Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science (RIELS) Journal
Vol. 4, No. 4, December 2023 | Page 829-840 |
https://www.randwickresearch.com/index.php/rielsj

# The Impact of Teacher Power on University Students' Satisfaction

**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v4i4.837

| Mustafa Rezaei[1,*] | Baz Mohammad Frogh[2] | Mujeeb Rahman Rahmani[3] |
| Ali Naqi Mohammadi[4] |

[1,3] Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Kabul University
[2] Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Bamyan University
[4] Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Kandahar University

*mustafarezaei65@gmail.com



**ABSTRACT**
*The aim of this study was to find the impact of teacher power on students' satisfaction. Participants were 364 university students (60 girls and 304 boys) which were selected by quota-random sampling method. All the students of the research sample voluntarily completed the questionnaires about the teacher's power and students' satisfaction. For analyzing the research data, SPSS.v.24 software was used. Results showed that there is a significant positive relationship between student satisfaction with both referent power and expert power. In addition, According to the difference in averages, the highest Mean is related to the type of reward power and the lowest mean was related to the type of coercive power. The findings further showed that female students are more satisfied than male students and in both groups, the least satisfaction was for evaluation method. Finally, the results indicate the importance of the optimal use of various teachers' power sources by teachers in forming a favorable climate, which can play a key role in increasing the satisfaction of students.*

**KEYWORDS**
*teacher power; academic satisfaction; university student*

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the higher education has been vastly influenced by globalization which followed by increasing competition between higher education institutions; aiming to maintain their credibility, reputation, customer satisfaction, and ultimately their stands such as, in today's competitive environment. Measuring satisfaction with education is one of the basic goals. Satisfaction with education is one of the important indicators of evaluation of educational organizations to achieve their goals and missions in a competitive environment. Satisfaction with education is rooted in students' perceived experiences of the educational environment, which emphasizes their sense of satisfaction with the facilities and quality of education in the educational organization (Hanssen & Solvoll, 2015) & (Hasan, 2008). It is considered one of the characteristics of individual behavior that due to organizational culture in the environment of organizations, causes the formation of attitudes and behavior (Tsui et al., 2007).

The quality of educational environments, professors 'skills in teaching and learning, and interpersonal relationships are some of the factors that can play an important role in shaping students' perceptions in academic satisfaction in universities. Fernandez Ross, Osman and Sapotra, also state that the quality of teachers' skills in the teaching process is one of the most important factors in student satisfaction (Feranades & Ross, 2013; Osman & Saputra 2019). Talented teachers can improve and manage good interactions with students and in the classroom to improve the teaching and learning process. The effectiveness of teachers and, consequently, the effectiveness of the classroom

environment will facilitate the process of teaching and learning for training specialized and efficient staff. Achieving this goals require communication and creating an appropriate learning environment in the classroom. The quality of the educational space to create relationships and a healthy atmosphere in the classroom is always influencing by the personal principles and criteria of the teacher (Koutrouba et al., 2012).

Professors are usually trying to have influence on students based on their abilities and characteristics to improve the teaching process. The concept of power generally refers to the ability to display desirable behaviors that are formally, informally, legally, and illegally applied (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Teachers' power can be defined as the ability to influence their students to keep students active (Richmond & McCroskey, 2009). The use of power varies among teachers based on their characteristics. The types of power will affect the quality of the educational process, which will create a feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the educational process among learners. Therefore, the need to pay attention to the role of professors and understand their sources of power, in increasing academic satisfaction and fulfillment of academic mission is a necessity. However, in academic settings, power is divided among individuals. However, the masters have the most power. The most important point here is that masters exercise the process of teaching and learning. Therefore, understanding how to exercise power and its role in the level of academic satisfaction can lead to understanding the pattern of power distribution and its application in universities and ultimately a picture of the effective dynamics and success of education in higher education. Accordingly, the following questions will be answered in this research.

