. The value of the standard deviation (S.D) 1.176 and the mean value 2.67 supported the statements. Whereas Table (3) & Figure (1) represents the comparative percentage of the agreed respondents under egalitarian heads 89.58%, under realization oriented heads 62.5%, under contingency heads 56.25%, under laissez-faire heads 31.25%, under dictatorial heads, 25% agreed about Job wellbeing under education managers’ control.

4.7. Gratitude

Table (2) Represents the education managers’ gratitude. According to data analysis, 45.6 %( 21.2%+24.4%) of the respondents agree with the statements that education managers’ gratitude with staff, while 42.4 %( 23.8%+21.6%) of the respondents disagreed, whereas 11.2% of the respondents undecided. Collectively most of the education managers 48.4 % (30%+18.4%) of
education managers’ gratitude with staff. The value of the standard deviation (S.D) 1.494 and the mean value 2.28 supported the statements. Whereas Table (3) & Figure (1) represents the comparative percentage of the agreed respondents under egalitarian heads 77.08%, under realization oriented heads 64.58%, under contingency heads 60.41%, under laissez-faire heads 25%, under dictatorial heads, 18.75% agreed about education managers’ gratitude with staff separately.

4.8. Trustworthiness

Table (2) Represents education manager is punctual. According to data analysis, 47.6 % (20%+27.6%) of the respondents agree with the statements that education manager is trustworthy, while 40% (26%+14%) of the respondents disagreed, whereas 12.4% of the respondents undecided. Collectively most of the education managers 47.6 % (20%+27.6%) are trustworthy. The value of the standard deviation (S.D) 1.244 and the mean value 2.69 supported the statements. Whereas Table (3) & Figure (1) represent the comparative percentage of the agreed respondents under egalitarian heads 72.91%, under realization oriented heads 62.5%, under contingency heads 62.5%, under laissez-faire heads 39.58%, under dictatorial heads, 22.91% agreed education manager is trustworthy separately.

5. DISCUSSION

The first theme of the study was related to management. According to research findings, it was explored that majority of the respondents agreed that education managers apply encouraging functioning atmosphere for teachers’ work, comparatively teachers were highly encouraged in egalitarian approaches, mostly in realization oriented approaches and then in contingency approaches but least in laissez-faire and dictatorial managerial approaches. The teacher who intrinsically content undertakes tasks satisfactorily (Din, 2008). It was confirmed that majority of the respondents agreed that education manager launches fair supervision comparatively teachers were highly agreed in egalitarian approaches, mostly in realization oriented approaches and then in contingency approaches but least in laissez-faire and dictatorial managerial approaches. It was depicted that the majority of the respondents agreed that education manager synchronized for duties, comparatively, teachers were highly agreed in egalitarian approaches, mostly in realization-oriented approaches and then in contingency approaches but least in laissez-faire and dictatorial managerial approaches. The education managers who are sensitive to approaches greatly impress institute staff members (Fook, 2004). It was revealed that majority of the respondents agreed that education manager is accountable, comparatively teachers were highly agreed in egalitarian approaches, mostly in realization-oriented approaches and then in contingency approaches but least in laissez-faire and dictatorial managerial approaches. The education manager is the role model to perform functional duties and inspiration for the staff (Sheilds, 2005). It was affirmed that the majority of the respondents agreed that education managers perform atmosphere, comparatively teachers were highly agreed in egalitarian approaches, mostly in realization oriented approaches then in contingency approaches but least in laissez-faire and dictatorial managerial approaches. It was found that majority of the respondents agreed that education managers create an atmosphere for job wellbeing for staff, comparatively teachers were highly agreed in egalitarian approaches, mostly in realization-oriented approaches and then in contingency approaches but least in laissez-faire and dictatorial managerial approaches. It was evident that the majority of the respondents
agreed about education managers’ gratitude, comparatively, teachers were highly agreed in egalitarian approaches, mostly in realization-oriented approaches and then in contingency approaches but least in laissez-faire and dictatorial managerial approaches. It was explored that majority of the education managers are trustworthy, have good management for contentment and dynamism of teachers but results proved that teachers are decidedly contentment in egalitarian approaches, mostly in realization approaches and then in contingency approaches but slightest contentment under laissez-faire and least in dictatorial managerial approaches.

6. CONCLUSION

The results of this study presented some evidence of the existence of the hypothesized relationship between education managers’ management approaches and teacher’s job contentment and dynamism. The study concluded that all five management approaches of education managers were found to have a significant relationship with teacher’s job contentment and dynamism.

Figure (2): Overall teacher contentment & dynamism in different managerial approaches

- Appreciation by heads increased the dynamism and contentment of staff along with mutual respect of staff reflection.
- Dynamism results of teachers were increased by assigning duties to staff according to capacities.
- Results showed that a discussion of matters with teachers increases the passion, devotion, and dedication of staff members.
- Results declared that education manager’s fair policies enhanced teacher contentment and dynamism.
- Comparative teacher contentment and dynamism differences results showed that teachers are highly contentment in egalitarian approaches, generally in realization approaches and then in contingency approaches but least contentment under laissez-faire and dictatorial managerial approaches.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of research findings and conclusions it was recommended that;
• Management training basis on new trends should be conducted for education managers at the secondary level.

• Egalitarian management approaches should be adopted by the education managers for effective institute management at the secondary level.
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