# 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

Muhammad Amin, Saeeda Shah, Ijaz Ahmad Tatlah
Email: dramin@ue.edu.pk

The study aims to explore the interplay between leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) and faculty job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic and overall) in a public university of Pakistan. The study is a cross-sectional survey and is analytic in nature. The whole faculty, 287 faculty members, of the chosen university was defined as the sample. The findings 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, 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. 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. Whereas, the laissez-faire leadership style, relatively, has weak positive and statistically insignificant effect on faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction. The transactional leadership style, on the other hand, has comparatively weak negative and statistically insignificant effect on faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction.

**Keywords:** *Leadership style, job satisfaction, university context*

## Introduction

The present study engages with international literature to explore and theorise the interplay between leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) and faculty job satisfaction with a focus on exploring and theorising the phenomenon in a public university of Pakistan. The relationship between perceived leadership styles of the principals/directors (leaders) and the faculty members' job satisfaction has been studied by many researchers. Stumpf (2003) examined this relationship in North Carolina at the university level, in an informal educational setting. She claims that professionals' overall job satisfaction is positively related to transformational leadership and the first two dimensions of transactional leadership, whereas it is negatively related to third dimension of the transactional leadership and the laissez-faire leadership. Leary *et al.* (1999) also investigated a similar relationship between deans or department chairs and subordinate faculty members at the higher-education level in West Virginia, and the findings confirm a strong relationship. Leary *et al* found that a stronger relationship exists between leadership styles and the faculty's extrinsic job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction. The relationship between leadership styles and the faculty members' intrinsic job satisfaction is statistically significant, but this relationship is not as strong as the relationships between leadership styles and the faculty's extrinsic and overall job satisfaction.

There are a number of studies from a variety of cultural contexts and settings that investigated the conceptual framework involving leadership styles and teachers/faculty job satisfaction to examine the relationship between them; these studies reveal this relationship to be significant (Al-Omari, 2008; Bogler, 2001; Dinham and Scott, 2000; Evans, 2001;

Rad and Yarmohammadian, 2006). More specifically, extensive research undertaken in different countries across the world and in a variety of organizational contexts, both non-educational and educational, showed that transformational leadership affected employee... job satisfaction... [However] despite the accumulated evidence on the effects of transformational leadership on job satisfaction... in business, military, [and] health service organizations..., research into the effects of transformational school [and university] leadership on teachers' job satisfaction... is scarce.

(Nguni *et al.*, 2006:146)

The leadership style that the leaders of an institution choose to exercise is underpinned by the culture and context of that institution, which may affect the teachers/faculty's job satisfaction (Al-Omari, 2008). So, it might be inferred that the leadership style may result in a satisfied or dissatisfied teacher/faculty member. This indicates that leadership style is an independent variable and job satisfaction is a dependent variable. These two variables have been taken, with the same arrangement, in the present study. A satisfied teacher/faculty member is more likely to deliver enhanced performance, and could be a prime element in improving the quality and performance of an educational institution (Chen and Silverthorne, 2005; Sharma and Jyoti, 2009; Toker, 2011; Woods, 2007; Karimi, 2008, see also Judge *et al.*, 1995; Wright and Crapanzano, 1997). Furthermore, "teachers' satisfaction from the job is highly important for the nexus between teachers and students, for satisfied teachers will be more enthusiastic about investing time and energy in teaching their students" (Bogler, 2001:679, see also Dusitsutirat, 2009:1091; Sharma and Jyoti, 2009). An appropriate leadership style is more likely to enhance job satisfaction among the teachers/faculty (Fowler, 1991), to potentially increase their performance (Madlock, 2008), and consequently to achieve institutional success (Nguni *et al.*, 2006). This argument underpins the present study.

The conceptual frame is informed by relevant literature and the purpose of the study. The conceptual frame encompasses the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles of the campus principals/divisional directors (leaders) and the job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic and overall) of the faculty members to examine their interplay. The leadership styles here are taken as an independent variable; whereas, faculty members' job satisfaction is taken as a dependent variable. There is limited international literature available at university level (Grosso, 2008) focusing on this particular aspect, and there is no study investigating this conceptual frame at the university level in Pakistan. In view of the importance of relationship between leadership and faculty job satisfaction, and to attend to the scarcity of research in this area in a higher education context, this study focuses on the relationship of university leadership with faculty job satisfaction.

