

---

## Relationship between Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction: A Study on Public Higher Education Institutions of Ethiopia

Tesfay Kelali<sup>1</sup>,

Ph.D. candidate

University School of Applied Management, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab, India

Dr. Sarang Narula<sup>2</sup>

Assistant Professor

University School of Applied Management, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab, India

### Abstract

This study examined the relationship of perceived leadership styles of Ethiopian public universities academic administrators' to job satisfaction of faculty members. Avolio and Bass's Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) and the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale questionnaires were distributed to 500 randomly selected academic staff of six public universities. Responses were received from 428 academic staff, representing an 81.6% response rate. Pair-wise correlation (correlation coefficient) was employed for analyzing the data using STATA 11.0. Findings revealed that transformational leadership style has a strong, positive and statistically significant effect on faculty members' intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction. Also contingent reward behavior of academic administrators is positively correlated with job satisfaction of faculty members. Transactional leadership style sub behaviors of Management By Exception-Active and Management By Exception-Passive have negative and statistically insignificant effect on faculty members' extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction. The laissez-faire (leadership) style of academic administrators is significantly and negatively correlated with extrinsic/intrinsic/total job satisfaction of faculty members. The ideal leadership style in Ethiopian higher education institutions should be a mix of transformational managerial abilities with a proper dose of transactional skills, such as contingent reward.

**Key words:** *leadership styles, extrinsic job satisfaction, intrinsic job satisfacti*

---

## 1. Introduction

The success of individual careers and the fate of organizations are determined by the effectiveness of leaders' behavior (Kaiser and Kaplan, 2006). Leadership is considered crucial for success, and some researchers have argued that it is the most critical ingredient (Carson et al., 2007). Domino's Pizza chain CEO David Brandon states that the success of each store is based on the leadership provided by the manager (White, 2005).

On the other hand, an organization's success depends on hiring and retaining satisfied employees (Cordeiro, 2010). For example, faculty members play a vital role in the success of higher education institutions. And through increased job satisfaction, greater employee retention helps colleges and universities achieve adequate faculty allocations (Froeschle & Sinkford, 2009). According to Wong & Heng (2009), faculty job satisfaction and its relationship to retention in higher education are business-related issues, as a 5% increase in retention can lead to a 10% reduction in costs. While a similar increase in retention can further result in substantial productivity increases, to as much as 65%.

It is often argued that effective leadership and employee job satisfaction are two factors that have been regarded as fundamental for organizational success. A capable leader provides direction for the organization and leads followers towards achieving desired goals. In similar vein, employees with high job satisfaction are likely to exert more effort in their assigned tasks and pursue organizational interests. An organization that fosters high employee job satisfaction is also more capable of retaining and attracting employees with the skills that it needs (Mutjaba, 2009). In addition, Fryer & Lovas (1991) noted that researchers in organizational behavior contend that a supervisor's leadership style has a powerful effect on employee attitudes and behavior (Kearney & Hays, 1994; Lucas, 1994). To this end, the relationship between leadership style and employees' job satisfaction has been studied extensively (Bhella, 1982; Beehr & Gupta, 1987; Bordieri, Reagle, & Coker, 1988; Burns & Shuman, 1988; Dobbins & Zaccharo, 1986; Jensen, White, & Singh, 1990; Putti & Tong, 1992), Cheryl et al., (2003) noted. However, studies of the leadership style of academic leaders and its influences have not been adequately investigated in Ethiopia.

## 2. Review of Related Literature

### Leadership and Leadership Styles

Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth (Burns, 1978). Leadership has been widely discussed, written about, and practiced for thousands of years and still remains an active area of inquiry (Kouzes & Posner 1995; Yukl 2002; Kotter, 1990; Bass, 1997; Bass, 1990; Bennis, 1989). Most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization (Gary, 2006). Similarly, Lussier and Achua (2010) defined leadership as the influencing process of leaders and followers to achieve organizational objectives through change. And here comes the question why do certain leaders have dedicated followers while others do not? Why were Gandhi, Mother Theresa, Martin Luther King, and Nelson Mandela such influential leaders?

### Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction may be defined as a positive emotional response from the assessment of a job or specific aspects of a job (Locke, 1976; Smith *et al.*, 1969). According to Bowen and Cattell (2008), job satisfaction refers to the sincere feelings of an employee towards his job. And it is the composition of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. It includes certain factors of satisfaction such as

---

salary, allowances, encouragement, working conditions, supervision styles, organizational policies, reporting relations and self-sufficiency.

A well-known theory of work motivation, Herzberg's two-factor, or motivator-hygiene theory, addresses both motivation and satisfaction. Hygiene needs are basically maintenance needs that frequently lead to job dissatisfaction. The dissatisfying elements are extrinsic job factors in the working environment, such as company policy, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions (Muchinsky, 1993). On the other hand, motivators are higher-order needs originating within an individual (Landy, 1989). These motivators involve incidents intrinsic to the job, such as responsibility, independence of action, and recognition for accomplishing difficult tasks. The two-factor theory emphasizes that jobs should be designed so that there would be a high degree of reward, provided by context factors to avoid dissatisfaction and content factors to ensure satisfaction (Muchinsky, 1993). Herzber insisted that a manager/leader must be sure to provide sufficient hygiene factors while at the same time building satisfiers or motivators into a job. In essence, hygiene factors are essential to be sure a subordinate is not dissatisfied, and satisfiers are needed to motivate an employee to work towards a higher level of performance. Much like making your peanut butter and jelly sandwich, it's all about finding the right balance.

According to Fryer and Lovas (1991), faculty morale in higher education results from perceptions faculty members hold regarding their value to the dean/department chair. Faculty members will be motivated (a) when given a chance to feel intellectually and emotionally challenged by their work, (b) when perceiving opportunities for personal and professional growth, (c) when afforded the opportunity to participate in decisions affecting their own development, (d) when encouraged to feel they are part of an important ongoing enterprise, and (e) to know that they make a difference and are given recognition and visibility (Lucas, 1994). These motivational needs of faculty, addressed through the interactions with their dean or department chair, are believed to contribute to faculty personal growth and development, job satisfaction and willingness to change (Kearney & Hays, 1994).

### **Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction**

The relationship between leadership styles and employees' job satisfaction has been studied extensively in schools, business, industry, and the healthcare system. Most of the researchers contended that a supervisor's leadership style has a powerful effect on employees' attitudes and behaviors. Lawler (1994) stated that research on motivation of subordinates indicates that a superior represents a source of reward for workers and a reward has an impact on satisfaction. Moreover, Mutjaba (2009) stated that higher education institutions that have effective leadership procedures have a better likelihood of retaining high-quality faculty members, which may enable them to outperform their competitors.

Therefore, as a result of this interaction, worker's satisfaction is related to leadership style. Some of the recently conducted researches on the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction and which the researcher considered most relevant are presented as follows:

*Bateh (2013)*, analyzed the correlation between perceived academic administrator leadership styles and satisfaction of faculty members in the State University System of Florida. The independent variables he considered were the transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership styles of academic administrators as evaluated by faculty members. And the dependent variable was job satisfaction of full-time faculty members. Bateh used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to identify the leadership style of an administrator as perceived by faculty members. One hundred four participants from a state university in Florida completed the online survey. The author developed and employed a logistic regression model, and the statistically significant correlations indicated that

(a) faculty members who identified transformational leadership as dominant had increased job satisfaction, (b) faculty members who identified transactional leadership as dominant had increased job satisfaction, and (c) faculty members who identified passive/avoidant leadership as dominant had decreased job satisfaction. Based on a 95% significance level, there was a significant relationship between the 3 leadership styles and job satisfaction. According to the author, using this model academic leaders can take further action by refining their leadership styles on the basis of their faculty members' indicated preferences. Moreover, the author believes that the study results may contribute to social change by making academic administrators aware of effective leadership models that promote higher job satisfaction among faculty in universities.

