



Original Research Article

The destructive leadership of schools' principals and its relation to teacher's job satisfaction in Jordan

Received 25 February, 2021

Revised 13 April, 2021

Accepted 19 April, 2021

Published 23 April, 2021

Aieman Ahmad Al-Omari*¹

¹Faculty of Educational Sciences,
Department of Educational
Foundations and Administration, The
Hashemite University Zarqa, Jordan.

*Author's Email:
aieman66@hu.edu.jo,
aieman66@hotmail.com

Tel.:+962796618374

Using destructive leadership and job satisfaction questionnaires, this study aimed to determine the destructive leadership of school principals and its relationship to teachers' job satisfaction as perceived by teachers in Zarqa First Education Directorate-Jordan. The study included 465 teachers who worked in public schools, and their gender, education, and teaching experience were all recorded. All dimensions of destructive leadership were low, while all dimensions of teacher job satisfaction were moderate to high. There are no significant differences in teachers' perceptions of destructive leadership of school principals based on gender, education, or teaching experience. In terms of teacher job satisfaction, there were significant differences between male and female teachers in favour of female teachers, significant differences between teacher education in favour of graduate education, and significant differences among the three groups of teaching experience in teaching experience, with teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience having more job satisfaction than teachers with more than 5 years of teaching experience. There is no significant relationship between five dimensions of destructive leadership in school principals and nine dimensions of job satisfaction in teachers. Training sessions for teachers and principals, as well as additional research, are required in Jordan's various educational districts and schools.

Keywords: Destructive leadership, job satisfaction, principals, teachers, Jordan.

INTRODUCTION

This research deals with destructive leadership and job satisfaction. Destructive leadership defined by Einarsen et al. (2007) as the systematic and repeated behaviour by a leader that violates the legitimate interest of the organization by undermining and/ or disrupting the organization's goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, job satisfaction of subordinates. Schyns and Schilling (2013) added that it is a process that a longer period of time the activities of individuals are repeatedly influenced by their manager in a way perceived as aggressive and/or uncooperative. In addition to that

Krasikova et al. (2013) describe it as a volitional behaviour.

Einarsen et al. (2007) suggested a model for destructive leadership included two dimensions; behaviour oriented toward subordinates, and behaviour oriented toward the institution. These dimensions directed to four types of leadership: Tyrannical, Derailed, Supportive-loyal, and constructive leadership. Destructive leadership has two types of behaviour: passive and active. Passive can be regarded as leaders use when they have more or less abdicated from manager responsibilities. But active behaviour of leaders regarded when using punishment,

being arrogant employees, and considered more volitional behaviour (Einarsen et al., 2007). In this regard, according to Baumeister et al. (2001) negative situations tend to have effects on the person than positive situations, but positive situations can overcome negative one by greater force.

Research on constructive and destructive leadership has opposing results. Constructive leadership have more positive relations than destructive leadership has, with outputs like job satisfaction, work climate, and performance (ForsBrandebø et al., 2016; Schyns and Schilling, 2013). Destructive leadership have more negative relation than constructive leadership has, with commitment, emotional fatigue (ForsBrandebø et al., 2016; Schyns and Schilling, 2013).

Job satisfaction defined as positive and or negative judgments people make about their jobs (Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2011; Weiss, 2002). It has substantial effects on individuals' attitudes and behaviours (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2008). School administrators affect the satisfaction of teachers in schools (Bass and Avolio, 2000). Markow (2003) stated, Job satisfaction is often related to experiences with the leaders of the organization, teachers who are dissatisfied with their careers have less satisfying and less frequent interactions with the principal of their school.

Hackman and Oldham (1976) supposed that job satisfaction influenced by three psychological situations: meaningfulness, responsibility for outputs of the job, and knowledge the results of accomplishments. Meaningfulness prepared by three job features; variety of skill, identity of task, and task importance. Demographic variables like as age, gender, and education have an influence on job satisfaction (Alpass et al., 1997). Such as, job satisfaction increase with age (Agho et al., 1993; Lopes et al., 2015).

Destructive leadership studies have shown that there can be devastating effects on individuals, and organizations. On a personal level, destructive leadership is likely to have a number of negative consequences. Employees may have more negative attitudes toward the leader, may also have lower levels of job satisfaction, leading to an increased likelihood of an employee leaving the organization (Markow, 2003). Also, Destructive leaders increase the level of psychological stress employees experience (Erickson et al., 2015). Some researchers (Rosenthal and Pittinsky, 2006; Hogan and Hogan, 2001) emphasize on destructive leadership syndromes such as psychopathy that are associated with alienation and betrayal, and some researchers (Howell and Avolio, 1992) emphasize on behaviours like manipulation, intimidation, coercion, and one-way communication. Other researchers underscore the negative outcomes experienced by organizations and their employees and external stakeholders, (House and Howell, 1992; O'Connor et al., 1995; Sankowsky, 1995). Either way, destructive leadership results in undesirable outcomes.

