A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' HAPPINESS AND EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

Assist. Prof. Dr. Vali MEHDINEZHAD
Department of Education
Faculty of Education and Psychology,
University of Sistan and Baluchestan,
University Boulevard, Zahedan, IRAN

ABSTRACT

This study was focused on high school principals' happiness and effective instructional management and also the relation between them. The methodology of this research was descriptive and correlative. The two questionnaires employed here were "*The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire*" and "*Principal Effectiveness Measures*" with five component measures of effective principal. SPSS 15 was used to produce Mean; Standard Deviations; Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r); t-test; and ANOVA. The results of the study showed that the high school principals described their happiness in high level and also in overall marked high scores on effective instructional management and components of effective management: Organizational Commitment (OC); Sense of Community (SoC); Productivity and Effort (PaE); Job Satisfaction (JS); and Employee Morale (EM). There was relatively high positive correlation between principals' happiness and effective instructional management and components of effective management. The analysis of data showed that there were no significant differences on principals' happiness and effective instructional management in terms of their background, such as age, sex, marital status, teaching and management experiences.

Keywords: High school principals, Happiness, Effective instructional management, components of effective management.

INTRODUCTION

According to Honefelder (1986) happiness is a phenomenon that has taken on an almost mythical dimension for mankind. Philosophers such as Lao-Tse, Aristotle, Blaise Pascal, poet and author Thomas Mann, the Brothers Grimm or Henrich von Kleist, noted that happiness is relevant to most (if not all) people. In addition to philosophers, writers and poets have argued that in 20th century, along with scientists in psychology, sociology, education and economics, happiness plays a part in their fields.

Almost all people would like to be happy. Argyle (2001:1) believed that for most people, happiness is the main, if not only, "ultimate objective in life". Frey & Stutzer (2000a:148) stated that happiness can be understood as "lasting, complete and justified satisfaction with life as a whole". Argyle (2001) refers to three aspects which can be used to define happiness. Happiness can be understood as (1) a state of joy or other positive emotion, (2) as being satisfied with one's life, or (3) the absence of depression, anxiety or other negative emotions.

Most people would agree that happiness has some effects on behavior. For example, by displaying positive non-verbal communication, happy people have better social relations and deal with conflicts constructively. They also have better social skills (Berry & Wilingham 1997). Happy people also smile more often than others or are more optimistic (Myers & Diner, 1996).

Some researchers believe that happiness is equivalent to "pleasure", "well-being" and even "positive psychology". For example, Mill (1993: 144) wrote: "By happiness is intended pleasure, and the absence of

pain". Kahneman and Schwarz (1999) stated that, recognizing all the complications we've discussed so far, social scientists today often use well-being as a definition of happiness.

Currently, in organizational behavior, very few research has been initiated which delineate psychological wellbeing of employees from the perspective of happiness (Bohem and Lyubomirsky, 2008). Earlier, wellbeing was correlated to work performance and quality of work life. It was assumed that the greater the wellbeing at workplace, the greater the performance, productivity and commitment of employees.

In the present scenario, the term "wellbeing" has been defined from varied perspectives and it is now widely accepted that to measure the success of an organization, the wellbeing of employees must be considered in terms of "happiness" (Aristotle, 1947; and Deci and Ryan, 2008). Happiness indicates the highest of all goods achievable by human actions and the feelings accompanying behavior in the direction of, and consistent with, one's true potential. It also indicates whether and to what extent an individual is dealing with the existential challenges of life, focusing on self-realization and whether the person is fully functioning, leading to satisfaction in all aspects of life (Ryff, 1989).

According to Dean (2010) studies have shown that: Happy people are kinder and more helpful to others i.e. increased altruism; happy people are more successful and show more effective leadership; they have better physical health, adding up to nine years to life expectancy; they have better mental health, i.e. less depression, and a more healthy self esteem; happy people can think more effectively and expansively; happy people are more likely to change the world in a positive way than unhappy people; and instructor's happiness is correlated with high participation rates in school activities. Nadler et al. (in press) found out the people are with better mood [happiness] have better performance. Indeed they believe theories of mood and its effect on cognitive processing suggest that positive mood may allow for increased cognitive flexibility.