*Stumpf (2003)*, in her research paper, examined the relationship of perceived leadership styles of North Carolina county extension directors' to job satisfaction of county extension professionals. The author noted that there existed significant differences in the job satisfaction of Extension professionals' based upon the perceived leadership style of their County Extension Director. These differences most often occurred in total job satisfaction. The perceived transformational and transactional leadership behaviors accounted for 32% of the variation in County Extension professionals' total job satisfaction scores. And the best two variable model, LF (Laissez Faire) and IC (Individualized Consideration) explained 45% of the variation of County Extension professionals' total job satisfaction. A bivariate correlation analyses identified significant associations between perceived leadership behaviors, total job satisfaction and demographic factors.

*Amin, et al (2013)*, in their paper analyzed the interplay between leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) and faculty job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic and overall) in a public university of Punjab, Pakistan. The findings of the study highlight that there is a significant relationship between the group of independent variables (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles) and the faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction. However, they argued that the group of independent variables has slightly stronger relationship with extrinsic job satisfaction as compared to overall job satisfaction, and the relationship of independent variables with intrinsic job satisfaction is relatively less strong. Moreover, they have come up with a result that the transformational leadership style, in relation to the other two independent variables (transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles), has a strong positive and statistically significant effect on faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction. Nonetheless, it was found out that the laissez-faire leadership style, relatively, has weak positive and statistically insignificant effect on faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction. On the other hand, the transactional leadership style has comparatively weak negative and statistically insignificant effect on faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction.

*Hamidifar (2009)* explored the relationship between leadership styles and employee job satisfaction at Islamic Azad University (IAU) branches in Tehran, Iran. The author claimed that the dominant leadership styles in the university were transformational and transactional and employees were moderately satisfied with their job. And the results showed that different leadership style factors do have different impacts on employee job satisfaction components. Thus, individualized consideration, a transformational sub-variable, positively influences all the job satisfaction factors. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership significantly and negatively influences them. Therefore, he concluded that individualized consideration and laissez-faire are strong predictors of all the job satisfaction factors. Moreover, the author recommended that special attention should be given by IAU leaders to motivators such as employee recognition, good working conditions, communication, competitive salaries, and promotion in order to improve job satisfaction. Furthermore, for the leaders to succeed in today's fast changing educational environment, it is recommended that they adopt a transformational leadership style rather than transactional or laissez-faire leadership ones to

---

enhance IAU employees' satisfaction consistently and efficiently; which will in turn generate higher quality performance on the employees' part.

*Long et al., (2013)* provided a study on the impact of transformational leadership style on job satisfaction that reveals the existence of a strong and significantly positive relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction as compared to transactional leadership. As per their finding, the transformational leadership style is preferred over transactional leadership style for the improvement of staff job satisfaction. In addition, a negative correlation was found between laissez faire leadership and job satisfaction. They justified the result to be due to the huge amount of freedom given to the staff without proper direction and supervision from their superior. Moreover, the results support the conclusion that a transformational leader may be expected to provide a clear vision of the organization's mission as well as inspiring his or her followers and gaining trust and respect through charisma (*Bass et al. 1990*). Thus, the authors believe that followers under such leadership styles can be expected to be more satisfied with their leaders.

In general, leadership has got a paramount importance on the success of organizations, be it private or public, profit or non-profit. It is also evident that the appropriate leadership style used by leaders may be the most effective in overcoming the low job satisfaction of staff in an organization. And that of transformational leadership style is vastly advised to be exercised in every organizational setting with, of course, a proper dose of transactional leadership style in some type of organizations such higher education institutions, banks, and manufacturing so as employees' intrinsic, extrinsic or total job satisfaction can be heightened which, in turn, can definitely improve staff work commitment and more importantly, it can also increase work quality and productivity.

Therefore, the hypothesis/research question for the present study relates to the argument that the leadership styles (of academic administrator) has significant bearing on job satisfaction (of faculty members). One such case, specifically public higher education institutions (universities) of Ethiopia, is the focus of this study.