On organizational level, employees with destructive leaders often end up hating their job and increasing their intention to leave, they can feel disrespect for the people

who hired them, which can then lead to an overall devaluing of their view of the organization, often feel depressed about their work life and have work consume all of their thoughts and private time (Erickson et al., 2015).

Some researchers concentrate on what destructive leaders do, as stress behaviour (Howell and Avolio, 1992; Conger, 1990; Hogan et al., 1990). Conger and Kanungo (1998) identifies a range of destructive behaviours common to narcissistic leaders, such as ignoring reality, overestimating personal capabilities, and disregarding the views of others. In addition to that, Hogan and Kaiser (2005) and Hogan and Hogan (2001) establish a taxonomy of 11 "dark side" personality categories, each related to leader behaviours that alienate coworkers, disrupt teams, and undermine group performance.

Organizational destructiveness arises when leaders bring misfortune to their followers, both internal and external stakeholders, and social institutions (Hogan and Kaiser, 2005; Kaiser and Hogan, 2007). Literature on constructive leadership has a greater effect on job satisfaction than destructive leadership (Schyns and Schilling, 2013), leaders have a great impact on how workers feel and view their work. Leadership and job satisfaction are correlated, Alpass et al. (1997), and Judge and Piccolo (2004) in their studies approve the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction.

While there is increasing attention in leadership, there remains a rarity of research that deals in such destructive leadership and job satisfaction in education sector. This study examines the destructive leadership of Schools Principal's and its relation to teacher's job Satisfaction as perceived by teachers in Zarqa governorate.

Problem of the Study and Research Questions

A survey of the related literature in Jordan indicated paucity of research that addressed the relationships between the Destructive Leadership of Schools Principal's and its relation to Teacher's Job Satisfaction as perceived their teachers in Zarqa governorate. Second, analyze the significant differences in Jordanian schools based in their gender, education, and teaching experience.

The investigation attempted to answer the following research questions:

Q1: How do teachers at Zarqa Governorate perceive the Destructive Leadership of Schools Principal's?

Q2: How do teachers at Zarqa Governorate perceive their Job Satisfaction?

Q3: Are there significant relationships between the Destructive Leadership of Schools Principal's and Teacher's Job Satisfaction as perceived their teachers?

Q4: Do the Destructive Leadership of Schools Principal's differ based on teachers' gender, education, and teaching experience?

Q5: Do Teacher's Job Satisfaction differ based on teachers' gender, education, and teaching experience?

Significance of Study

This study is important for several reasons. Destructive leadership behaviour influences the job satisfaction of subordinates at any given organization (Erickson et al., 2015). The findings of this study will contribute to the knowledge of leadership behaviour and destructive leadership, and employees job satisfaction.

This data will further help leaders recognize how leadership may have an effect on job satisfaction and school teachers job satisfaction. The study may also suggest areas where additional research in destructive leadership and teachers job satisfaction is needed. It is likewise anticipated that these findings could improve the way educational organizations operate and leaders lead.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study is a quantitative conducting through utilizing the relationships between the Destructive Leadership of Schools Principal's and Teacher's Job Satisfaction as perceived their teachers. and do teachers differ regarding to their gender, education, and teaching experience.

Population and Sample of Study

The population of study consists of all teachers who are working in Zarqa first education directorate during second semester of academic year 2018/2019, with total number of (465), (Female= 195; Male= 270). A stratified proportional random sample was selected for the purpose of this study representing (465) faculty members (Female= 195, male= 270) based on teachers' gender, education (Bachelor degree = 245, Graduate studies = 220, and teaching experience (1-5 years=192, more than 5 - 10 years = 139, and over 10 years = 134).

Measurement

Destructive leadership behaviours: A questionnaire developed depends on Larsson et al. (2012) work. The questionnaire consisted 20-items, with five factors with four items in each: (1) arrogant, unfair: (makes subordinates stupid, behaves arrogant, treats people differently, and is unpleasant); (2) threats, punishments, over-demands: (shows violent tendencies, punishes subordinates who make mistakes or do not reach set goals, uses threats to get his/ her way, and puts unreasonable demands); (3) ego-oriented, false: (takes the honor of subordinates' work, puts own needs ahead of the group's, does not trust his/ her subordinates, and does not keep promises); (4) passive, cowardly: (does not dare to confront others, does not show up among subordinates, does not show an active interest, and does not take a grip

on things); and (5) uncertain, unclear, messy: (shows insecurity in his/ her role, is bad at structuring an planning, gives unclear instructions, and behaves confused). The response scale on all items ranged from 1 Never or almost never to 5 Very often or always.