PRINCIPALS' HAPPINESS

Accordingly, the study on principals' happiness is of utmost importance, as the effective functioning of the educational system partially depends on it. Recent signals, however, report feelings of dissatisfaction, overload and workload among school principals (Devos & Vanderheyden, 2002; Vandenberghe et al., 2003). Principals are a part of a larger interpersonal system. Their people oriented job characterized by the art of working with teachers, gaining public approval, coping with rules and regulations imposed by governments, are situational and environmental conditions that affect their status of happiness. In McGrath's model (1976) two subsystems are distinguished, which help to explain the emergence of occupational happiness due to situational conditions. One of these subsystems involves the physical environment which provides the context within which the worker carries out his or her duties. This system can produce several sources of negative and positive happiness such as level of autonomy, skill variety, work load, task difficulty and task ambiguity. The second subsystem, social-interpersonal subsystem, defines the social framework within which the focal person interacts with superiors, subordinates and peers, and is characterized by role ambiguity, role conflict, role overload and support as potential antecedents of happiness. In sum, it is expected that school principals who get easily impatient or are very competitive focused will experience more negative happiness, whereas those who are achievement oriented will experience higher positive well-being.

According to Edgar (2005), caring for oneself and having a high sense of happiness is probably the most significant building block of the work/life challenge. Self-care is examined as part of a New Zealand study (Trenberth & Drewe, 2002) on the importance school principals give to leisure as a means of coping with stress. Whilst high rates of burnout were found, school principals also suggested that "being totally focused" was an important reason for engaging in active/challenging leisure (providing a total change from work) and passive leisure as a recuperative mechanism. Similarly, Burford (2004) emphasizes the importance of nurturing personal interests as a way of providing a sense of purpose and bring joy to life. Trenberth and Drewe (2002)

make the point that in part, leisure has a role to play in preventing and ameliorating stress and burnout. Fullan (2005) develops a concept called cyclical energizing, which reflects similar notions and emphasizes the importance of recuperation. Duke (1998) also contends that energetic, change-oriented leaders require "down time". They can better face the rigours of "turning a school around" if they know that a sabbatical or short-term job change awaits them. The finding of Prasad (2008) showed that happier principals are more likely to follow a humanistic leadership style and that the teams led by happier leaders would experience greater happiness at the work place.

HAPPINESS AND EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS

It is very difficult to define "effective principals". They are individuals who pursue their leadership capabilities to foster the school's philosophy with farsighted horizons; they understand the diverse characteristics of their school and their stakeholders, and they promote a team building spirit to generate collaboration and commitment to fulfill their mission. O'Hanlon and Clifton (2004: vi) observed effective principals as individuals "who exhibit the principles of positive psychology in their everyday work, and bring to their school something extra that produces greater growth for all involved".

Effective principals begin with a clear understanding of their destination. They have a clear map in their mind about the position of the school, where it is heading, what the challenges are, and how to satisfy the stakeholders (Blackaby & Blackaby, 2001). They inspire the teachers and students by presenting a realistic vision for the school. They do future planning for the growth of the school, teachers, and students (Everard et al., 2004). They share their vision from the top to the bottom (teachers to students and parents). They can visualize the big picture and take initiative to face the upcoming challenges through problem solving skills (Marzano et al., 2005).

School Principals/leaders have a multiplier effect, they can put in place conditions that help or hamstring effective teaching. One reason for this, research shows, is that effective principals can attract and retain good teachers, while poor leadership has the opposite effect. Principals are the central figure of school organization. What they say, do or think has a significant effect on organizational performance (Spark, 2007). A principal's interaction and participation can increase learning climate, productivity, achievement and school reputation (Sergiovanni, 2007). The accomplishments of a school and even whether or not it achieves its goals and mission can be determined by the principal's effectiveness in their vision, both foresight and hindsight (Blackaby & Blackaby, 2001). A principal's effectiveness can have a positive effect on student academic achievement, organizational management, and staff development. Their leadership can promote human relationships, management motivation, collegial relationships, school improvement; and collaboration with stakeholders including students, teachers, parents, staff, and the community. A good principal envisions a mission for the school that accomplishes the needs of the community (Hoerr, 2008; Barth, 2006). Only effective principals can deal with the fast-paced changes and the demanding expectations of today's society (LaPointe & Davis, 2006). Without effective leadership, it is not possible to have "harmonious development" of each student. Only effective principals can excite the support of constituents, stakeholders, teachers, students, parents and community.