Does the type of teachers' power in the classroom have a significant effect on student satisfaction? Which type of power is used more by teachers at Kandahar University? Is there a significant difference between the student's satisfaction of male and female students?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### *Teacher power and student satisfaction*

Teachers in educational environments need different tools to influence students and create effective interactions to achieve their educational goals. One of the most important of these tools is the power it has (Hersey et al., 2012). Power is defined as the ability of one person to influence another to do something (Robeyns, 2005). In other words power is defined by Max (Anderson & Brion, 2014) as the imposition of one's behavior on the behavior. Rabbinz, (2007) state that it seems difficult to define power simply and operationally, but one of the dimensions of power is the capacity and ability to control or influence the behavior of others. However, there is no guarantee that those in power in the organization will use their power reasonably and fairly (Hersey et al., 2012). In educational organizations, teachers are the most important people, and their power is based on the interactions they have with their students. The process of teaching and learning is very important. And it depends entirely on the teacher's point of view on how to exert power but the teacher's use of power can have a positive relationship with students 'sense of learning and motivation to learn, while the same power can harm students' learning outcomes. (Schrodt & Paul, 2007). McCrosky & Richmond (1983) Based on the French power model and (Kovach, 2020) state that the way teachers communicate with their students affects the level of power and influence they have over them (Richmond & Richmond, 2009). Nevertheless, the important point in the concept of power is that power does not rely on the amount of power that those in power have but is based on the perception that people have of them. Usually, what gives professors the ability to influence is the students' perceptions

of their power, and these perceptions affect their level of influence. Accordingly, the teacher's effort to influence students is based on five types which is coercive, rewarding, legitimate, referential, and specialized (McCrosky & Richmond, 1983).

The most important analysis of power sources is provided by French and Raven. They also identified five sources of power in organizational environments, including legal powers, rewards, coercion, authority, and expertise (Early et al., 2007). Legitimate power is the power that emanates from an organizational position and relies on the official position of the individual. Psychology such as receiving approval from the teacher or praise from the teacher is evident when understudies realize that a instructor can offer such rewards, they may be more slanted to acknowledge the educator. Therefore, the power of the teacher will affect the students' desire to teach (Schrodt & Paul, 2007) the power of coercion; this power is based on the students' fears and is based on fear and intimidation. Also, coercive power indicates that the teacher can potentially punish students through negative outcomes such as grading or losing the teacher's popularity. In addition, understanding compulsive power reduces students' motivation and enthusiasm (Paulsel et al., 2005). Authority; whenever students attribute good qualities such as honesty, trustworthiness, and confidentiality to their teacher, it is said that the teacher has authority (Rabbinz, 2007). Finally, the power of expertise; is the ability to control the behavior of others through knowledge or expertise (Rabbinz, 2007).

Within the classroom, understudies may recognize the teacher's proficient foundation and understanding of the predominance of the curriculum, as well as the skillful use of classroom presentation methods. The teacher's influence on students stems from their perception of the teacher as an expert instructor with a superior intellectual knowledge of course content (Paulsel et al., 2005). However, it can be said that the type of power that the teacher uses in the process of education or the process of interaction with the student affects the level of learning or commitment of the student in the class, considering these cases, the level of student satisfaction with the process. Training also depends on the type of power it uses. Satisfaction can be defined as an experience of achieving the expected results. A person will be satisfied when his or her expectations are met. Satisfaction refers to feelings of pleasure or frustration that result from comparing perceived performance with expectations. Teachers, as one of the most important facilitators of learning, should provide the necessary ground for positive and constructive changes in students' attitudes to encourage and create more desire, leading to sustainable and continuous learning. Scholarly fulfillment is one of the characteristics of person behavior that due to organizational culture, leads to the arrangement of organizational states of mind and behavior (Tsui et al., 2007). Concurring to numerous specialists, fulfillment could be a work of mental execution and desires of people. Carey, Karen; Renee L. Cambiano and De Vore, (2002) contend that fulfillment covers seen issues and understudy encounters amid the college a long time. Whereas most understudy fulfillment ponders center on the client point of view. Therefore, to have a clear definition of academic satisfaction, a specific theory of customer satisfaction is needed (Boehm et al., 2002).

Although the approach of students as customers is at risk, given the current conditions and atmosphere of the higher education market, a new ethical presupposition has been introduced that introduces students as "customers". So they can, as payers, logically want to be heard and acted upon (William et al., 2002). In this research, the basis for measuring the satisfaction of investment theory is the satisfaction of students of teacher, Prussia, Crater, and Fitzgerald. This theory reflects the behavior of student satisfaction with university performance from an investment perspective. According to this theory, the student perceives his time, energy, and effort as an investment and seeks a return according

to which students will be satisfied if they are rewarded for the investment they have made. In 1994, Noel Levitz created a list of factors that contribute to student satisfaction in higher education, including faculty services, university experience, student support facilities, university living, and social integration. Satisfaction with education is also an influential structure in education that includes students 'perceptions of educational programs, the necessary conditions for study, as well as the teacher's behavior and guidance, and the quality of these services also affects students' satisfaction (Ayres et al., 2013). Everything that happens in the classroom and any practical selection made by students in students' experiences affects their overall satisfaction, in addition to the fact that the internal learning environment has an impact on student satisfaction and students' values have a mediating effect on their satisfaction (Martono et al., 2020).