The intended study may be useful for the Higher Education Commission (HEC), Pakistan, to initiate further research projects in this field and consequently to introduce reforms for the development of university leadership that may enhance faculty job satisfaction. This study can be of interest to the vice-chancellor, campus principals and divisional directors of the university which is under study in particular and also to the vice-chancellors and other university leadership, comparable to campus principals and divisional directors such as head/chairperson of the department, of other Pakistani universities in general, to reflect and critique the current leadership practices and to improve them so as to enhance faculty job satisfaction. This may ultimately contribute to improvement in the overall performance of the universities. Furthermore, the study may offer an opportunity to compare and contrast the similar studies from other international contexts, and to explore the influence of country context and culture on the interplay between leadership style(s) and faculty job satisfaction.

**Leadership Styles**

House (1976) argues that leadership style affects followers' job satisfaction. The qualities of a leader may determine a specific style for the leader, which may create a positive picture of the leader among subordinates. This constructive opinion about leader may lead towards a positive change in the group members' attitude and behaviour, which in turn may enhance the subordinates' job satisfaction and efficient performance (Grosso, 2008). This assumption signals the transformational capacity of

charismatic leadership and the influence it may have on the subordinates (Grosso, 2008).

The term leadership style in this study is taken as the pattern of the principal/director's interaction or behaviour that he/she exerts to guide, structure and facilitate activities and relationships in a campus/division. The three selected leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) further have nine dimensions in total, and the questionnaire items map these nine dimensions, which then map the three leadership styles. These nine dimensions are important in terms of engaging with the affective domain and demonstrating a critical engagement with values and morals which potentially goes beyond charismatic leadership subsumed within transformational leadership (Gunter, 2001). The three leadership styles and their nine dimensions are briefly discussed below.

## Transformational Leadership

This form of leadership comprises behaviour that motivates subordinates to higher-order needs, addresses the subordinates' developmental needs individually, results in performance ahead of expectations, promotes new approaches to solve issues, shares the leader's vision efficiently, encourages change, and becomes a source of satisfaction among followers (Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 2000). The four transformational leadership dimensions are presented below (Avolio *et al.*, 1995).

*Idealized Influence*: Idealized influence describes leaders who function as strong role models for their subordinates due to their exceptional abilities and high principles of ethical and moral conduct. They prioritise subordinates' needs as compared to their own needs and offer them a vision. Idealised influence has two aspects: first, idealised influence behaviour, which is linked with the leader's behaviour, and second, idealised influence attributed, which is related to the elements that are attributed to the leader by their subordinates (Avolio *et al.*, 1999; Gill, 2006).

*Inspirational Motivation*: Here leaders inspire subordinates by offering appealing visions of the upcoming circumstances, enriching subordinates' aims and stimulating passion and optimism. These leaders provoke spirit in the team, convey clear expectations and express dedication to objectives and a collective vision (Bass, 1985; Bass and Riggio, 2006).

*Intellectual Stimulation*: Intellectual stimulation refers to the leadership that inspires subordinates to be creative and innovative and to challenge not only their own viewpoints and values but also to those of the leader and the institution. Here, criticism of subordinates' errors is not encouraged (Bass, 1998; Hater and Bass, 1988).

*Individualised Consideration*: Individual consideration represents leaders who focus on each individual's needs for accomplishment and growth to their full potential by means of offering an encouraging atmosphere, recognising the differences with reference to the needs and aspiration of each individual follower, and through performing the function of a mentor (Bass and Avolio, 1990; Northouse, 2007).

## Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership is underpinned by exchange theory, where a leader and subordinates decide the aims and the procedure of attaining objectives by means of an exchange of rewards and the use of coercion to acquire the subordinate's compliance and endeavour in order to accomplish organisational performance (Bass, 1985). The three dimensions associated with transactional leadership are discussed below (Avolio *et al.*, 1995).

*Contingent Reward*: Contingent reward is an exchange process between a leader and their subordinates in which a leader with the concurrence of subordinates decides the aims, defines rewards for achievement of those aims and provides agreed compensation when performance objectives are fulfilled (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Northouse, 2010).

*Management-by-Exception (active)*: This is a leadership behaviour where the leader observes subordinates closely for mistakes and deviances from criteria in their jobs, and takes corrective measures as required (Bass, 1998; Gill, 2006).

*Management-by-Exception (passive)*: In this form of leadership the leader waits inactively for

subordinates' mistakes and deviances from benchmarks to happen or until issues have arisen before taking corrective measures (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2007).

## Laissez-Faire Leadership

Laissez-faire leadership is characterized as non-leadership or the absence of leadership. A laissez-faire leader renounces their liability, delays decisions, gives no feedback and offers less attention to assist subordinates to fulfil their needs (Avolio *et al*., 1999; Northouse, 2010).