Much of the research on principal effectiveness focuses on measures of principals' dispositions and feelings of overall effectiveness. As one example, in a study of 96 principals, Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) find that the school principal's sense of collective self efficacy positively predicts the schools' achievement levels. Other studies emphasize management styles or orientations, as with the large body of work on instructional management and transformational management (e.g., Marks & Printy, 2003). Leithwood et al. (2004) and Hallinger (2005) similarly conduct reviews of the literature on how school principals impacts student achievement and conclude that leaders tend to impact student learning through their influence on school staff and structures.

In a recent meta-analysis, Robinson et al. (2008:636) use the results of 22 studies of these two approaches to compare the effects of instructional and transformational management on student outcomes. They estimate that the average effect of instructional management on student outcomes is three to four times greater than the effect of transformational management. In a second analysis, the authors analyze survey items from 12 of the studies and inductively identify five management dimensions: (1) establishing goals and expectations; (2) resourcing strategically; (3) planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum; (4) promoting and participating in teacher learning and development; and (5) ensuring an orderly and supportive environment. They find the strongest effects on student outcomes from dimension (4), followed by dimensions (1) and (3). Combining the findings from the two analyses, the study concludes that "the more principals focus their relationships, their work, and their learning on the core business of teaching and learning, the greater their influence on student outcomes".

Effective principals concentrate on various management skills (Dessler, 2008). They engage teachers, parents and other stakeholders in planning, organizing, directing, coordinating and evaluating to advance the school and improve achievement (Bernardin, 2007; Everard et al., 2004). Effective principals ensure efficiency and take action if standards are not met. They follow "due process" to implement the policies of the governing board for recruitment, selection, appointment, ranking appraisal and disciplining the teachers and staff (Bernardin, 2007; Dessler, 2008).

Effective principals provide teachers with opportunities for professional growth and development by providing feedback (Sergiovanni, 2007). They use reward and recognition (intrinsic and extrinsic) to empower their teachers and staff (Blasé & Blasé, 1994; Sergiovanni, 2000). Effective principals provide training, seminar, conference, workshop, and other services for teachers and students to increase the organizational standards (Blasé & Blasé, 2004). They clarify the practices and reinforce positive interactions within the school (Mandel, 2006; Robbins, 2005).

Effective principals care for both people within the school and people outside the school by building caring relationships (Noddings, as cited in Reed & Johnson, 2000). Effective principals maintain and communicate with students, parents, colleagues, school leaders, supervisor, board members, and the community who are directly or indirectly related with the teaching profession. They nurture collegiality and collaboration among stakeholders to generate respect and credibility (Barth, 2006). They unite teachers to increase professional commitment and minimize doubt, competition, and uncertainties among teachers and other administrators (Blasé & Blasé, 2004).

Strong instructional leaders are described as hands-on with curriculum and instruction issues, unafraid to work directly with teachers, and present often in classrooms. While the focus on instructional management waned somewhat in the 1990s as transformational management received greater research attention, interest in instructional management in the literature has been invigorated by the accountability and school improvement movements, which have re-emphasized the role of the principal in facilitating instructional quality (Hallinger, 2005). Scholars also have argued for other approaches, such as Marks and Printy's (2003) "integrated management" approach, which combines instructional and transformational management. This research concludes that the most effective schools are the ones in which the two models coexist. As instructional leaders, principals can foster an understanding of the school vision, facilitate implementation of the mission, and establish the school climate. Ubben and Hughes (1992) stated that principals could create a school climate that improves the productivity of both staff and students and that the leadership style of the principal can foster or restrict teacher effectiveness.

In a follow-up book, Nanus (1992) described the process of, and the necessity, of principals' developing vision. Effective Principals were those who developed, communicated, and implemented a strong vision for their

organization. The best Principals were those who transformed their vision into a shared vision among the various stakeholders of an organization. As for education, Nanus stated that schools placed too much emphasis on the past and should provide for opportunities for problem-finding, not just problem-solving skills. Kouzes and Posner (2002) examined the field of leadership and identified five practices of exemplary management. The authors paid particular attention to the interpersonal relationships that they felt were at the heart of effective leadership. They acknowledged that most effective leaders possessed a sense of self-worth and morality, and they recognized the value of celebrating the accomplishments of others.