The same values of the teacher and the student affect the interactions within the classroom. According to (Chua, 2004), satisfaction is one of the four key elements for creating and developing competitive experiences; Satisfying students will not only help their loyalty but also maintain them for a long time. Numerous factors affect students' academic satisfaction, some individual and some environmental. Some researchers have pointed out that the culture, atmosphere, and organizational structure of the institution are environmental factors that can affect academic satisfaction. Student satisfaction is a multidimensional prepare that's impacted by different variables. Average scores are the foremost compelling figure in understudy fulfillment sorts (Marshall, Walker and Hudson, 1999). Appleton-Knapp and Krentler moreover found two bunches of components affecting understudy fulfillment in higher instruction educate that presented them as individual and organizational variables. Individual components incorporate, age, sex, work, favored learning fashion, and review point normal. Organizational components incorporate guidelines quality, incite and convenient instructor criticism, clarity of desires, and educating fashion (Appleton-knapp & Krentler, 2006). Wilkins and Blocker Shan distinguished the quality of workforce instructing, the quality of physical offices, and the viable utilize of innovation as determinants of understudy fulfillment. Too, understudy fulfillment in colleges is significantly impacted by the quality of criticism, teacher-student relationship, and interaction with other understudies, course substance, learning fashion, gear, library offices, and learning materials. In expansion, instructing capacity, adaptable educational modules, college status and validity, autonomy, workforce supervision, item development and advancement, student-centered, college environment, regulation viability, and social conditions are recognized as key determinants of understudy fulfillment in higher instruction.

To review the background literature and get acquainted with the existing challenges on the subject of research, some research done in this field has been stated. In a study conducted by Diaz et al., (2016), entitled High School Students' Perceptions of and Attitudes Towards Teacher Power in the Classroom, they reported that teachers use more professional power to be effective in teaching, and assessment, as well as to implement Laws, punishments, and student behavior control use legitimate power. In other research, it has been reported that most professors use coercive, legitimate, and specialized power (Diaz et al., 2016). In a study entitled Relationship Between Student Perceptions of Instructor Power and Classroom Justice reported that classroom justice is related to legitimate, referential, specialized, and compulsory types of power but is not related to teachers' reward power with classroom justice (Paulsel et al., 2005). In a study conducted by Tuğba, in 2016 entitled the impact of control sources utilized by speakers in course administration on the pre-service instructors 'perceptions of reasonableness with respect to their learning environment, the comes about of this think about showed that the use of

personal power and specialized power by the teacher leads to a greater understanding of justice in the classroom and also the use of coercive power by teachers causes them to have less understanding of class justice (Hoşgörür & İlker, 2016). Jalilvand and Vista conducted research on classroom power sources, based on data from students, faculty, and teachers; It was concluded that the source or base of legitimate power from the student's point of view is the strongest base and coercive power, expertise, reference, and reward were in the next categories (Jalilvand & Vista, 2015; Shim et al., 2013 and Yoon & Jamesont, 1988).

Cornelius, (2010) reported that students must first have their motivations and ideas to learn and follow a particular disciplinary approach. To build participatory structures that respond to students' educational, personal, and social needs, they must multiple power relationship interactions are considered in the classroom. The structure of these interactions Learning will be affected (Cornelius & Herrenkohl, 2010). Chua, 2004 in his research entitled "Study of the concept of quality in higher education" said that among the dimensions of quality of higher education, professors are the most important element in this field. Chandra et al., (2019) Also reported that one of the important factors in student satisfaction is experienced and professional professors. In another study by Usman entitled the impact of teacher's qualification and experience on student satisfaction, they state that the education sector is a key driver and indicator of economic world growth, predominantly in the context of higher education.

Understudy fulfillment is vital to preserve the quality standard and assess the teacher's execution. The worldview has moved from instructor work fulfillment to understudy fulfillment. Understudies are the key partners and buyers of higher instruction colleges. Hence, understudy criticism is an vital indicator in deciding the execution of instructors and the instruction framework. To decide instructor execution, instructor capabilities, involvement, aptitudes, strategies, and knowledge-sharing were utilized in this think about. It is clear from the comes about that educator capability could be a major indicator of understudy fulfillment than instructor encounter. Instructor abilities and strategies, and compelling and viable knowledge's-sharing mostly intervened the relationship between instructor aptitudes and strategies, information – sharing and student satisfaction.