### **3. Objective of the Study**

The major objective of this study is determining the relationship between leadership style and faculty job satisfaction. And specifically,

- To identify which leadership styles (transformational, transactional, laissez- faire) of academic administrators, as perceived by faculty members, relate to extrinsic job satisfaction levels at public higher education institutions in Ethiopia.
- To identify which leadership styles (transformational, transactional, laissez- faire) of academic administrators, as perceived by faculty members, relate to intrinsic job satisfaction levels at public higher education institutions in Ethiopia.

### **4. Research Methodology**

#### **Research design**

A correlational design was used to seek information related to the study's research questions, making use of a cross-sectional survey instrument. Thus, self-administered questionnaires were used to gather the faculty perceptions of the leadership styles of academic administrators and faculty members' job satisfaction levels. According to Stone (1978), a survey is an appropriate method of collecting data for descriptive or exploratory studies. It can be used in studies in which individuals are the unit of analysis, and it is also considered best suited for measuring attitudes and obtaining personal and social facts, as well as beliefs (*Babbie, 1989; Kerlinger, 1986*).

---

## Population and Sample

The population of the study consists of the full-time academic staff of public higher education institutions of Ethiopia. They constitute twenty thousand and fifty one (20051) in number. Thus, all the staffs in the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, lecturer, assistant lecturer, and graduate assistant employed permanently for teaching or research at the public universities of the country were the target population of the study.

## Instrumentation

Based on the literature review of instrumentation in similar studies, the latest version of the MLQ Form 5X (MLQ-5X) and Mohrman Cooke Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale (MCMJSS) were found to be relevant and selected for use in this study.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) is the standard instrument for assessing transformational and transactional leadership behavior (Bass & Avolio, 2000; Avolio & Bass, 2004). Bass & Avolio (2000) used nine samples ( $n = 2,154$ ) from a variety of occupations to examine the construct validity and reliability. As a result, the coefficient alpha of reliability of the total scale and each the leadership factor subscale ranged from .74 to .94, indicating the achievement of a sufficient internal consistency level. Moreover, the researcher has gone through testing the validity of the instrument by surveying 100 faculty members of Aksum University, one of the sample universities of the study. As a result, a confirming and satisfactory result was obtained. That is, a Cronbach's alpha value of the total scale was found to be .85 and that of the nine subscales ranged from .71 to .82.

The MCMJSS (Mohrman et al., 1977) is used to measure employee job satisfaction with employee self-report on three major aspects, that are (i) extrinsic, (ii) intrinsic, and (iii) overall job satisfaction (Pritchett, 2006). Reliability of the instrument using Cronbach's alpha for the intrinsic scale ranged from .81 to .87 while the extrinsic scale ranged from .77 to .82 (Mohrman et al., 1977). In other research by Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman, Cronbach's alpha was .86 for the intrinsic section and .71 for the extrinsic. Moreover, similar to the MLQ, test of reliability of the instrument was conducted in this study also using the 100 sample respondents. Consequently, the Cronbach's alphas (of reliability) of the instrument were .81 for the total satisfaction scale, .79 for the intrinsic satisfaction subscale, and .78 for the extrinsic satisfaction subscale which could be regarded as reliable enough for psychometric measurement.

## Data Analysis

Frequency distribution and descriptive analyses were completed on the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ), as well as the *Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale* (MCMJSS). An overall mean and standard deviation were determined for each score. Pair-wise correlation (Pearson's Correlation coefficient) was used to analyze the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction. Both measures were included in the STATA 11.0. Moreover, a significance of .05 was set for analysis of the data collected for this study.

## 5. Results and Discussion

The correlation analysis revealed that, at 95% level of confidence, there is statistically significant correlation ( $p < 0.05$ ) between the extrinsic job satisfaction sub scale and all three leadership styles but not as strongly correlated in all the cases. Also the correlations are varied in sign. While the correlation between the extrinsic job satisfaction sub scale and the first two leadership styles of transformational and transaction is positive, it is negative with the laissez-faire style ( $r = -0.2654$ ).

Moreover, the correlation between extrinsic job satisfaction and transformational leadership style is stronger ( $r=0.5229$ ) than with transactional leadership style ( $r=0.1524$ ) which can of course be labelled as very weak (See Table 1 below).