Happiness research in social and community psychology has identified sense of community as one aspect of a person's social relationships that is consequential for happiness (Davidson & Cotter, 1991; Farrell et al., 2004; Prezza et al., 2001; Prezza & Constantini, 1998). Sense of community (SoC) was defined by Sarason (1974:1) as ''the sense that one was part of a readily supportive network of relationships upon which one could depend''. This concept concerns community connections and the influence they provide in achieving personal and collective goals. In addition to well-being, research has reported associations between SoC and participation in one's community (Davidson & Cotter, 1989; Obst et al., 2002), the community's social and physical qualities (Kim & Kaplan, 2004; Kingston et al., 2000; Pretty, 1990; Puddifoot, 2003), and length of residence in the community (Tartaglia, 2006) among other things (see Fisher et al., 2002). In the studies concerning SoC and life satisfaction, Prezza et al. (2001) reported statistically significant zero-order correlations ranging from 0.22 to 0.52 in six samples. In an earlier study the statistically significant correlations were 0.23 and 0.38 in their samples of a small city and a small town, respectively (Prezza & Constantini, 1998). Other studies have shown that social relationship variables such as SoC have a complex relationship with well-being.

Davidson and Cotter (1991) showed that, while SoC and happiness were correlated, they had different determinants. Sense of community, but not well-being, was significantly associated with participants' evaluations of the quality of their community, neighborhood and local government. Further, Farrell et al. (2004) have shown that SoC can act to mediate the effects of other variables on well-being. In their study the quality of participants' neighboring behaviors had no direct effect on wellbeing, only an indirect one through SoC. On the basis of studies to date which have investigated the links between SoC and happiness, a model of happiness was developed combining economic and psychological approaches.

The links between productivity and human happiness are of interest to many kinds of social scientists. Argyle (1989, 2001) points out that little is understood about how life satisfaction affects productivity, but that there is (some) evidence that job satisfaction exhibits modestly positive correlations with measures of worker productivity. Wright and Staw (1998) find a significant and sizeable effect of long term happiness on productivity. More specifically, Boehm and Lyubomirsky (2008) preliminarily define a happy person as someone who frequently experiences positive emotions like joy, satisfaction, contentment, enthusiasm and interest. Then, by drawing on both longitudinal and experimental studies, they show that people of this kind are more likely to be successful in their careers.

Fritz et al. (2010) indicated that higher levels of self-reported detachment were associated with higher levels of significant other-reported life and job satisfaction as well as lower levels of emotional exhaustion. In addition, they found curvilinear relationships between psychological detachment and coworker reported job performance (task performance and proactive behavior). Thus, although high psychological detachment may enhance employee happiness, it seems that medium levels of detachment are most beneficial for job performance.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this research was descriptive and correlative. The two questionnaires employed here were "*The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire*" of the Hills & Argyle (2002) and "*Principal Effectiveness Measures*" with

five component measures of effective principal of the Amram (2009). Internal consistency reliability was estimated by Cronbach's alphas. For "The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire" an alpha of .87 and for "Principal Effectiveness Measures" an alpha of .95 was obtained. Of the 110 high school principals (69 female and 41 male) 86 valid samples (54 female and 32 male) were produced in each questionnaire by the targeted high school principals in Zahedan City (IRAN). SPSS 15 was used to produce Mean; Standard Deviations; Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r); t-test; and ANOVA.

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the current situation of high school principals' happiness and effective instructional management and also the relationship between them. The first focus was on the current situation upon principals' happiness, effective instructional management and components of effective management. Next, the researcher further investigated how principals' happiness and effective instructional management differ in terms of their background, such as age, sex, marital status, teaching and management experiences.

The figures at table 1 show that the high school principals described their happiness in high level and also in overall marked high scores on effective instructional management and components of effective management: Organizational Commitment (OC); Sense of Community (SoC); Productivity and Effort (PaE); Job Satisfaction (JS); and Employee Morale (EM).

Table 1
Mean and Std. D. of principals' happiness, effective instructional management and components of effective management (N=86)

Variables	Mean	Std. D.
Principals' Happiness	99.3782	13.01694
effective instructional management:	96.7409	17.63058
Organizational Commitment	28.0004	5.00162
Sense of Community	14.2674	1.89589
Productivity and Effort	11.3702	1.89142
Job Satisfaction	22.8762	3.83828
Employee Morale	15.8528	3.16298

There was relatively high positive correlation between principals' happiness and effective instructional management and components of effective management (Table 2).