## Interplay between Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction

In the context of this study, job satisfaction refers to positive and favourable attitudes and feelings which faculty members may have about their jobs (Armstrong, 2006). Evans (2001:292) argues that teachers' job satisfaction is "influenced much less by externally initiated factors, such as salary, education policy and reforms and conditions of service, than by factors emanating from the more immediate context within which [the] teachers work: institution-specific or, more precisely, job-specific factors". Evans establishes that "leadership emerged as a key attitudes-influencing factor, since it shapes teachers' work contexts and has the capacity, through policy [implementation] and decision-making, to enable or constrain and to determine individuals' proximity to their ideal jobs" (2001:294). In essence, there are a number of factors which might influence faculty job satisfaction (Al-Omari, 2008; Wetherell, 2002), but for the purpose of this study job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic and overall) as influenced by the leadership styles is investigated. However, an important factor in this regard is the cultural context influencing leadership concept, styles and practices.

Leadership is underpinned by culture-informed leadership style(s) and, therefore, in different cultural contexts different leadership styles are preferred and practiced because the practices that we take for granted may become distorted in different contexts (Shah, 2006b; Shahin and Wright, 2004). The studies on leadership styles in educational settings reveal that in different cultural contexts

different leadership styles have a significant impact on the job satisfaction of teachers/faculty members (Bogler, 2001; Madlock, 2008). Therefore, researchers advocate the practice of those leadership styles which have been found to have a significant impact on teacher/faculty member job satisfaction in that specific context in order to enhance institutional effectiveness (Dimmock and Walker, 2005; Nguni *et al*., 2006). This shows that there is a variety of views and theories, and there is no 'one leadership style' which may consistently contribute to productivity within an institution and can match all cultural contexts (Al-Omari, 2007).

A great deal of academic research on leadership in general, albeit within a variety of theoretical paradigms, is "predominantly reflective of Western perspectives" (Shah, 2010a:27; see also Simkins *et al*., 2003 and Northouse, 1997), and "most if not all evidence from research on transformational and transactional leadership [in particular] has been more confined to the Western world than in the developing world" in its origin and orientation (Nguni *et al*., 2006:146; see also Foskett and Lumby, 2003; Geijsel *et al*., 2003). Naturally, the resulting notions of leadership are embedded in that intellectual and cultural tradition, and therefore cannot be applied unmodified in other countries (Little, 1996; Rodwell, 1998). The question rises, then, "How far do the assertions and models of school [or university] leadership developed there pertain to the societies and cultures of the developing world?" (Simkins *et al*., 2003:275). Shah (2006a, 2006b and 2010a) consistently emphasised the need to locate and exercise context-specific leadership practices because these develop in and are influenced by societal culture and context, and are, consequently, helpful for faculty job satisfaction. Therefore, to keep the faculty members satisfied within their job and to improve the effectiveness of educational institutions, leaders need to know and use the appropriate leadership style(s) in their specific cultural context (Shaw, 2005). This argument highlights the need to identify leadership style/s that is/are more appropriate to enhance faculty job satisfaction in a particular culture and context through exploring the relationship between leadership style and faculty job satisfaction.

There has been a growing interest in the link

between educational leadership, institutional effectiveness and teacher/faculty member job satisfaction (Rad and Yarmohammadian, 2006; Smallwood, 2008); however, most research in this regard has been focused on the school context (Grosso, 2008; Somech, 2005). Effectively leading a university into the future is not an easy task for university leaders (Grosso, 2008). They find themselves demanding more from the faculty in order to cope with the challenges of an ever changing environment (Bohen and Stiles, 1998). University leaders have the critical task of ensuring a high level of faculty job satisfaction in order to motivate the faculty to give the extra effort required to efficiently progress the university (Grosso, 2008). Thus, institutions need to focus on context-based leadership style/s to likely increase a teacher/faculty member's performance by keeping him/her satisfied in their job (Grosso, 2008; Madlock, 2008), and consequently to possibly achieve institutional aims. This implies that it is important to investigate the interplay between leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction in specific cultural and organisational context.