**Table 1. Pair-wise correlation between EJS and Leadership styles**

	TL	TCL	LF
<b>EJS</b>			
r	0.5229*	0.1524*	-0.2654*
p-value	0.0000	0.0020	0.0000

EJS=Extrinsic job satisfaction, TL= Transformational leadership, TCL = Transactional leadership, LF = Laissez-fair .

\* Significant at 95% confidence interval (or  $p < 0.05$ )

It has been defined that transformational leaders are highly visible and spend a lot of time communicating. They are also known to be constantly inspiring team members with a shared vision and future. Whereas transactional leadership is believed to be based on a simple premise: that people are motivated by reward and punishment. Thus, taking into account the findings of this study and the definitions of the variables in question, it is evident that the very act of constantly communicating and inspiring team members with a shared vision and future (transformational leadership) is having more impact on extrinsic job satisfaction of employees than the mere exchange or reward and punishment (transactional) form of leadership. In addition, it is indicated that the laissez-faire style is having an inverse relationship with extrinsic job satisfaction of employees, implying that adhering to the philosophy of “leave it be” or laissez-faire leadership which is usually associated with absence of contact results in lesser or no satisfaction on the side of the team members. In addition, it is a confirmation to the idea that constantly communicating and inspiring team members with a shared vision and future does actually work on getting them motivated or satisfied. Moreover, this finding is in agreement with the findings of Voon et al., (2011) which stated that transformational leadership style has a stronger relationship with job satisfaction implying that transformational leadership is deemed suitable for managing government organizations. It is also consistent with the findings of Ahmad et al., (2013) which indicated the existence of strong relationships between job satisfaction and transformational leadership comparable to transactional leadership and where, the authors argued, there is a different effect between transformational leadership and transactional leadership on job satisfaction and, thus, transformational leadership has higher ratio and beta that show higher influence on job satisfaction compared to transactional leadership.

To view more specific relationship between the variables, a pair-wise correlation analysis has been conducted between extrinsic job satisfaction and the sub behaviors of transformational and transactional leadership styles. As can be observed from Table 2 below, statistically there exists positive and significant correlation between the sub behaviors of transformational leadership style of the academic administrators and extrinsic job satisfaction of faculty members, the stronger links being with the sub behaviors of Intellectual Stimulation ( $r = 0.5196$ ) and Inspirational Motivation ( $r = 0.4920$ ). Also the sub behavior of contingent reward (CR) of the transactional leadership style is directly and significantly correlated with extrinsic job satisfaction. However, unlike to the general results observed in table 1, the sub behaviors of management by exception- active (MBEA) and management by exception-passive (MBEP) of the transactional leadership style are inversely (negatively) related with extrinsic job satisfaction.

**Table 2. Pair-wise correlation between EJS and the sub scales of transformational-transactional leadership styles**

	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC	CR	MBEA	MBEP
EJS	0.4500*	0.4273*	0.4920*	0.5196*	0.3727*	0.4849*	-0.0364*	-0.1409*
r	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4635	0.0043
p-value								

EJS=Extrinsic Job Satisfaction, IIA= Idealized Influence-Attributed, IIB = Idealized Influence-Behavior, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS= Intellectual Motivation, IC= Individualized Consideration, CR= Contingent Reward, MBEA= Management By Exception-Active, MBEP= Management By Exception-Passive.

\* Significant at 95% confidence interval (or  $p < 0.05$ )

This finding is exactly in line with other previous research findings such as that of Webb (2003) where, based on his research results, the author stated, “by combining the transformational leadership behaviors of Attributed Charisma (idealized influence-attributed) and Individual Consideration with the transactional leadership behavior of Contingent Reward, leaders may develop leadership styles that are more satisfying, motivating, and effective for followers than solely using the transformational model of leadership.” It also mirrors the findings of Bodla and Nawaz (2010) who declared that the dimension, of ‘idealized attributes’ ( $r = 0.155, p < 0.05$ ), ‘idealized behavior’ ( $r = 0.126, p < 0.05$ ), ‘inspirational motivation’ ( $r = 0.231, p < 0.01$ ), and ‘intellectual stimulation’ ( $r = 0.233, p < 0.01$ ) all have positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction.