It seems that examining the use of a professor by the type of power he has at his disposal from the students 'point of view can be a factor to increase students' satisfaction and acceptance as consumers of knowledge and teaching professors, followed by improving the quality and quantity of education in the university. On the other hand, universities are one of the centers for the exchange of ideas and information in any society, and it seems necessary to study the factor affecting the relationship between professor and student as the main pillars of these centers.

## RESEARCH METHODS

This study was designed in the correlational survey model. The population of this study consists of 2693 undergraduate student of Kandahar University. Based on Cochran's formula, 364 student were selected as the sample of this research. Respondents included 16.5% (n=60) females and 83.5% (n=304) males Participants. The majority of student were with 60.7% (n=221) and classified as both third-year students and 39.3% (n=143) classified second-year student. All students, were selected by quota-random sampling method, with awareness and voluntarily completed the questionnaires. To ensure ethical consideration, informed consent was also obtained and participants were informed that their participations were completely voluntary and were free withdraw or refuse to answer to any question at any point of time. In addition, in order to observe the participants' anonymity no personal information like their name was gathered.

Moreover, the research committee of the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Science, Kabul University provided the approval for this study (approval number: PSYEDU-R.P.07-2022).

In this study, two questionnaires were used. First, the questionnaire for teacher power was comprised on five (5) sections. Teacher power items employed from the study of Schrodt & Paul (2007), in which participants expressed their answers in a 5-point Likert scale. Second, the questionnaire for student satisfaction was comprised from three (3) sections. Student satisfaction tool had nineteen (19) items which were adopted from Fieger (2012), computed on six (6) point Likert scale ranged from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree' and 'not applicable'. The reliability results for eighteen (18) student satisfaction items which had reliability of .892 Cronbach's Alpha, which indicate or as a high level of internal consistency for empowerment scale with this specific sample. Originally student satisfaction had nineteen (19) items, one (1) item was deleted (Item 19), because, it was weakly correlated. The reliability results for twenty six (26) teacher power items had reliability of .792 Cronbach's Alpha, which indicate as a high level of internal consistency for empowerment scale with this specific sample. Originally student satisfaction had nineteen (30) items, four (4) item were deleted (Items 1, 2, 3, 5), all of them were negatively correlated.

**Table 1.** Demographic information of students

| Faculty | Class | | | | Gender | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 3th | | 4th | | Female | | male | | |
| | frequency | Percent | frequency | Percent | frequency | Percent | frequency | Percent | |
| Education | 102 | 18/4 | 23 | 18/4 | 18 | 14.4% | 107 | 85.6% | 125 |
| Engineering | 43 | 65% | 28 | 39/4 | 2 | 2.8% | 69 | 97.2% | 71 |
| Computer scenes | 13 | 50/0 | 13 | 50/0 | 4 | 15.4% | 22 | 84.6 | 26 |
| Law | 13 | 49/0 | 14 | 51/0 | 6 | 22.2% | 21 | 77.8% | 27 |
| Public | 13 | 50% | 13 | 50% | 26 | 100% | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Journalism | 9 | 50% | 9 | 50% | 1 | 5.6% | 17 | 94.4 | 18 |
| Islamic Law | 4 | 18.2% | 18 | 81.2% | 0 | 0 | 22 | 100% | 22 |
| Economic | 10 | 50% | 10 | 50% | 2 | 10.0% | 18 | 90.0% | 20 |
| Literature | 14 | 49% | 15 | 51% | 1 | 3.4% | 28 | 96.6 | 29 |
| Total | 221 | 60.7% | 143 | 39.2% | 60 | 16.5% | 304 | 83.5% | 364 |

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table. 2 shows, a multiple linear regression was calculated to predict student satisfaction based on teacher's power. A significant regression equation was found (F (5, 358) =47.535, $p < 0.000$), with an R2 of 0.632. Participants' predicted satisfaction is equal to 42.934-0.68 (Coercive Power), -0.066 (Legitimate Power), +0.031 (Reward Power) +0.167 (Referent Power) +0.541 (Expert Power). Participant's satisfaction increased 0.167 pounds for each per unit of referent power, also participant's satisfaction increased 0.541 pounds for each per unit of expert power. Both referent power and expert power were significant predictors of student satisfaction.