## Relationship between Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction in Higher Education

Leary et al. (1999) investigated the relationship between leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction in the higher education context of the United States. The study focuses on the college level, and faculty members rated the leadership styles of their leaders and their own job satisfaction. The findings demonstrated that generally there was a statistically significant relationship between leadership styles and the faculty's overall job satisfaction. In detailed findings a stronger relationship was indicated between extrinsic job satisfaction and both dimensions of the leadership - consideration and initiation structure. On the other hand, the study showed a weaker relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and both dimensions of the leadership. Al-Omari (2008) conducted a similar study at university level in the context of Jordan and the findings confirmed Leary et al.'s results. Al-Omari argues that the weaker relationship between leadership aspects and the faculty's intrinsic satisfaction within their job is logical, because the factors which cause intrinsic job satisfaction come

from inside the person, whereas leadership style is from the outside environment of the individual. In both these studies only two dimensions of the leadership, consideration and initiation structure, were investigated, which is a potential limitation of these studies.

In another study, Seseer (2007) also examined a similar relationship in the Mongolian university context. The results of the study again endorsed the findings of the previous studies through maintaining that there is a strong relationship between faculty job satisfaction and the leadership styles, and faculty members express more job satisfaction when their leaders are perceived highly in both initiating structure and consideration leadership dimensions. Seseer's study also showed that behaviours of the leaders are the main factors which contribute to faculty members' job dissatisfaction. The findings, furthermore, highlighted that faculty members want their leader to have professional abilities, excellent communication and managerial expertise, and to treat them fairly, give them respect and involve them in the decision-making process. Klein and Takeda-Tinker (2009) and Mckee (1990) also explored a similar relationship between leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction in the higher education context of the United States and their findings support the above discussed results. The leadership behaviours that are investigated by the above studies are part of the transformational and transactional leadership approach.

## Transformational and Transactional Leadership and Job Satisfaction in Higher Education

A great deal of literature on transformational and transactional leadership within the educational setting does not focus on higher education (Bents and Blank, 1997; Bogler, 2001; Fields and Herold, 1997; Barnett and McCormick, 2004; Nguni et al., 2006). There are some studies from different cultural contexts that were carried out in the higher education setting, such as Grosso (2008), Tucker et al. (1992), Stumpf (2003), Burns (2007), Levine (2000) and Webb (2003) from the American context, Sung (2007) from the Taiwanese context and Dastoor et al. (2003) from the Thai context, which investigated the relationship between leadership styles and

faculty job satisfaction. All these studies utilised the transformational and transactional leadership theoretical paradigm to explore the leadership styles. The findings of these studies highlight that generally transformational leadership behavioural characteristics are practised more frequently by leaders as compared to the transactional leadership characteristics, and laissez-faire leadership behaviour is exercised with least frequency. The findings further show that the transformational leadership style has a positive and stronger relationship with, or accounts for more of the variance in, faculty members' self-perceived job satisfaction as compared to the transactional leadership style. However, Grosso (2008:104) contradicts this and maintains that "the transactional [leadership] behaviours ... did not" have significantly positive relationship with faculty job satisfaction.

The above studies differed in their detailed findings. Stumpf's (2003) study is the most relevant to the present research because the two variables 'leadership style and job satisfaction' are being investigated with the same instruments (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Mohrman-Cook-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale (MCMJSS) respectively) in order to examine the relationship between them at university level, as in Stumpf's case. Stumpf, similar to Dastoor *et al*. (2003) and Tucker *et al*. (1992), found that the relationship between the transactional leadership characteristics of the leader and followers' job satisfaction exists to varying degrees. The first two dimensions, contingent reward and management-by-exception (active), of transactional leadership have a positive relationship with followers' job satisfaction, but contingent reward has a stronger relationship as compared to management-by-exception (active). However, the third dimension, management-by-exception (passive), of transactional leadership has a significantly negative relationship with faculty job satisfaction. Similarly, laissez-faire behaviour by the leader was also perceived to have a significantly negative relationship with faculty members' job satisfaction. This means that in Stumpf's study context a leader should not practise the behaviours related to management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire, because these lead the faculty members towards job dissatisfaction.

Tucker *et al*. (1992) found that when the transactional style of the leaders was augmented by the transformational style the followers' perception of being satisfied was more frequent. Moreover, similar to Sung's (2007) findings, the faculty members working with the leader who was exercising transformational leadership behaviour showed more satisfaction as compared to the followers whose leader was practicing transactional and laissez-faire leadership behaviour. Tucker *et al*., therefore, argue that leaders who want to enhance their subordinates' satisfaction should exhibit transformational leadership behaviour. This practice will improve their job relationships with their followers, and in turn will boost the followers' satisfaction. The potential weakness of this study is that some of the leaders were rated by only one or two subordinates. Levine (2000:84) asserts that "transformational leadership is in fact a highly suitable leadership style in educational settings". This claim endorses the findings from studies conducted by Tucker *et al*. (1992) and Roueche *et al*. (1989) regarding the appropriateness and successfulness of transformational leadership in higher education institutions. Grosso (2008) also supports this notion by arguing that if the leaders utilise transformational leadership style, it might encourage an atmosphere of harmony and efficiency to achieve the collective aim or vision, and might offer faculty members an authority to develop and contribute to different plans.