Job satisfaction: To measure job satisfaction, a questionnaire that used in this study developed by Spector (1994). The job satisfaction is a self-report instrument that is designed to measure employee attitudes about the job itself and various aspects of the job (Spector, 1985). The instrument is comprised of 36 items that are divided into to nine facets to include (a) pay: (I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do, Raises are too few and far between, I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me, and I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases); (b) promotion: (There is really too little chance for promotion on my job, Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted, People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places, and I am satisfied with my chances for promotion); (c) supervision: (My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job, My supervisor is unfair to me, My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates, and I like my supervisor); (d) fringe benefits: (I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive, The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer, The benefit package we have is equitable, There are benefits we do not have which we should have); (e) contingent rewards: (When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive, I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated, There are few rewards for those who work here, and I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be); (f) operating procedures: (Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult, My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape, I have too much to do at work, and I have too much paperwork); (g) coworkers: (I like the people I work with, I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with, I enjoy my coworkers, and There is too much bickering and fighting at work); (h) nature of work: (I sometimes feel my job is meaningless, I like doing the things I do at work, I feel a sense of pride in doing my job, and My job is enjoyable); and (i) communication: (Communications seem good within this organization, The goals of this organization are not clear to me, I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization, and Work assignments are not fully explained). The instrument has been tested and retested across multiple organizations that range from education to retail (Thomas, 2014). It uses a 5-point Likert response scale that ranges from 1 (disagree very much) to 5 (agree very much).

Instrument Validity

For the purpose of examining the validity of the instrument in this study (face validity evidence) it was presented to six experts in educational administration, research and

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviation for the teachers perceived destructive leadership behavior of principals' at Zarqa Governorate schools

Destructive leadership Factors	Mean	SD	Level
arrogant, unfair	1.34	.323	Low
threats, punishments, over-demands	1.26	.370	Low
ego-oriented, false	1.44	.299	Low
passive, cowardly	1.65	.375	Low
uncertain, unclear, messy	1.51	.357	Low
Total	1.44	.193	Low

evaluation and educational measurement. They were asked to check whether the statements in the instrument are clear and linked appropriately with the problem of study. Based on the experts' comments, some revisions regarding to the language were done to the instrument.

Instrument Reliability

Regarding the reliability of the instrument in this study, an internal consistency procedure (to estimate the consistency across the items) was used. A pilot study of 30 participants had been conducted. Those participants did not participate in the final study. The instructions were clear and all of the items of instrument functioning in appropriate manner. The values of alpha (the internal consistency coefficient) for dimensions of instrument "Destructive leadership behaviours" were as follows: The questionnaire consists of five factors with four items in each: (1) arrogant, unfair, Cronbach alpha: 0.72; (2) threats, punishments, over-demands, Cronbach alpha: 0.74; (3) ego-oriented, false, Cronbach alpha: 0.76; (4) passive, cowardly, Cronbach alpha: 0.83; and (5) uncertain, unclear, messy, Cronbach alpha: .89.

The values of alpha (the internal consistency coefficient) for the job satisfaction questionnaire dimensions: Pay- Pay or remuneration= 0.77, Promotion- opportunities for promotion= 0.81, Supervision- Immediate supervisor= 0.84, Fringe benefits- monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits=0.83, Contingent rewards=0.83, Contingent procedures=0.87, Coworkers=0.79, Nature of work=0.78, Communication= 0.86. The previous values can be considered reasonably satisfactory to achieve the objectives of the current study.

The researcher followed Brislin's (1970) backwards translation method for converting the survey from English to Arabic. The original English version was first translated into Arabic by a professional translator. Then the Arabic version was translated back into English by a second native speaker who was unfamiliar with the original version. The two version was then compared discrepancies identified and discussed, and refinements made to the Arabic version.

Collection and Analysis of Data

Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used to analyze

the data. Means, standard deviations, and ANOVA analysis were calculated for the research questions. Regarding to the cut points, the response scale of each item that ranged from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very often) will be determine as follows: 1-2.33 = low, 2.34 to 3.67 = moderate, and 3.68-5.00 = high.

RESULTS

Q1: How do teachers at Zarqa Governorate perceive the Destructive Leadership of Schools Principals'?

Means and standard deviations for the teachers perceived destructive leadership of principals' in Jordanian schools were measured for each dimension: arrogant, unfair (M=1.34, SD=.323) with low-level perception, threats, punishments, over demands (M=1.26, SD=.370) with low-level perception, ego-oriented, false (M=1.44, SD=.299) with low-level perception, passive, cowardly (M=1.65, SD=.375) with low-level perception, and uncertain, unclear, messy (M=1.51, SD=.357) with low-level perception (Table 1). The destructive leadership behaviour of principals at Zarqa Governorate schools as perceived by teachers was (M=1.44, SD=.193) with low-level perception.

Q2: How do teachers at Zarqa Governorate perceive their job satisfaction?