Table 2
Correlation between principals' happiness, effective instructional management and components of effective management (N=86)

Variables	Principals' Happiness
Principals' Happiness	1
effective instructional management:	.217(*)
Organizational Commitment	.208(*)
Sense of Community	.276(*)
Productivity and Effort	.371(**)
Job Satisfaction	.323(**)
Employee Morale	.351(**)

*P < .05   **P < .005

In tables 3 and 4, the computation of t-test showed that there were no significant differences between sex, marital status and years of management experience groups, however, the principals who got the higher scores on happiness were those who were male, married and more than six years of management experience. Also the computation of ANOVA about age and years of teaching experiences groups showed that there were no significant differences between the groups, however, it seems that principals who got the higher scores on happiness in comparison with other groups were 36 to 40 years old and between 11 to 15 years of teaching experiences.

Table 3
Mean, Std. D. and T-test of principals' happiness by sex and marital status (N=86)

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. D.	df	T
Happiness	Male	32	101.6720	14.14452	84	1.262
	Female	54	98.0188	12.23374		
Marital Status		N	Mean	Std. D.	df	T
Happiness	Single	11	98.1907	14.34934	84	-.322
	Married	75	99.5523	12.90592		

$P > .05$

Table 4
Mean, Std. D., t-test and ANOVA of principals' happiness by age and years of teaching and management experience (N=86)

Age	N	Mean	Std. D.	df	F
31-35	22	93.7712	12.06164	3, 82	2.106
36-40	32	102.2460	13.00408		
41-45	19	101.3367	13.16045		
46 - Over	13	98.9450	12.77141		
Years of Teaching Experience	N	Mean	Std. D.	df	F
0 - 5	9	98.6915	14.03667	4, 81	.960
6 - 10	13	96.2270	10.52513		
11 - 15	18	103.4318	13.47892		
16 - 20	32	97.4086	13.09576		
21 - Over	14	102.0357	13.69932		
Years of Management Experience	N	Mean	Std. D.	df	T
0 - 5	30	99.0287	12.73703	84	-.181
6 - 10	56	99.5654	13.27479		

$P > .05$

In tables 5 and 6, about the effective instructional management, the computation of t-test showed that there were no significant differences between sex, marital status and years of management experience groups, however, the principals who got the higher scores on effective management were those who were male, married and less than five years of management experience, and also the computation of ANOVA about age and years of teaching experiences groups showed that there were no significant differences between the groups. However, it seems that principals who got the higher scores on effective management in comparison with other groups were 41 to 45 years old and between 11 to 15 years of teaching experiences.

Table 5
Mean, Std. D. and T-test of effective instructional management by sex and marital status (N=86)

Sex		N	Mean	Std. D.	df	T
Happiness	Male	32	100.7500	15.68850	84	1.639
	Female	54	94.3651	18.41453		
Marital Status		N	Mean	Std. D.	df	T
Happiness	Single	11	91.9740	16.11854	84	-.960
	Married	75	97.4400	17.83425		

P > .05

Table 6
Mean, Std. D., t-test and ANOVA of effective instructional management by age and years of teaching and management experience (N=86)

Age	N	Mean	Std. D.	df	F
31-35	22	94.6688	16.05405	3, 82	.281
36-40	32	97.4375	20.21966		
41-45	19	99.2105	17.53276		
46 - Over	13	94.9231	14.52849		
Years of Teaching Experience	N	Mean	Std. D.	df	F
0 - 5	9	97.5556	10.03881	4, 81	.868
6 - 10	13	90.4615	18.44187		
11 - 15	18	101.0952	18.70367		
16 - 20	32	95.1875	19.73606		
21 - Over	14	100.0000	13.66072		
Years of Management Experience	N	Mean	Std. D.	df	T
0 - 5	30	99.3667	16.24486	84	1.011
6 - 10	56	95.3342	18.31569		