**Table 2.** Multiple linear regression test

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig |
| Constant | 42.934 | 4.199 | - | 10-224 | .0001 |
| Coercive Power | -.180 | .119 | -.68 | -1.510 | .132 |
| Reward Power | .084 | .126 | .031 | .669 | .504 |
| Referent Power | .514 | .134 | .167 | 3.830 | .0001 |
| Legitimate Power | -.199 | .130 | -.066 | -1.531 | .127 |
| Expert Power | 1.232 | .111 | .541 | 11.065 | .0001 |

*Dependent Variable: satisfaction*

Table.3 shows, the descriptive statistics of power sources. Expert power (M=22.39, SD=5.32), Reward power (M= 22.35, SD=4.41), Referent power (M=18.67, SD=3.93), Legitimate power (M=18.68, SD= 3.99) and Coercive power (M= 15.99, SD=4.57). According to the difference in averages, the highest mean score is related to the type of reward power and the lowest mean score was related to the type of coercive power.

**Table 3.** Descriptive statistics

| Variables | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Coercive power | 364 | 15.991 | 4.572 |
| Reward power | 364 | 22.354 | 4.411 |
| Referent power | 364 | 18.832 | 3.938 |
| Legitimate power | 364 | 18.673 | 3.993 |
| Expert power | 364 | 22.39 | 5.328 |

Table 4. Presents a one-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to compare the type of teacher power. Considering the significance of Mochli's test and the value less than 0.75 epsilon, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used, F = (1, 363) 110.993 (P≤0.01), eta=0.234. There was a significant difference, Wilks' Lambda = 0.461, F (4,360) = 105.282, p = 0.000. From the perspective of students, professors use different sources of power. According to the significance results of ANOVA, Bonferroni post hoc test was used to determine the significant pairwise difference.

**Table 4.** One-way repeated measures ANOVA

| Source | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | f | sig | Partial Eta Squared |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Power | 3024.485 | 1 | 3024.485 | 110.993 | 000.1 | 0.234 |
| (Error) power | 9891.515 | 363 | 27.249 | | | |

Table 5. Shows Bonferroni pairwise comparisons test was conducted to compare the Means of teacher's power. The pairwise comparisons type of teachers power were equal to Reward-Coercive (MD1=-6.363*), Referent- Coercive (MD=-2.841*), Legitimate-Coercive (MD=-2.681*), Expert- Coercive (MD=-6.398*), Referent- Reward (MD=3.522*), Legitimate- Reward (MD=3.681*), Expert- Reward (-0.036), Legitimate-Referent (0.151), Expert- Referent (-3.558*) and Expert- Legitimate (MD=-3.717). Based on significance level, mostly pairwise difference of type of power is significant (P<0.05).

[1] Mean Difference

**Table 5.** Bonferroni pairwise comparisons test

| Type of power | Coercive | Reward | Referent | Legitimate | Expert |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coercive | | | | | |
| Reward | -6.363* | | | | |
| Referent | -2.841* | 3.522* | | | |
| Legitimate | -2.681* | 3.681* | 0.151 | | |
| Expert | -6.398* | -0.036 | -3.558* | -3.717* | |

Table 6. Presents an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the students' satisfaction between male and female students. There was a significant difference in the scores for component of teaching for male (M=23.493, SD=4.643) and teaching of female (M=24.716, SD=3.822) condition; t (362) = -2.181, p=0.03. In the second component, there was also a significant difference in the scores for assessment for male (M=18,037 SD=4.311) and assessment of female (M=20.216, SD=3.189) condition; t (362) = -2.663, p=0.009. Moreover, the third component had a significant difference in the scores for learning experience for male (M=32,368 SD=5.720) and assessment of female (M=33.916, SD=4.629) condition; t (362) = -1.972, p=0.04. Based on mean and significance level, Female students are more satisfied than male students and was the least satisfied from the evaluation method.