The basic aim of Webb's (2003) study was to find a model comprising joint leadership behaviour linked with transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles to better predict subordinates' job satisfaction as compared to any of these leadership styles alone. The results highlighted that a combined four-factor model, including attributed charisma, individual consideration, contingent reward and laissez-faire, accounts for faculty job satisfaction "slightly better than the transformational model and much better than the transactional or laissez-faire models" (Webb, 2003:89). The above debated studies highlight that there is a relationship between leadership and culture, and leadership practices might vary in different cultural contexts; and consequently the interplay between leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction depends upon the specific societal and

organizational culture. The focus of the paper is to examine the relationship between perceived leadership styles of the principals/directors and the faculty's self-perceived job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic and overall) in a Pakistani public university context. Keeping in view the purpose of the study, the following research questions are investigated:

1. What is the relationship between the <u>faculty's perceived</u> leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) and the faculty members' self-perceived intrinsic job satisfaction?

2. What is the relationship between the <u>faculty's perceived</u> leadership styles and the faculty members' self-perceived extrinsic job satisfaction?

3. What is the relationship between the <u>faculty's perceived</u> leadership styles and the faculty members' self-perceived overall job satisfaction?

**Methodology**

The study is a cross-sectional survey and is 'analytic' in nature (Cohen *et al*., 2007:207). A co-relational design is adopted to seek information from the quantitative data. A survey is considered a suitable means of gathering data for analytic research, as it allows the identification and investigation of relationship patterns between variables (Bryman, 2008; Cohen *et al*., 2007), which this study aims to do. The study seeks to objectively explore the relationship between leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction; therefore, in order to collect extensive quantitative data two structured questionnaires (MLQ - which measures leadership styles, and MCMJSS - which measures faculty job satisfaction) have been adopted. The paper focuses on seeking perceptions of the faculty members about their leaders' leadership styles and their own job satisfaction. The whole faculty, 287 faculty members, of the chosen public university was defined as the sample. The university under study has 10 different sites with 13 different units (10 campuses and three divisions – division of education, division of science and technology, and division of arts and social sciences); so, in total there are 13 leaders (campus principals and divisional directors). All the leaders and participants have a working relationship of more than one year in the current campus/division. The researcher himself

collected the data. From a total of 287 faculty members, 268 received the questionnaires, excluding the 19 (five who participated in piloting and 14 who were on leave); 228 usable responses were received, which is an 85% response rate.

The multiple regression analysis has been employed to test if there is a significant relationship, with an Alpha level set at 0.001, between the three leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) and faculty job satisfaction (extrinsic, intrinsic and overall). A multiple regression analysis is an appropriate technique for measuring the relationship between more than one independent variables and a dependent variable (Cohen *et al*., 2007; Pallant, 2007; Pavkov and Piece, 1997), as is the case in the present study, where the three leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) are independent (predictor) variables and the faculty job satisfaction (extrinsic, intrinsic and overall) is a dependent (criterion) variable. Multiple regression analysis explains or predicts variation in a dependent variable because of the independent variables which is assessed using the coefficient of determination known as 'adjusted R square'(Carver and Nash, 2005:166; Cohen *et al*., 2007:540). The larger the coefficient, the larger the effect of the independent variables upon the dependent variable. Prior to running this procedure, all the four assumptions - *Normality, Zero mean, Homogeneity of variance*, and *Independence* - (Carver and Nash, 2005:178) of multiple regression analysis were checked and found to be satisfied. This ensures that the estimates and results of the multiple regression analysis are unbiased and otherwise reliable and can be used for consequent decisions (Carver and Nash, 2005). This analysis has been performed through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) - version 18.0.

**Data Presentation and Findings**

The output of multiple regression analysis to address the *first research question* is presented in table 1. The data indicate that the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles account for 24% of the variance in intrinsic job satisfaction (adjusted R square 0.24).