The correlation of the study which indicated the least effect on the reported job satisfaction was between the Individualized Consideration (IC) of the transformational leadership style and intrinsic job satisfaction, implying that faculty members prefer their leaders to deal with development of teamwork and team satisfaction instead of concentrating on individual needs. This result is in agreement with other research findings such as that of Bodla and Nawaz (2010) who stated that the only dimension that has no significant relationship with the satisfaction was ‘individualized consideration’ ( $r = 0.099$ ). However, this particular result of the present study is especially in contradiction with other research findings such as that of Long et al., (2013) where, in an attempt to examine the relationship between transformational leadership style and employee job satisfaction, they discussed four transformational leadership characteristics: *idealized influence, inspiration motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration* and claimed that only one of the four transformational leadership characteristics, *individualized consideration*, is found to have significant relationship with job satisfaction and declared that it contributes the most in job satisfaction. It also contradicts with the research finding of Hamidifar (2009) where the author stated, “Results show that different leadership style factors will have different impacts on employee job satisfaction components. To mention some, individualized consideration and laissez-faire are strong predictors of all the job satisfaction factors.”

The second research question of the study seeks to determine the relationship between the intrinsic job satisfaction sub scale and leadership styles. Here again pair-wise correlation analysis was performed and as can be observed from Table 3, there is, statistically significant correlation between the intrinsic job satisfaction of faculty members and transformational and transaction leadership styles of the academic administrators though, compared to the one with extrinsic satisfaction, the correlation is to a weaker level ( $r = 0.3234, r = 0.1062$ ), implying that the feelings of self-esteem, self-

respect or worthwhile on a certain job are directly impacted by transformational or transactional leadership style but to a lower degree. In other words, be it the constantly communicating and inspiring of team members on shared values and future or the mere rewarding and punishing practice, they all do positively impact the intrinsic job satisfaction of employees, though not as strongly they do on the extrinsic case. Moreover, the correlation between intrinsic job satisfaction and laissez-fair is found to be negative and weaker ( $r = -0.1386$ ).

**Table 4.14. Pair-wise correlation of IJS and TL, TCL, and LF**

	TL	TCL	LF
<b>IJS</b>			
r	0.3234*	0.1062*	-0.1386*
p-value	0.0000	0.0020	0.0000

IJS=Intrinsic job satisfaction, TL= Transformational leadership, TCL = Transactional leadership, LF = Laissez-fair

\* Significant at 95% confidence interval (or  $p < 0.05$ )

Similar to the first research question, further analysis has been made in the second research question so as to look for some specific results. A pair-wise correlation analysis, as shown in Table 4 below, revealed that intrinsic job satisfaction is positively and significantly correlated with all the sub behaviors of transformational leadership style and Contingent Reward (CR). And the Individualized Consideration sub behavior showed relatively the weakest positive effect. This could be verified by Burns' (1978) proposal that transformational leaders have an obligation to concentrate their efforts on moral purpose and values as well as the higher-order intrinsic needs of their followers. Also these particular results of the present study mirror that of Amin et al., (2013) who claimed that the group of independent variables (leadership styles) has slightly stronger relationship with extrinsic job satisfaction as compared to overall job satisfaction, and the relationship of independent variables with intrinsic job satisfaction is relatively less strong.

On the other hand, the sub behaviours of Management By Exception-Active and Management By Exception-Passive are seen to have negative and statistically insignificant effect on faculty member's intrinsic job satisfaction. Also, laissez-faire leadership style and intrinsic job satisfaction are significantly but negatively correlated. Thus, it's evident that still the non-leadership style (laissez-faire) is having a devastating impact on intrinsic job satisfaction of employees. These results are particularly mirroring the findings of Amin et al., (2013) which showed that the transactional leadership style has comparatively weak, negative and statistically insignificant effect on faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction.