**Table 6**. compering the student satisfaction among gender

| Variables | | Gander | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | t | DF | sig | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students satisfaction | Teaching | male | 304 | 23.493 | 4.643 | -2.181 | 362 | 0.03 | -1.223 | .560 |
| | | female | 60 | 24.716 | 3.822 | | | | | |
| | Assessment | male | 304 | 18.037 | 4.311 | -2.663 | 362 | 0.009 | -1.279 | .480 |
| | | female | 60 | 20.216 | 3.189 | | | | | |
| | Learning-Experiences | male | 304 | 32.368 | 5.720 | -1.972 | 362 | 0.04 | -1.548 | .785 |
| | | female | 60 | 33.916 | 4.629 | | | | | |

## *Discussion*

Academic satisfaction is influenced by several factors, the most important of which are personal (gender, age, work and learning style) and organizational (teaching quality, teaching style, instructions) factors (Appleton-knapp & Krentler, 2006). As the most important organizational element of a university, a professor can have the most effective role on the academic satisfaction of the students. The type of organization and management of a class by teachers and the type of use of his power can also affect the level of academic satisfaction. Based on this, the current research was conducted with the aim of determining the impact of power sources used by professors on the level of academic satisfaction of students. The findings of the research showed that the authority power and expertise of professors have a significant effect on the level of academic satisfaction of students. In fact, professors who use authority power and expertise create more satisfaction in students. As it is obvious, for students, the power of expertise and authority is considered as an important coercive and legal power. As coercive and legal power has a negative and insignificant relationship with academic satisfaction, the results of this part of the findings are in line with the results of several other studies (Wang, 2006, Teven & Herring, 2005 and Jamieson, D.w., Thomas, 1974). The mentioned result means that in the cultured and free-thinking atmosphere of the university, the compulsion does not cause real answers and

practically has no place in the management of teaching and learning activities and teacher-student relations. For this reason, it is considered that the inverse relationship or academic satisfaction has been assigned to itself. On the other hand, the power resulting from the legal status also had a negative relationship with the academic satisfaction of students. Therefore, consultation has also been a source of power and influence of the teacher and has had a negative effect on academic satisfaction. This result can be justified considering that the university is a professional and mainly specialized bureaucracy (Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

Also, comparing the types of resources, the strength of the findings showed that from the point of view of students, professors use reward and expertise sources more than other sources. In the research Turman & Schrod in, 2006 it was also reported that students rated the power of reward more than other types of power and it is in line with the findings of this part of the research. In the explanation of this part of the findings, it can be stated that since the society of Afghanistan and especially the University of Kandahar has a traditional culture, in the type of culture, position of the professor is a respectable position and is associated with spirituality. On the other hand, Kandahar University's status and external image as one of the most prestigious universities in southern Afghanistan has special expectations for specialized knowledge in the presence of their expert professors. For this reason, according to them, expertise and professors are considered an important source of power, and it is obvious that they obey and respond to it. In addition, students, at the same time, with the common scientific spirit that exists among them, want a high level of quality and expertise of professors in their related educational and research activities. They emphasize more than other types of power.

Another finding of the research also showed that between academic satisfactions in the evaluation dimension, it shows the lowest level of satisfaction and the highest satisfaction score belongs to the learning experience dimension. Furthermore, the result of the study showed that there is a significant difference between the academic satisfaction of male and female students. In fact, female students are more satisfied with the educational situation than male students. This part of the research findings is consistent with (Fitri & Hasan, 2008, Tabbane & Debabi, 2015,and Garcia-Atacil, 2009) regarding the low and different satisfaction of male and female students from educational services. Since the higher education system is a nascent and growing system in Afghanistan, universities provide services for their customers, especially students, with minimal educational opportunities. This will also have a negative impact on the implementation process and the quality of education. According to the traditional culture of Kandahar University, the presence of girls from such a conservative society is a new opening for this generation, and this has raised a positive attitude among female students. Therefore, this can be the reason for the high satisfaction of female students compared to boys.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the obtained results, it is clear that the type of power exerted by professors in the education process has a positive and significant relationship with students' academic satisfaction. It thus confirms what other literature suggests here, that optimally exercising faculty power in the teaching-learning process may potentially improve student satisfaction. This is the priority of academic organizations in today's competitive field, because they compete with each other to create a suitable competitive image in the environment. Based on the results, the type of power of expertise and authority had a greater impact on students' academic satisfaction, so anything that increases the use of these two types of power by professors, should be considered to raise the level of student

satisfaction. Thus, it can be said that the desirability of the environment of the classroom teaching-learning process depends on the type of exercise of the power of the professors. Professors can influence the academic satisfaction of students through the optimal use and establishment of a healthy relationship with their students and recognition of their interest, abilities and capabilities and their motivation.