**Table 1: Relationship between the Faculty's Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and the Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles**

|  | **Adjusted R Square** | **F test statistics** | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-Faire Leadership Style | 0.24 | 24.32 | 0.000 |
|  | **Beta (β)** | **t test statistics** | |
|  |  | **t** | **Sig.** |
| Transformational Leadership Style | 0.57 | 5.80 | 0.000 |
| Transactional Leadership Style | -0.12 | -1.12 | 0.266 |
| Laissez-Faire Leadership Style | 0.09 | 1.34 | 0.181 |

The *F* test statistics for the adjusted R square is 24.32 and the associated *p*-value is 0.000. It indicates that $p < 0.001$; therefore, a statistically significant relationship exists between intrinsic job satisfaction and the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles at the 99.9% confidence level. It is important, however, to note that this relationship is 'modest' (Muijs, 2004:165).

It is essential to point out here that the Beta (β) weighting for the three independent variables (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles) are calculated *relative* to each other instead independent of each other. Therefore, relative to each other, the transformational leadership style has the stronger positive effect on the intrinsic job satisfaction (β = 0.57), and that this is statistically significant at the 99.9% confidence

level because the *t* test statistics for the Beta is 5.80 and the associated *p*-value (0.000) is less than 0.001. The transactional leadership style has a negative effect on the intrinsic job satisfaction (β = -0.12), but that this is statistically insignificant as the *t* test statistics for the Beta is -1.12 and the associated *p*-value is 0.266, which shows that $p > 0.001$. The laissez-faire leadership style has a positive effect on the intrinsic job satisfaction (β = 0.09), however this is not statistically significant since the *t* test statistics for the Beta is 1.34 and the associated *p*-value is 0.181, which is greater than 0.001.

The data, presented in table 2 to address *second research question*, show that the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles account for 38% of the variance in extrinsic job satisfaction (adjusted R square 0.38).

**Table 2: Relationship between the Faculty's Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and the Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles**

|  | **Adjusted R Square** | **F test statistics** | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | **F** | **Sig.** |
| Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-Faire Leadership Style | 0.38 | 46.31 | 0.000 |
|  | **Beta (β)** | **t test statistics** | |
|  |  | **t** | **Sig.** |
| Transformational Leadership Style | 0.68 | 7.59 | 0.000 |
| Transactional Leadership Style | -0.09 | -0.93 | 0.354 |
| Laissez-Faire Leadership Style | 0.08 | 1.28 | 0.203 |

The *F* test statistics for the adjusted R square is 46.31 and the associated *p*-value is 0.000. It validates that $p < 0.001$; therefore, a statistically significant relationship exists between extrinsic job satisfaction and the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles at the 99.9% confidence level. It is important, however, to highlight that this relationship is 'moderate' (Muijs, 2004:165).

The transformational leadership style, in relation to the other two leadership styles, has the stronger positive effect on the extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta$ = 0.68), and that this is statistically significant at the 99.9% confidence level since the *t* test statistics for the Beta is 7.59 and the associated *p*-value is 0.000, which verifies that $p < 0.001$. The transactional leadership style has a negative effect on the extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta$ = -0.09), however this is not statistically significant as the *t* test statistics for the Beta is -0.93 and the associated *p*-value is 0.354, which is greater than 0.001. The laissez-faire leadership style has a positive effect on the extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta$ = 0.08), but that this is statistically insignificant for the reason that the *t* test statistics for the Beta is 1.28 and the associated *p*-value is 0.203, which highlights that $p > 0.001$.

Statistical data for *third research question* is presented in the table 3. The data highlight that the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles account for 36% of the variance in overall job satisfaction (adjusted R square 0.36).

The *F* test statistics for the adjusted R square is 44.04 and the associated *p*-value is 0.000. It substantiates that *p* is less than 0.001; therefore, a statistically significant relationship exists between overall job satisfaction and the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles at the 99.9% confidence level. It is important, however, to signify that this relationship is 'moderate' (Muijs, 2004:165).

The transformational leadership style, relatively, has the stronger positive effect on the overall job satisfaction ($\beta$ = 0.68), and that this is statistically significant at the 99.9% confidence level because the *t* test statistics for the Beta is 7.60 and the associated *p*-value is 0.000, which validates that $p < 0.001$. The transactional leadership style has a negative effect on the overall job satisfaction ($\beta$ = -0.12), but that this is statistically insignificant as the *t* test statistics for the Beta is -1.19 and the associated *p*-value (0.234) is greater than 0.001. The laissez-faire leadership style has a positive effect on the overall job satisfaction ($\beta$ = 0.10), however this is not statistically significant in view of the fact that the *t* test statistics for the Beta is 1.52 and the associated *p*-value is 0.129, which confirms that $p > 0.001$.