The means and standard deviations for the teachers perceived their job satisfaction at Zarqa Governorate schools were measured. The job satisfaction as perceived by teachers as total (M=3.71, SD=.658) with high-level perception, as presented in Table 2. The following dimensions were coming in high-level: pay-pay or remuneration (M=3.79, SD=.707), promotion-opportunities for promotion (M=3.91, SD=.781), supervision-immediate supervisor (M=3.83, SD=.742), and fringe benefits-monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits (M=3.86, SD=.688), while the following dimensions were coming in moderate level: contingent rewards (M=3.57, SD=.851), contingent procedures (M=3.60, SD=.765), coworkers (M=3.67, SD=.932), nature of work (M=3.62, SD=.870), and communication (M=3.53, SD=.829).

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviation for Job Satisfaction of teachers at Zarqa Governorate schools

	Mean	SD	Level
Pay- Pay or remuneration	3.79	.707	High
Promotion- opportunities for promotion	3.91	.781	High
Supervision- Immediate supervisor	3.83	.742	High
Fringe benefits- monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits	3.86	.688	High
Contingent rewards	3.57	.851	Moderate
Contingent procedures	3.60	.765	Moderate
Coworkers	3.67	.932	Moderate
Nature of work	3.62	.870	Moderate
Communication	3.53	.829	Moderate
Total	3.71	.658	High

Table 3. t-test, means and standard deviation for the difference between male and female in the perceived Destructive Leadership of Schools Principal's

Destructive leadership factors	Gender	N	Means	SD	T	P
arrogant, unfair	M	270	1.34	.332	.535	.593
	F	195	1.33	.310		
threats, punishments, over-demands	M	270	1.26	.375	.070	.944
	F	195	1.26	.364		
ego-oriented, false	M	270	1.45	.305	1.304	.193
	F	195	1.41	.291		
passive, cowardly	M	270	1.66	.393	1.102	.271
	F	195	1.62	.348		
uncertain, unclear, messy	M	270	1.51	.355	.042	.966
	F	195	1.51	.361		
Total	M	270	1.44	.198	.995	.320
	F	195	1.43	.186		

Table 4. t-test, means and standard deviation for the difference between "education" teachers in the perceived Destructive Leadership of Schools Principal's

Destructive leadership Factors	Education	N	Means	SD	T	P
arrogant, unfair	Bachelor	245	1.35	.328	.678	.498
	Graduate	220	1.33	.317		
threats, punishments, over-demands	Bachelor	245	1.27	.376	.773	.440
	Graduate	220	1.25	.363		
ego-oriented, false	Bachelor	245	1.45	.294	1.018	.309
	Graduate	220	1.42	.305		
passive, cowardly	Bachelor	245	1.65	.348	.271	.786
	Graduate	220	1.64	.403		
uncertain, unclear, messy	Bachelor	245	1.51	.387	.451	.652
	Graduate	220	1.50	.321		
Total	Bachelor	245	1.45	.191	1.106	.269
	Graduate	220	1.43	.196		

Q3: Do the Destructive Leadership of Schools Principal's differ based on teachers' gender, education, and teaching experience?

Gender

t-test were used to examine the difference in means between male and female teachers perceived. Related to gender; Table 3 shows that there were no significant

differences between male and female teachers in the perceived destructive leadership of principals.

Education

t-test were used to examine the difference in means between teachers perceived. Related to their "education"; Table 4 shows that there were no significant differences between "education" teachers in the perceived destructive

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviation for perceived destructive leadership behavior of principals at Zarqa Governorate schools related to teachers "teaching experience"

Dimensions	Teaching experience	N	Mean	SD
arrogant, unfair	1-5 years	192	1.31	.329
	Over 5-10 years	139	1.32	.285
	Over 10 years	134	1.39	.345
	Total	465	1.34	.323
threats, punishments, over-demands	1-5 years	192	1.23	.364
	Over 5-10 years	139	1.26	.360
	Over 10 years	134	1.29	.387
	Total	465	1.26	.370
ego-oriented, false	1-5 years	192	1.43	.323
	Over 5-10 years	139	1.44	.279
	Over 10 years	134	1.42	.286
	Total	465	1.43	.299
passive, cowardly	1-5 years	192	1.68	.412
	Over 5-10 years	139	1.61	.320
	Over 10 years	134	1.63	.369
	Total	465	1.65	.375
uncertain, unclear, messy	1-5 years	192	1.51	.364
	Over 5-10 years	139	1.50	.335
	Over 10 years	134	1.50	.372
	Total	465	1.51	.357
Total	1-5 years	192	1.43	.203
	Over 5-10 years	139	1.43	.172
	Over 10 years	134	1.45	.201
	Total	465	1.44	.193

Table 6. Three-Way ANOVA, the difference among the teachers in the perceived Destructive Leadership of Schools' Principals related to their teaching experience

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
arrogant, unfair	Between groups	.553	2	.276	2.664	.071
	Within groups	47.938	462	.104		
	Total	48.491	464			
threats, punishments, over-demands	Between groups	.287	2	.144	1.049	.351
	Within groups	63.247	462	.137		
	Total	63.534	464			
ego-oriented, false	Between groups	.027	2	.013	.149	.862
	Within groups	41.727	462	.090		
	Total	41.753	464			
passive, cowardly	Between groups	.422	2	.211	1.501	.224
	Within groups	64.890	462	.140		
	Total	65.311	464			
uncertain, unclear, messy	Between groups	.011	2	.006	.044	.957
	Within groups	59.355	462	.128		
	Total	59.366	464			
Total	Between groups	.033	2	.016	.438	.645
	Within groups	17.381	462	.038		
	Total	17.414	464			

leadership of principals.