## *Limitations and recommendations*

The type of exercise of power by professors is widely accepted as the main point of satisfaction. Neglecting it may endanger the competitiveness of an organization because the satisfaction and competitiveness of an academic organization is related to the quality of its professors. Hence, denying or ignoring the importance of professors' work quality is like jeopardizing the continuity and competitiveness of institutions. Therefore, it is suggested that professors make optimal use of their power in the education process to create healthy relationships and interactions between professors and students and ultimately increase satisfaction. For this purpose, professors should be as flexible as possible in their class schedules and avoid applying restricted and unchangeable schedules and pay more attention to the role of specialization and authority.

The limitation of the present study is related to its design. The role of professors' power sources on students' academic satisfaction are not causal relationships, in the best conditions these relationships are a kind of contemporaneous relationships. The second limitation of this study is related to the measurement tools. Questionnaire measurement tools have a number of inherent limitations (measurement error, lack of introspection, socially acceptable answers, and lack of attention to the necessary accuracy of some students in answering questions), so in future research, other methods are required to be considered.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, C., & Brion, S. (2014). Perspectives on Power in Organizations. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091259

Appleton-knapp, S. L., & Krentler, K. A. (2006). Measuring Student Expectations and Their Effects on Satisfaction : The Importance of Managing Student Expectations. 28(3), 254–264. https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475306293359

Aslam, U., Rehman, M., Imran, M. K., & Muqadas, F. (2016). The impact of teacher qualifications and experience on student satisfaction: a mediating and moderating research model. Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS), 10(3), 505-524. http://hdl.handle.net/10419/188265

Ayres, M., Shirazi, H., Carvalho, R., Hall, J., Speir, R., Arambula, E., David, R., Gadzinski, J., Caves, R., Wong, D., & Pitfield, D. (2013). Modelling the location and consequences of aircraft accidents q. *Safety Science*, *51*(1), 178–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2012.05.012

Boehm, B. O., Home, P. D., Behrend, C., Kamp, N. M., & Lindholm, A. (2002). Premixed insulin aspart 30 vs . premixed human insulin 30 / 70 twice daily : a randomized trial in Type 1 and Type 2 diabetic patients. 393–399. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1464-5491.2002.00733.x

Carey, Karen; Renee L. Cambiano; DE vore, J. b. (2002). Student to faculty satisfaction at a Midwestern university in the United States. The 25th HERSDA Annual Conference. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=7236719760016055657&hl=en&oi=scholarr

Chandra, T., Hafni, L., Chandra, S., Purwati, A. A., Chandra, J., Chandra, T., Hafni, L., Chandra, S., Purwati, A. A., Chandra, J., Chandra, T., Hafni, L., Chandra, S., & Purwati, A.

A. (2019). student loyalty The influence of service quality, university image on student satisfaction and student loyalty. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-07-2018-0212

Chua, C. (2004, July). Perception of quality in higher education. In Proceedings of the Australian universities quality forum (pp. 1-7). Melbourne, Australia: AUQAOccasional Publication.

Cornelius, L. L., & Herrenkohl, L. R. (2010). Power in the Classroom : How the Classroom Environment Shapes Students' Relationships With Each Other and With Concepts. June 2015, 37–41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690Xci2204

Diaz, A., Cochran, K., & Karlin, N. (2016). The Influence of Teacher Power on English Language Learners' Self-Perceptions of Learner Empowerment Learner Empowerment. 7555 (April). https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2015.1126801

Early, D. M., Maxwell, K. L., Burchinal, M., Alva, S., Bender, R. H., Bryant, D., ... & Zill, N. (2007). Teachers' education, classroom quality, and young children's academic skills: Results from seven studies of preschool programs. Child development, 78(2), 558-580. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01014.x

Feranades, c, K Ross, M. M. (2013). Understanding student satisfaction and loyalty in the UAE HE sector. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 613–630. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2012-0082

Fitri, H., & Hasan, A. (2008). Service Quality and Student Satisfaction : A Case Study at Private Higher Education Institutions. 163–175. https://www.academia.edu/download/31753676/982-2957-1-PB.pdf

García-Aracil, A. (2009). European graduates' level of satisfaction with higher education. Higher Education, 57(1), 1-21. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10734-008-9121-9

Hanssen, T. E. S., & Solvoll, G. (2015). The importance of university facilities for student satisfaction at a Norwegian University. Facilities, 33(13/14), 744-759. https://doi.org/10.1108/F-11-2014-0081

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (2012). Management of Organizational Behavior.10th Edition. person. https://eprints.uny.ac.id/74662/1/fulltext_mariyem_20633251012.pdf