P > .05

DISCUSSION

In this research paper researcher has argued that answers to the questions "does happiness influence effective instructional principals and to the contrary", if so, how and how much? In fact, the focal point of this study was if the principal's happiness influences his/her effective management in school and contrary. In general the happiness of school principals in Iran is rather high. Furthermore, researcher has found relatively high positive relationship between principal's happiness and effective instructional principals and components of effective management (see tables 1 and 2). On the basis of the results, the factor 'happiness' plays an important role in effective management, so, other researchers have found that the hope, optimism, happiness, and resilience have positive influence in some important work attitudes e.g. organizational commitment (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Lyubomirsky, 2008); sense of community (Hoerr, 2008; Barth, 2006; Mandel, 2006; Robbins, 2005; Davidson & Cotter, 1991; Farrell, Aubry, & Coulombe, 2004; Prezza, Amici, Roberti, & Tedeschi, 2001; Prezza & Constantini, 1998; Davidson and Cotter, 1991); productivity and effort (Wright and Staw, 1998; Ubben and Hughes, 1992); job satisfaction (Fritz et al., 2010; Argyle, 1989, 2001); and Employee Morale (Reitman, 2009; Mallick, 2009; Adiele, 2009). The results indicated that higher hopefulness impacted the ability to handle diverse situations at work. Consequently, more happiness would likely stay longer in the organization because they inherently felt

like it. The results of the analyses indicated that there were no significant differences between two variables by sex, age, marital status and job experiences.

Overall satisfaction with life (happiness) also contributed to feeling good towards the organization and work, reflected in positive affective and normative commitment and no relationship with continuance commitment. Happiness showed a strong relationship with job satisfaction (Judge & Watanabe, 1993) comparable to affective commitment. Brodbeck et al. (2007) and Luthans et al. (2006) have found positive but not significant relationship between generalized self-efficacy and job satisfaction. The results of this study also support the finding that happiness is positively and significantly related to job satisfaction (Judge & Bono, 2001). These findings establish that there is indeed a positive influence of positive characteristics on organizational commitment, job satisfaction and so on. Past research on the consequences of components of effective management found that these attitudes result in higher role performance in some contexts (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Shim & Steers, 2001; Satjkovic & Luthans, 1998). Thus organizations may be well-advised to look for positive people as employees. Though this appears common-sense in hindsight this study is among the first few to empirically establish this link.

BIODATA AND CONTACT ADDRESS OF AUTHOR

Assist. Prof. Dr. Vali MEHDINEZHAD graduated from the Educational Planning & Management Department at Shiraz University in 1991. He completed his M.A. at Isfahan University in 1993 and his PhD at University of Turku in 2008. Currently he has been working as an Assistant Professor at University of Sistan and Baluchestan. He is interested in classroom management, Program Evaluation, Improvement and development of program in: Basic Education, Higher Education and Teacher Education. More Information about his is at
http://www.usb.ac.ir/staff/Default.aspx?ID=2427&Culture=en-us

Assist. Prof. Dr. Vali MEHDINEZHAD
Department of Education,
Faculty of Education and Psychology,
University of Sistan and Baluchestan,
University Boulevard, Zahedan, IRAN
Mobile: +98 915 192 3719
Fax: +98 541 245 0910
E-Mail: mehdinezhad@gmail.com

REFERENCES

Adiele, N. (2009). Improving Employee Morale, http://ezinearticles.com/?Improving-Employee Morale&id=3023461

Amram, Joseph, Y. (2009). The Contribution of Emotional and Spiritual Intelligences to Effective Business Leadership (Dissertation).

Aristotle (1947) Nicomachean Ethics, in McKeon R (ed, 1947) Introduction to Aristotle, Modern Library, McGraw-Hill, New York.

Argyl, M. (2001). The psychology of happiness. 2nd Edition. Rutledge.

Argyle, M. 1989. Do happy workers work harder? The effect of job satisfaction on job performance. In: Ruut Veenhoven (ed), (1989) *How harmful is happiness? Consequences of enjoying life or not,* Universitaire Pers Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

Barth, R. S. (2006). Improving relationships within the schoolhouse. *The Journal of Educational Leadership*, *63(6),* 8-13.

Bernardin, H. J., (2007). Human resource management: An experiential approach. Boston. McGraw Hill/Irwin.

Berry, D.S.; Willingham, J.K. (1997). Affective traits, responses to conflict, and satisfaction in romantic relationships. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *31(4),* 564-576.