Teaching experience

Related to the teachers teaching experience; Table 5 showed mean and standard deviation of dimensions for

perceived destructive leadership of principals regarding to teachers' "teaching experience".

By utilizing three-way analysis of variance, as can be observed in Table 6, shows that there were no significant differences among the three groups of teaching experience in teaching experience.

Table 7. t-test, means and standard deviation for the difference between male and female teachers in their job satisfaction

Dimensions	Gender	n	Means	SD	t	P
Pay- Pay or remuneration	M	270	3.63	.635	-5.680	.000
	F	195	4.01	.744		
Promotion- opportunities for promotion	M	270	3.71	.790	-7.115	.000
	F	195	4.20	.676		
Supervision- Immediate supervisor	M	270	3.66	.786	-6.485	.000
	F	195	4.08	.600		
Fringe benefits- monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits	M	270	3.72	.689	-5.392	.000
	F	195	4.06	.640		
Contingent rewards	M	270	3.36	.805	-6.712	.000
	F	195	3.87	.824		
Contingent procedures	M	270	3.40	.731	-6.882	.000
	F	195	3.87	.726		
Coworkers	M	270	3.37	.942	-8.916	.000
	F	195	4.07	.748		
Nature of work	M	270	3.37	.909	-8.297	.000
	F	195	3.97	.670		
Communication	M	270	3.31	.799	-7.138	.000
	F	195	3.83	.774		
Total	M	270	3.50	.654	-8.806	.000
	F	195	4.00	.549		

Table 8. t-test, means and standard deviation for the difference between "education" in teachers job satisfaction

	Education	n	Means	SD	t	p
Pay- Pay or remuneration	Bachelor	245	3.67	.659	-3.814	.000
	Graduate	220	3.92	.736		
Promotion- opportunities for promotion	Bachelor	245	3.77	.794	-4.379	.000
	Graduate	220	4.08	.734		
Supervision- Immediate supervisor	Bachelor	245	3.69	.779	-4.705	.000
	Graduate	220	4.00	.663		
Fringe benefits- monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits	Bachelor	245	3.73	.694	-4.630	.000
	Graduate	220	4.02	.650		
Contingent rewards	Bachelor	245	3.38	.824	-5.432	.000
	Graduate	220	3.79	.829		
Contingent procedures	Bachelor	245	3.42	.740	-5.579	.000
	Graduate	220	3.80	.742		
Coworkers	Bachelor	245	3.42	.956	-6.286	.000
	Graduate	220	3.94	.823		
Nature of work	Bachelor	245	3.40	.919	-6.097	.000
	Graduate	220	3.87	.738		
Communication	Bachelor	245	3.33	.811	-5.459	.000
	Graduate	220	3.74	.798		
Total	Bachelor	245	3.53	.665	-6.401	.000
	Graduate	220	3.91	.594		

Q4: Do Teacher's Job Satisfaction differ based on teachers' gender, education, and teaching experience?

Gender

t-test were used to examine the difference in means between male and female teachers perceived. Related to gender; Table 7 shows that there were significant differences between male and female teachers in their job

satisfaction in favour for female teachers as it showed in Means of dimensions of job satisfaction.

Education:

t-test were used to examine the difference in means between "education" teachers perceived. Related to "education"; Table 8 shows that there were significant differences between "education" teachers in their job

Table 9. Means and Standard Deviation for teachers' job satisfaction at Zarqa Governorate schools related to "teaching experience"