Hoşgörür, T., & İlker, Y. (2016). The Effect of Power Sources Used by Lecturers in Class Management on The Pre- Service Teachers ' Perceptions of Fairness Regarding Their Öğretim Elemanlarının Sınıf Yönetiminde Kullandıkları Güç Kaynaklarının Öğretmen Adaylarının Öğrenme Ortamlarına Yönelik Adalet Algılarına Etkisi. 375–404. https://doi.org/10.14812/cuefd.284860

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice. (No Title). https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1130000796045313280

Ingrid Robeyns. (2005). The Capability Approach: a theoretical survey. *Journal of Human Development*, *6*(1), 93–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/146498805200034266

Jalilvand. M.A, V. L. (2015). Examining the relationship between managerial power and affectinve organiztion commitment. *Sport Busness and Management Journal*, 344–464. https://doi.org/10.1108/SBM-04-2011-0041

Jamieson, D.w., Thomas, K. W. (1974). Power and conflict in the student-teacher relationship. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *10*(3), 321–336. https://doi.org/10.1177/002188637401000304

Koutrouba, K., Baxevanou, E., & Koutroumpas, A. (2012). High school students' perceptions of and attitudes towards teacher power in the classroom. *International Education Studies*, *5(*5), 185–198. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n5p185

Lin, H. Y., Wang, M. H., Wu, M. J., Chiu, L. M. W. Y., & Hong, J. Y. *The International Journal of Organizational Innovation. vol*, *10*, 1-323. https://ijoi-online.org/attachments/article/53/Final%20Issue%20Vol%2010%20Num%201%20July%202017%20Section%20A.pdf

Marshall, Walker; Hudson, C. (1999). "Student Satisfaction and Student Success in the University System of Georgia. AIR 1999 Annual Forum Paper. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED433778

Martono, S., Nurkhin, A., Pramusinto, H., Afsari, N., & Arham, A. F. (2020). The Relationship of Good University Governance and Student Satisfaction. 9(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n1p1

Osman, A. R. (2019). A pragmatic model of student satisfaction : a viewpoint of private higher education. March. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-05-2017-0019

Paulsel, M. L., Chory-assad, R. M., & Dunleavy, N. (2005). The Relationship between Student Perceptions of Instructor Power and Classroom Justice. July 2016. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036810500207030

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. (2012). Essentials of organizational behavior. https://web.spcollege.edu/instructors/uploads/16296897dd/man_3240s1.pdf

Richmond, james c. macCrosky & virginia p. (1983). Power in the classroom i: Teacher aNd sTudent pErceptions. Communication Education, 32(2), 175–184. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528309378527

Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. Communication Education, 39(3), 181-195. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529009378801

Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., & Turman, P. D. (2007). Reconsidering the measurement of teacher power use in the college classroom. Communication Education, 56(3), 308-332. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520701256062

Shim, S. S., Cho, Y. J., & Wang, C. (2013). Classroom goal structures, social achievement goals, and adjustment in middle school. Learning and Instruction, 23(1), 69–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2012.05.008

Tabbane, R. S., & Debabi, M. (2015). Electronic word of mouth: Definitions and concepts. Capturing, Analyzing, and Managing Word-of-Mouth in the Digital Marketplace, 11(12), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-9449-1.ch001

Teven, J. J., & Herring, J. E. (2005). Teacher influence in the classroom: A preliminary investigation of perceived instructor power, credibility, and student satisfaction. Communication Research Reports, 22(3), 235-246. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036810500230685

Tsui, A. S., Nifadkar, S. S., Ou, A. Y., & Ou, A. Y. (2007). Journal of Management. Management. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300818

Turman, P. D., & Schrodt, P. (2006). Student perceptions of teacher power as a function of perceived teacher confirmation. Communication Education, 55(3), 265-279. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520600702570

Wang, Y. S. (2006). The relationship between coaching leadership behaviors and Taiwanese collegiate Tae Kwon Do competitor's satisfaction. University of the Incarnate Word. https://search.proquest.com/openview/9b1c74a6ff4b280557beb26f199a6390/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

William, J., Euler, C., Christensen, S., & Shlomchik, M. J. (2002). Evolution of autoantibody responses via somatic hypermutation outside of germinal centers. Science, 297(5589), 2066-2070. DOI: 10.1126/science.1073924

Yoon, S., & Jameson, A. (1988). Lower-upper symmetric-Gauss-Seidel method for the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations. *AIAA journal*, *26*(9), 1025-1026. https://doi.org/10.2514/3.10007