Blackaby, H.T., & Blackaby, R. (2001). Spiritual leadership: Moving people on to God's agenda. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. R. (2004). Handbook of instructional leadership: How successful principals promote teaching and learning (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. R. (1994). Empowering teachers: What successful principal do. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Boehm, J. K., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). Does happiness lead to career success? *Journal of Career Assessment, 16(1),* 101-116,
 http://jca.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/16/1/101

Brodbeck, F. C., Chhokar, J. S., & House, R. J. (2007). Culture and leadership in 25 societies: Integration, conclusions, and future directions. In J. S. Chhokar, F. C. Brodbeck & R. J. House (Eds.), *Culture and leadership across the world: The globe book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Burford, C. (2004). Joy and Justice in Community: The Ethical Challenge for Leaders in Education, Queensland Secondary Principal's Association, Annual Conference, Principal Advantage, Gold Coast, 10th June, 2004.
www.aspa.asn.au/Confs/qspa2004/burford.htm

Davidson, W. B., & Cotter, P. R. (1991). The relationship between sense of community and subjective well-being: A first look. *Journal of Community Psychology, 19(3),* 246–253.
Davidson, W. B., & Cotter, P. R. (1989). Sense of community and political participation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 17(2)*, 119–125.

Dean, M. Jane. (2010). No Evaluation Left Behind: Nonresponse in Online Course Evaluations, (Dissertation).
http://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/ir/bitstream/1840.16/6364/1/etd.pdf

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11(4)*, 227-268.

DeCotiis, T. A., & Summers, T. P. (1987). A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations, 40(7)*, 445-470.

Dessler, G. (2008). Human resource management. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Devos, G. and Vanderheyden, K. (2002). "Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers. Background report for Flanders",
 http://www.oecd.org/pdf/M0003700/M00037100.pdf.

Frey, B.S; Stutzer, A. (2000a). Maximizing Happiness? *German Economic Review, 1(2),* 145-167.

Duke, D. (1998). Why principals consider quitting. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70(4),* 308-313

Edgar, D. (2005). *Family Impact Statement on "work choice"—the proposed new Industrial Relations Regime*, Unions NSW, November, 2005.

Everard, K. B., Morris, G., & Wilson, I. (2004). Effective school management. London, UK: Paul Chapman.

Farrell, S. J., Aubry, R., & Coulombe, D. (2004). Neighbourhoods and neighbours: Do they contribute to personal well-being? *Journal of Community Psychology, 32(1),* 9–25.

Fisher, A. T., Sonn, C. C., & Bishop, B. J. (2002). Psychological sense of community: Research, applications, and implications. NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Fritz, F.; Yankelevich, M.; Zarubin, A. & Barger, P. (2010). Happy, Healthy, and Productive: The Role of Detachment from Work during Nonwork Time, *Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 95(5),* 977-983.

Fullan, M. (2005). Resiliency and Sustainability, *the School Administrator*, February, 2005 http://www.michaelfullan.ca/Articles_05/2005_01.pdf

Hallinger, Phillip. (2005). "Instructional Leadership and the School Principal: A Passing Fancy that Refuses to Fade Away." *Leadership and Policy in Schools 4(3):* 221–39.

Hills, P. & Argyle, M. (2002). The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire: a compact scale for the measurement of psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33(7)*, 1073-1082.

Hoerr, T. R. (2008). What is instructional leadership? *Journal of Educational Leadership, 65(4),* 56-64.

Honefelder, G. (1986). Vom Glück – Erkundigungen. Insel: Frankfurt am Main.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Thoresen, C. J., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127(3)*, 376-407.

Judge, T. A., & Hulin, C. L. (1993). Job satisfaction as a reflection of disposition: A multiple causal source analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 56(3)*, 388-421.

Kahneman, Daniel. D. and Schwarz, N. (1999).*Well-Being*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. PP. 213 – 229.

Kim, K., & Kaplan, R. (2004). Physical and psychological factors in sense of community: New urbanist Kentlands and nearby Orchard Village. *Environment and Behavior, 36(3),* 313–340.

Kingston, S., Mitchell, R., Florin, P., & Stevenson, J. (2000). Sense of community in neighborhoods as a multi-level construct. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27(6),* 681–694.

Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2002). *Leadership: the challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

LaPointe, M., & Davis, S. H. (2006). Effective schools require effective principals. *Leadership, 36(1),* 14-36.

Leithwood, Kenneth, and Doris Jantzi. (2008). "Linking Leadership to Student Learning: The Contributions of Leader Efficacy." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 44(4): 496–528.

Leithwood, Kenneth, Karen Seashore Louis, Stephen Anderson, and Kyla Wahlstrom. (2004). "How Leadership Influences Student Learning." Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, Learning from Leadership Project.