**Table 3: Relationship between the Faculty's Overall Job Satisfaction and the Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles**

| | Adjusted R Square | *F* test statistics | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | F | Sig. |
| Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-Faire Leadership Style | 0.36 | 44.04 | 0.000 |
| | Beta (β) | *t* test statistics | |
| | | t | Sig. |
| Transformational Leadership Style | 0.68 | 7.60 | 0.000 |
| Transactional Leadership Style | -0.12 | -1.19 | 0.234 |
| Laissez-Faire Leadership Style | 0.10 | 1.52 | 0.129 |

In conclusion, the data indicates significant relationships between the group of independent variables (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles) and the faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction. However, 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. 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. Whereas, the laissez-faire leadership style, relatively, has weak positive and statistically insignificant effect on faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction. The transactional leadership style, on the other hand, has comparatively weak negative and statistically insignificant effect on faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction.

**Discussion**

Al-Omari (2008) and Leary *et al.* (1999) examined the relationships between the department heads' leadership styles and the faculty's intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction in the higher education context. The results of these studies are similar to those in the current study, where leadership style has been found to have a statistically significant relationship with the faculty's extrinsic job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction. As in the current study, the relationship between leadership style and the faculty's intrinsic job satisfaction in Al-Omari's and Leary *et al.*'s cases is statistically significant, but not as strong as the relationships between leadership style and the faculty's extrinsic job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction. In a similar study, Mckee (1990), unlike the results of the present, Al-Omari's and Leary *et al.*'s studies, found that leadership styles have approximately similar statistically significant relationships with the faculty's intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction. In the current study, the less strong relationship between leadership styles and intrinsic job satisfaction is justified because "intrinsic job satisfaction indicates that the degree to which a respondent feels satisfied is determined by internally

motivated factors... [which] come from within the individual" (Al-Omari, 2008:118), whereas leadership styles do not come from within the individual. Rather, these styles, which represent the behaviour of the campus principals/divisional directors, stem from the faculty members' working environment and are therefore considered to be external behaviours/factors or extrinsic in nature (Al-Omari, 2008; Stumpf, 2003; Worrell, 2004); thus, they have a weaker relationship with the faculty's intrinsic job satisfaction as compared to extrinsic job satisfaction.

Tucker *et al.* (1992), Levine (2000) and Nguni *et al.* (2006) highlight, similar to the present study, that the transformational leadership style is found to have a statistically significant and positive relationship with faculty job satisfaction. The transactional leadership style in these studies has also significantly positive relationship with faculty job satisfaction, but this relationship in the present case is insignificantly negative. These findings are substantiated by meta-analyses of the literature carried out by Lowe *et al.* (1996) and Dumdum *et al.* (2002). The laissez-faire leadership style in the present study has the positive and insignificant relationship with job satisfaction; whereas, in the case of Levine (2000:73) this relationship is found to be significantly negative.

Grosso (2008), Dastoor *et al.* (2003), Webb (2003) and Stumpf (2003) explore the relationship between job satisfaction and leadership styles through using the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership theoretical framework, similar to the present study, in the higher education context. They find that, like the present study, there is a significantly positive relationship between the transformational leadership style and faculty job satisfaction. However, there are number of differences as well, such as laissez-faire leadership style in these studies has a strong negative relationship with the faculty members' job satisfaction; whereas, this relationship in the current study is insignificantly positive.

Moreover, in the present case the relationship between the transactional leadership style and faculty job satisfaction is insignificantly negative, whereas in the Grosso's study this relationship is

insignificantly positive. In Dastoor *et al.*'s study the two dimensions, contingent reward and management-by-exception (active), of the transactional leadership style are positively and significantly related to faculty job satisfaction and the third dimension, management-by-exception (passive), of this style has insignificantly negative relationship with faculty job satisfaction. Whereas, Webb's study highlights that the first dimension of contingent reward demonstrates a positive and significant relationship with faculty job satisfaction, whilst the second dimension management-by-exception (active) exhibits a strong negative relationship with faculty job satisfaction, and the third dimension management-by-exception (passive) has also a negative but insignificant relationship with faculty job satisfaction. Whilst, in Stumpf's case, the first dimension, contingent reward, of the transactional leadership style has a strong positive relationship with the faculty members' job satisfaction, the second dimension, management-by-exception (active), of this style also has a positive but insignificant relationship with faculty job satisfaction, whereas the last dimension, management-by-exception (passive), of this style has significantly negative relationship with the faculty members' job satisfaction. This difference in findings highlight that the interplay between leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction is defined by the cultural and organizational context.