Dimensions	Teaching experience	N	Mean	SD
Pay- Pay or remuneration	1-5 years	192	4.17	.772
	Over 5-10 years	139	3.56	.565
	Over 10 years	134	3.47	.428
	Total	465	3.79	.707
Promotion- opportunities for promotion	1-5 years	192	4.33	.576
	Over 5-10 years	139	3.69	.739
	Over 10 years	134	3.55	.802
	Total	465	3.91	.781
Supervision- Immediate supervisor	1-5 years	192	4.12	.605
	Over 5-10 years	139	3.60	.540
	Over 10 years	134	3.66	.942
	Total	465	3.83	.742
Fringe benefits- monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits	1-5 years	192	4.14	.605
	Over 5-10 years	139	3.38	.554
	Over 10 years	134	3.98	.663
	Total	465	3.86	.688
Contingent rewards	1-5 years	192	4.00	.893
	Over 5-10 years	139	3.38	.751
	Over 10 years	134	3.17	.577
	Total	465	3.57	.851
Contingent procedures	1-5 years	192	3.89	.838
	Over 5-10 years	139	3.22	.487
	Over 10 years	134	3.57	.716
	Total	465	3.60	.765
Coworkers	1-5 years	192	4.10	.714
	Over 5-10 years	139	3.26	.698
	Over 10 years	134	3.47	1.148
	Total	465	3.67	.932
Nature of work	1-5 years	192	4.07	.760
	Over 5-10 years	139	3.37	.616
	Over 10 years	134	3.24	.958
	Total	465	3.62	.870
Communication	1-5 years	192	3.86	.918
	Over 5-10 years	139	3.23	.570
	Over 10 years	134	3.36	.758
	Total	465	3.53	.829
Total	1-5 years	192	4.08	.622
	Over 5-10 years	139	3.41	.435
	Over 10 years	134	3.50	.654
	Total	465	3.71	.658

satisfaction in favour for "graduate education".

Teaching experience

Related to the teachers "teaching experience"; Table 9 showed mean and standard deviation of dimensions for job satisfaction regarding to teachers "teaching experience".

By utilizing three-way analysis of variance, as can be observed in Table 10, shows that there were significant differences among the three groups of teachers in "teaching experience".

To assess pairwise differences among the levels of teachers "teaching experience" toward job satisfaction, the LSD procedures ($p=.05$) was performed (Table 11).

Regarding (1-5) years "teaching experience" toward job satisfaction ($M=4.08$) differ significantly from (5-10) years "teaching experience" ($M= 3.41$) at $p=.00$ and (10 and over) years of "teaching experience" ($M=3.50$). This means that teacher with 1-5 years of "teaching experience" have more job satisfaction than other "teaching experience" level of teachers.

Q5: Are there significant relationships between the Destructive Leadership of Schools Principal's and Teacher's Job Satisfaction as perceived their teachers?

Table 12 displays the correlation matrix between the Destructive Leadership of Schools Principal's and Teacher's

Table 10. Three-Way ANOVA, the difference among the teachers in their job satisfaction related to their "teaching experience"

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Pay- Pay or remuneration	Between groups	49.483	2	24.742	62.623	.000
	Within groups	182.531	462	.395		
	Total	232.015	464			
Promotion- opportunities for promotion	Between groups	58.703	2	29.351	60.363	.000
	Within groups	224.648	462	.486		
	Total	283.351	464			
Supervision- Immediate supervisor	Between groups	27.368	2	13.684	27.644	.000
	Within groups	228.696	462	.495		
	Total	256.064	464			
Fringe benefits- monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits	Between groups	48.975	2	24.488	66.152	.000
	Within groups	171.019	462	.370		
	Total	219.995	464			
Contingent rewards	Between groups	61.829	2	30.915	51.969	.000
	Within groups	274.829	462	.595		
	Total	336.658	464			
Contingent procedures	Between groups	36.252	2	18.126	35.572	.000
	Within groups	235.418	462	.510		
	Total	271.670	464			
Coworkers	Between groups	62.667	2	31.334	42.527	.000
	Within groups	340.397	462	.737		
	Total	403.064	464			
Nature of work	Between groups	66.399	2	33.200	53.797	.000
	Within groups	285.116	462	.617		
	Total	351.516	464			
Communication	Between groups	37.028	2	18.514	30.288	.000
	Within groups	282.409	462	.611		
	Total	319.437	464			
Total	Between groups	44.190	2	22.095	64.905	.000
	Within groups	157.273	462	.340		
	Total	201.463	464			

Job Satisfaction as perceived their teachers. The results of the Pearson Correlational analysis revealed that negative relationship but no significant correlation exists between five dimensions of destructive leadership of schools' principals and nine dimensions of teachers' job satisfaction.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The present study examined the relationships between the destructive leadership of principals and teacher's job satisfaction as perceived their teachers. All dimensions of destructive leadership were in low level: arrogant, unfair, threats, punishments, over demands, ego-oriented, false, passive, cowardly, and uncertain, unclear, messy. All dimensions of teachers' job satisfaction were in moderate and high level: The following were coming in high-level: pay-pay or remuneration, promotion-opportunities for promotion, supervision-immediate supervisor, and fringe benefits-monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits, and the following were coming in moderate level: contingent rewards, contingent procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication.

No significant differences between male and female

teachers in the perceived destructive leadership of Principals. No significant differences between "education" of teachers in the perceived destructive leadership of principals, there were no significant differences among the three groups of teachers in "teaching experience" variable.