Luthans, F., Zhu, W., & Avolio, B. J. (2006). The impact of efficacy on work attitudes across cultures. *Journal of World Business, 41(2)*, 121-132.

Mallick, S. (2009). Effective Management Of People At Workplace
http://rimsology.com/sukaushalam/?p=243

Mandel, S. (2006). What new teachers really need? *The Journal Educational Leadership, 63(6),* 66-69.

Marks, Helen M., and Susan M. Printy. (2003). "Principal Leadership and School Performance: An Integration of Transformational and Instructional Leadership." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 39(3): 370–97.
Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). School leadership that works: From research to results. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development (ASCD).

McGrath, J. (1976), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* Rand McNally Publishing Company, Chicago.

Meyers, D.G.; Diener, E. (1996). The pursuit of happiness. *Scientific American, 274(5),* 70-73.
Mill, John. S. (1993). *On Liberty* and *Utilitarianism*. New York: Bantam Books. P.144

Nadler, R. T., Rabi, R. R. & Minda, J. P. (in press). Better mood and better performance: Learning rule-described categories is enhanced by positive mood. *Psychological Science*.

Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Obst, P., Smith, S. G., & Zinkiewicz, L. (2002). An exploration of sense of community, Part 3: Dimensions and predictors of psychological sense of community in geographical communities. *Journal of Community Psychology, 30(1),* 119–133.

O'Hanlon, J., & Clifton, D. O. (2004). Effective principals: Positive principles at work. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Prasad, R. (2008). Generating Happiness at Workplace for Optimal Performance, Abstract, (Dissertation).
http://www.iimcal.ac.in/programs/fpm/ThesisAbstracts/Abstract_Rajiv.pdf

Pretty, G. M. H. (1990). Relating psychological sense of community to social climate characteristics. *Journal of Community Psychology, 18(1),* 60–65.

Prezza, M., Amici, M., Roberti, T., & Tedeschi, G. (2001). Sense of community referred to the whole town: Its relations with neighbouring, loneliness, life satisfaction and area of residence. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14(1),* 6–23.

Prezza, M., & Constantini, S. (1998). Sense of community and life satisfaction: Investigation in three different territorial contexts. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 8(3),* 181–194.

Puddifoot, J. E. (2003). Exploring ''personal" and ''shared" sense of community identity in Durham City, England. *Journal of Community Psychology, 31(1),* 87–106.

Reed, R. F., & Johnson, T. W. (2000). Philosophical documents in education. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc

Reitman, A. (2009). *Five Management Styles that Hurt Employee Morale, How Insecure Managers Exhibit Poor Practices in Organizations*, http://www.suite101.com/content/five-management-styles-that-hurt-employee-morale-a115538

Robinson, Viviane M. J., Claire A. Lloyd, and Kenneth J. Rowe. (2008). "The Impact of Leadership on School Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types." *Educational Administration Quarterly 44(5),* 635–74.
Robbins, S. P., & Decenzo, D.A. (2005). Supervision today. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Ryff, C.D. (1989). 'Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 57(6),* 1069–1081.

Stajkovic, A., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: *A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 124(2),* 240-261

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2007). Rethinking leadership: A collection of articles. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2000). The lifeworld of leadership: Creating culture, community, and personal meaning in our schools. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shim, W. S., & Steers, R. M. (2001). The entrepreneurial basis of Korean enterprise: Past accomplishments and future challenges. *Asia Pacific Business Review, 7(4)*, 22-43.

Sparks, D. (2007). Leading for results: transforming teaching, learning and relationships in schools. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tartaglia, S. (2006). A preliminary study for a new model of sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology, 34(1),* 25–36.

Trenbeth, L.& Drewe, P,. (2002). The Importance of leisure as a means of coping with work related stress: an exploratory study. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, Vol 15(1),* 59-72.

Ubben, G., & Hughes, L. (1992). The principal: Creative leadership for effective schools. Meedham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Vandenberghe, R., Daniëls, K., Dierynck, R. and Joris, C. (2003*), Starting principals in primary schools: An investigation on the professional development of school leaders*, Leuven University Press, Leuven.

Wright, T.A., Staw, B.A. (1998). Affect and favorable work outcomes: two longitudinal tests of the happy-productive worker thesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1-23.