**Table 4. Pair-wise correlation of IJS and IIA, IIB, IM, IS, IC, CR, MBEA, and MBEP**

	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC	CR	MBEA	MBEP
<b>EJS</b>								
r	0.2887*	0.2989*	0.3068*	0.3130*	0.1903*	0.3004*	-0.0274	-0.0622
p-value	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	0.0000	0.5814	0.2099

---

IJS=Intrinsic Job Satisfaction, IIA= Idealized Influence-Attributed, IIB = Idealized Influence-Behavior, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS= Intellectual Motivation, IC= Individualized Consideration, CR= Contingent Reward, MBEA= Management By Exception-Active, MBEP= Management By Exception-Passive

\* Significant at 95% confidence interval (or  $p < 0.05$ )

Generally, the findings of this study support previous researches which revealed the greater effect of transformational leadership on followers' job satisfaction (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Avolio et al., 1999; Bass, 1997; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Stumpf, 2003; Webb, 2009; Sadeghi and Pihie, 2013; Bateh, 2013). It is also in line with the studies by Mason (1998), Webb (2003, 2009), and Bateh (2013) that found laissez-faire as a significant negative predictor of job satisfaction.

## 6. Conclusion and Remarks

Generally, transformational leadership style, compared to the other two independent variables (transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles), has a strong, positive and statistically significant effect on faculties' intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction.

- Transformational leadership style (and the Contingent Reward sub behavior of transactional leadership style) is significantly and positively correlated with extrinsic, intrinsic, and total job satisfaction of faculty members. Therefore, it can be inferred that the very act of constantly communicating and inspiring team members with a shared vision and future (transformational leadership) is having more impact on job satisfaction of employees than the mere exchange or reward and punishment (transactional) form of leadership.
- Transactional leadership style sub behaviors of Management By Exception-Active and Management By Exception-Passive have negative and statistically insignificant effect on faculty members' extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction. And this is an indication that subordinates are not content with the very act of the leaders in keeping track of mistakes and/or not taking action until mistakes occur.
- The laissez-faire leadership style of academic administrators is significantly and inversely correlated with extrinsic/intrinsic/total job satisfaction of faculty members. Thus, it is evident that the laissez-faire leadership style does have a devastating impact on job satisfaction of employees.
- The independent variables (leadership styles) have slightly stronger relationship with extrinsic job satisfaction as compared to intrinsic or overall job satisfaction.

Academic administrators, who wish to increase the job satisfaction of their faculty, need to consider concentrating on their transformational (and transactional leadership to some extent) behaviors. The academic administrators also need to concentrate on those leadership values that do level up the intrinsic job satisfaction of their faculty members and, of course, maintaining the momentum on the extrinsic aspects. Job enrichment and empowerment might be only two of the measures to be taken in this case.

---

## References

- Ahmad, A. R., Adi, M. N. M., Noor, H. M., Rahman, A. G. A. & Yushuang, T. (2013). The influence of leadership style on job satisfaction among nurses. *Asian Social Science*, 9(9), 172-178.
- Amin, M., Shah, S., Tatlah, I. A. (2013). Impact of principals/directors' leadership styles on job satisfaction of the faculty members: Perceptions of the faculty members in a public university of Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, 7(2), 97-112.
- Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire. Manual and sampler set*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.
- Babbie, E. (1989). *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). *Does the transactional/transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?* *American Psychologist*, 52, 130-139.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *Manual for multifactor leadership questionnaire: Sampler set* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bateh, J. T. (2013). Leadership styles and faculty satisfaction in the State University System of Florida. Walden University Scholar Works. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2067&context=dissertations>.
- Bennis, W. G. (1959). Leadership theory and administrative behavior: The problem of authority. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 4, 259-260.
- Bodla, M. A. and Nawaz, M. M. (2010). Transformational leadership style and its relationship with satisfaction. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(1), 370-381.
- Bowen and Cattell (2008). Job satisfaction of South African quantity surveyors. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 15(3), 260-269.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/title/leadership/oclc/3632001>.
- Carson, J. B., Tesluck, P. E., Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 (5), 1217-1234.
- Cheryl M., Deléne V., Gert R. (2003). Leadership style and its relation to employee attitudes and behaviour. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29 (2), 72-82.
- Cordeiro, W. P. (2010). A business school's unique hiring process. *Business Education Innovation Journal*, 2(1), 56-60.
- Fryer, T.W., & Lovas, J.C. (1991). *Leadership in governance: Creating conditions for successful decision making in the community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Froeschle, M. L., & Sinkford, J. C. (2009). Full-time dental faculty perceptions of satisfaction with the academic work environment. *Journal of Dental Education*, 73, 1153-1170.
- Fryer, T. W., & Lovas, J. C. (1991). *Leadership in governance: Creating conditions for successful decision making in community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gary Y. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*. Six edition. Pearson Prentice Hall.