There were significant differences between male and female teachers in their job satisfaction in favour for female teachers as it showed in Means of dimensions of job satisfaction, that there were significant differences between "education" teachers in their job satisfaction in favour for "graduate education". There were significant differences among the three groups of teachers in "teaching experience". Regarding (1-5) years "teaching experience" toward job satisfaction (M=4.08) differ significantly from (5-10) years "teaching experience" (M= 3.41) at $p=.00$ and (10 and over) years of "teaching experience" (M=3.50). This means that teacher with 1-5 years of "teaching experience" have more job satisfaction than other "teaching experience" level of teachers.

No significant correlation exists between five dimensions of destructive leadership of principals and nine dimensions of teachers' job satisfaction. It is important to point out that the correlation was not significant. It is possible, however, that the five destructive leadership behaviour selected for the

Table 11.LSD multiple comparisons for teachers' job satisfaction regarding to their "teaching experience"

Dependent Variable	(I) experience	(J) experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Pay- Pay or remuneration	1-5	5-10	.613*	.070	.000
		10 OVER	.705*	.070	.000
	5-10	1-5	-.613*	.070	.000
		10 OVER	.092	.076	.224
	10 OVER	1-5	-.705*	.070	.000
		5-10	-.092-	.076	.224
Promotion- opportunities for promotion	1-5	5-10	.647*	.077	.000
		10 OVER	.782*	.078	.000
	5-10	1-5	-.647*	.077	.000
		10 OVER	.134	.084	.111
	10 OVER	1-5	-.782*	.078	.000
		5-10	-.134-	.084	.111
Supervision- Immediate supervisor	1-5	5-10	.521*	.078	.000
		10 OVER	.457*	.079	.000
	5-10	1-5	-.521*	.078	.000
		10 OVER	-.063-	.085	.455
	10 OVER	1-5	-.457*	.079	.000
		5-10	.063	.085	.455
Fringe benefits- monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits	1-5	5-10	.759*	.067	.000
		10 OVER	.157*	.068	.022
	5-10	1-5	-.759*	.067	.000
		10 OVER	-.601*	.073	.000
	10 OVER	1-5	-.157*	.068	.022
		5-10	.601*	.073	.000
Contingent rewards	1-5	5-10	.615*	.085	.000
		10 OVER	.830*	.086	.000
	5-10	1-5	-.615*	.085	.000
		10 OVER	.215*	.093	.022
	10 OVER	1-5	-.830*	.086	.000
		5-10	-.215*	.093	.022
Contingent procedures	1-5	5-10	.668*	.079	.000
		10 OVER	.326*	.080	.000
	5-10	1-5	-.668*	.079	.000
		10 OVER	-.342*	.086	.000
	10 OVER	1-5	-.326*	.080	.000
		5-10	.342*	.086	.000
Coworkers	1-5	5-10	.830*	.095	.000
		10 OVER	.620*	.096	.000
	5-10	1-5	-.830*	.095	.000
		10 OVER	-.209*	.103	.044
	10 OVER	1-5	-.620*	.096	.000
		5-10	.209*	.103	.044
Nature of work	1-5	5-10	.693*	.087	.000
		10 OVER	.829*	.088	.000
	5-10	1-5	-.693*	.087	.000
		10 OVER	.135	.095	.156
	10 OVER	1-5	-.829*	.088	.000
		5-10	-.135-	.095	.156
Communication	1-5	5-10	.625*	.087	.000
		10 OVER	.502*	.088	.000
	5-10	1-5	-.625*	.087	.000
		10 OVER	-.122-	.094	.195
	10 OVER	1-5	-.502*	.088	.000
		5-10	.122	.094	.195
Total	1-5	5-10	.664*	.064	.000
		10 OVER	.579*	.065	.000
	5-10	1-5	-.664*	.064	.000
		10 OVER	-.084-	.070	.233
	10 OVER	1-5	-.579*	.065	.000
		5-10	.084	.070	.233

Table 12. Correlations Matrix: Pearson Correlations among Destructive Leadership Dimensions of school principals and teachers job satisfaction as perceived by their teachers.

	arrogant, unfair	threats, punishments, over-demands	ego- oriented, false	passive, cowardly	uncertain, unclear, messy	Total
Pay- Pay or remuneration	-.098	-.048	-.031	-.061	-.085	-.049
Promotion- opportunities for promotion	-.059	-.033	-.003	-.067	-.049	-.026
Supervision- Immediate supervisor	-.021	-.038	-.026	-.109	-.015	-.018
Fringe benefits- monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits	-.046	-.004	-.005	.058	-.045	-.018
Contingent rewards	-.043	-.045	-.018	-.061	-.003	-.001
Contingent procedures	-.046	-.043	-.027	-.082	-.003	-.009
Coworkers	-.024	-.044	-.018	-.069	-.027	-.014
Nature of work	-.047	-.047	-.019	-.072	-.003	-.013
Communication	-.045	-.031	-.002	-.063	-.036	-.015
Total	-.046	-.045	-.007	-.086	-.030	-.012

present study ((1) arrogant, unfair, (2) threats, punishments, over-demands, (3) ego-oriented, false, (4) passive, cowardly, and (5) uncertain, unclear, messy) are not the ones that affected teachers job satisfaction.

The findings of the present study provide an important addition to the field of leadership studies and help to address the limited research related to destructive leadership and relationship to job satisfaction. This data has the potential to help individuals improve leader-follower relationships by increasing training in the practice of preventing destructive leadership behaviour and it is linked to follower job satisfaction. Promoting destructive leadership on a global scale will allow a greater number of leaders to realize the negative aspects of using destructive leadership behaviour in leading their organization and building a job satisfaction among their followers and increasingly satisfied with their job.

Findings herein may prompt action from both key stakeholders in the study and scholars in the field of destructive leadership behaviour and job satisfaction. In light of the data suggesting administrators within the Educational System responsible for leadership training would benefit from providing training in the principles of leadership. This training could potentially improve administrators' leadership behaviour that could in turn raise job satisfaction of all teachers.

Further research is recommended to conduct similar studies within populations involving different education sectors in order to verify the claim that destructive leadership and job satisfaction is grounded in basic education standards. Regarding destructive leadership and job satisfaction more studies are needed.

Conflict of interests

The author declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Agho AO, Mueller CW, Price JL (1993). Determinants of employee job satisfaction: An empirical test of a causal model. *Human Relations*. 46(8): 1007–1027.
- Alpass F, Long N, Chamberlain K, MacDonald C (1997). Job satisfaction differences between military and ex-military personnel: The role of demographic and organizational variables. *Military Psychology*. 9(3): 227–249.
- Baumeister RF, Bratslavsky E, Finkenauer C, Vohs KE (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*. 5(4): 323–370.
- Bass BM, Avolio BJ (2000). Technical report, leaders form, rater form and scoring key for the MLQ form 5x short. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies, Binghamton University
- Brislin RW (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 1(3): 185–216.
- Conger J (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*. 19(2): 44–55.
- Conger J, Kanungo R (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Einarsen S, Aasland MS, Skogstad A (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 18(3): 207–216.
- Erickson A, Shaw B, Murray J, Branch S (2015). Destructive leadership: Causes, consequences and countermeasures. *Organizational Dynamics*. 44(4): 266–272.
- Fors Brandebo M, Nilsson S, Larsson G (2016). Leadership: Is bad stronger than good? *Leadership & Organization Development J*. 37(6): 690–710.
- Hackman JR, Oldham GR (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*. 16(2):250–279.
- Hogan R, Hogan J (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from

- the dark side. *International J. Selection and Assessment*. 9(1-2): 40-51.
- Hogan R, Kaiser R (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*. 9(2): 169-180.
- Hogan R, Raskin R, Fazzini D (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K. Clark, & M. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343-354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- House R, Howell J (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*. 3: 81-108.
- Howell JM, Avolio BJ (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*. 6(2):43-54.
- Judge TA, Piccolo RF (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 89(5):755-768.
- Kaiser RB, Hogan R (2007). The dark side of discretion: Leader personality and organizational decline. In R. Hooijberg, J. Hunt, J. Antonakis, & K. Boal (Eds.), *Being there even when you are not: Leading through strategy, systems and structures*, Monographs in leadership and management, Vol. 4. (pp. 177-197) London: Elsevier Science.
- Krasikova DV, Green S, LeBreton JM (2013). Destructive leadership: A theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda. *J. Manag.* 39(5): 1308-1338.
- Kreitner R, Kinicki A (2008). *Organizational behaviour* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Larsson G, Fors Brandebo M, Nilsson S (2012). Destrudo-L: Development of a short scale designed to measure destructive leadership behaviours in a military context. *Leadership & Organization Development J.* 33(4): 383-400.
- Lopes S, Chambel MJ, Castanheira F, Oliveira-Cruz F (2015). Measuring job satisfaction in Portuguese military sergeants and officers: Validation of the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General Scale. *Military Psychology*. 27(1): 52-63.
- Markow D (2003). *MetLife survey of the American teacher. Key elements of quality schools*. New York, NY: Louis and Harris and Associates.
- O'Connor J, Mumford M, Clifton T, Gessner T, Connelly M (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: An historiometric study. *Leadership Quarterly*. 6: 529-555.
- Rosenthal SA, Pittinsky TL (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*. 17: 617-633.
- Sankowsky D (1995). The charismatic leader as a narcissist: Understanding the abuse of power. *Organizational Dynamics*. 23: 57-71.
- Schyns B, Schilling J (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 24(1): 138-158.
- Skaalvik E, Skaalvik S (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 27: 1029-1038.
- Spector P (1985). Measure of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American J. Community Psychol.* 13: 693-713.
- Spector P (1994). *Job satisfaction survey*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.
- Thomas S (2014). *The effects of principal leadership behaviour on new teachers' overall job satisfaction*. Doctoral dissertation, Walden University.
- Weiss HM (2002). Deconstruction job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*. 12(2): 173-194.