- 
- Hamidifar, F. (2009). A Study of the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Employee Job Satisfaction at Islamic Azad University Branches in Tehran, Iran. *Researchgate*, 3(1), 45-58.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: Meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 755-768.
- Kaiser, R. B. and Kaplan, R. B. (2006). The deeper work of executive development: Outgrowing sensitivities. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(4), 463-483.
- Kearney, R.C., & Hays, S.W. (1994). *Labor-management relations and participative decision making: Toward a new paradigm*. *Public Administration Review*, 54(1), 44-50.
- Kotter, P. J. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *Leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Landy, F. J. (1989). *Psychology of work behavior* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). *The Nature and causes of job satisfaction: Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Rand-McNally.
- Long, C. S, Thean, L. Y., Kowang, T.O. (2013). The transformational leadership: A possible TQM solution to increase job satisfaction? *Life Science Journal* 2013; 10(4) accessed from <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>.
- Lucas, A. (1994). *Strengthening departmental leadership: A team-building guide for chairs in colleges and universities*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
- Lussier N. Robert, Achua F. Christopher (2010). *Leadership: Theory, application, & skill development*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. University of Virginia's College at Wise. South Western Cengage Learning.
- Mohrman, A. M., Cooke, R. S., Mohrman, S. A., Duncan, R. B. & Zaltman, G. (1977). *An assessment of a structural task approach to organizational development in a school system*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.123helpme.com/qualitative-and-inductive-approach-preview.asp?id=273481>
- Muchinsky, P. M. (1993). *Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Mutjaba, B. (2009). Faculty development practices in distance education for success with culturally diverse students. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 4(4), 1-12.
- Sadeghi, A. and Pihie, Z. A. L. (2013). The role of transformational leadership style in enhancing lecturers' job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(8). Retrieved from [http://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_4\\_No\\_8\\_Special\\_Issue\\_July\\_2013/26.pdf](http://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_8_Special_Issue_July_2013/26.pdf)
- Smith P, Kendall L, Hulin C, (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*, Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Stumpf, M. N. (2003). The relationship of perceived leadership styles of North Carolina County Extension Directors' to job satisfaction of County Extension Professionals. A PhD Dissertation. North Carolina State University, Adult Community College, Raleigh, NY. Retrieved from <https://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/handle/1840.16/5913>.
- Stone, E. (1978). *Research methods in organizational behavior*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Voon, M.L. , Lo M.C., Ngui1 K.S., Ayob N.B. (2011). The influence of leadership styles on employees' job satisfaction in public sector organizations in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 24-32.
-

---

Webb, K. S. (2003). Presidents' leadership behaviors associated with followers' job satisfaction, motivation toward extra effort, and presidential effectiveness at Evangelical Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from

[https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc4377/m2/1/high\\_res\\_d/dissertation.pdf](https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc4377/m2/1/high_res_d/dissertation.pdf)

White E. (2005). To keep employees, Domino's decides it's not all about pay. *The Wall Street Journal* (February 17, 2005): A1. Retrieved from

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB110859140448656895>

Wong, E., & Heng, T. (2009). Case study of factors influencing job satisfaction in two Malaysian universities. *International Business Research*, 2(2), 86-98.

Yulk G. (2002). *Leadership in organization*. 7<sup>th</sup> Ed. University of Albany. State University of New York. Pearson.