There are many other studies from different educational levels, such as school, college and university, conducted in various cultural contexts across the world that were aimed to explore the relationship between leadership styles and teacher/faculty job satisfaction have similarities and differences, in their findings (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1985 and 1998; Bass and Avolio, 1993; Bogler, 2001; Bragg, 2008; Bycio *et al.*, 1995; Kirby *et al.*, 1992). These differences highlight the importance of particular cultural and organizational context for the interplay between leadership style and faculty job satisfaction.

The findings suggest that an increased practice of transformational leadership behaviours could enable principals/directors to be effective and to enhance the faculty members' job satisfaction. Satisfied faculty members are more likely to perform better and, in turn, they might contribute to improvement in the quality and performance of the concerned educational institution (Chen and Silverthorne, 2005; Woods, 2007). This suggestion concurs with previous researchers' observations that effective educational leaders practise transformational leadership aspects (Bass and Avolio, 1990; Nguni *et al.*, 2006). The suggestion also supports Bass's (1999:10) claim that "transformational leadership, which fosters autonomy...became increasingly important to followers' job satisfaction". A number of studies from the business and military contexts confirm Bass's argument (Howell and Avolio, 1993; Seltzer and Bass, 1990; Waldman and Bass, 1986). Satisfaction within a job might also increase the faculty members' propensity to remain in that specific job (Rahim and Afza, 1993). The findings further suggest that the principals/directors' behaviours which characterise the transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles, discussed in the first section, have no significant effect on faculty job satisfaction, and the principals/directors, therefore, should not practise such behaviours.

However, some of the suggested behaviours have different interpretations in the Pakistani context. The transformational leader, for example, motivates followers to challenge their own personal ideas and values along with the leader's and institution's values. In Pakistan, contrary to this, challenging the leader's values is considered inappropriate (Shah, 2009) because of the cultural and religious values and norms associated with leaders and the led. Furthermore, in a collective society of Pakistan faculty members generally suppose their leader to take decision by themselves (Hofstede, 2001; House *et al.* 2004), and subordinates are also expected by their heads to 'obey' and 'work' without challenging their decisions (Shah, 2009).

In conclusion the relationship between leadership style and faculty job satisfaction exist, however it vary in its degree with reference to different leadership styles and different aspects (intrinsic, extrinsic and overall) of job satisfaction. The interplay between leadership style and faculty job satisfaction is defined by the organizational and cultural context, therefore there may not be one leadership style that might enhance the faculty job satisfaction in different organizational and cultural

context. Moreover, different situations may require different leadership styles and might be linked with different aspects (intrinsic, extrinsic and overall) of job satisfaction. This highlight that in order to satisfy the faculty members within their job leader need to practise appropriate leadership style/s in different situations and even at different stages of the same situation.

## References

Al-Omari, A. (2007),.Leadership Styles of Department Chairs at the Hashemite University'. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, *8(3)*, 7-24.

Al-Omari, A. (2008). .The Relationship between Leadership Styles of Hashemite University Department Chairs and Job Satisfaction as Reported by Department Faculty Members. *University of Sharjah Journal for Humanities & Social Sciences*, *5(2)*, 101-124.

Armstrong, M. (2006). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. (10th ed.) London: Kogan Page.

Avolio, B.J. (1999) *Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1995). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Technical report*. Redwood City: Mind Garden.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. J. (1999).Re-examining the Components of Transformational and Transactional Leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, **72** (4), 441-462.

Barnett, K. and McCormick, J. (2004). .Leadership and Individual Principal-Teacher Relationships in Schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, **43** (3), 406-434.

Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1998) *Transformational Leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B.M. (1999).Two Decades of Research and Development in Transformational Leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, **8** (1), 9-32.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1990). .The Implications of Transactional and Transformational Leadership for Individual, Team, and Organizational Development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, **4** (1), 231-272.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational Leadership: A Response to Critiques, in Chemmers, M.M. and Ayman, R. (eds.) *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1994). Introduction, in Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (eds.) *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (2000). *Platoon Readiness as a Function of Leadership, Platoon and Company Cultures: Final Report*. Washington: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioural and Social Sciences.

Bass B.M. and Riggio, R.E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*. (2nd ed.) Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bents, R. and Blank, R. (1997). Authority, Responsibility, and Power: Change and or Transformation. *Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education*, **19** (2), 67-72.

Bogler, R. (2001).The Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher Job Satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* **37** (5), 662-683.

Bohen, S.J. and Stiles, J. (1998) .Experimenting with Models of Faculty Collaboration: Factors that Promote their Success. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, **98** (100), 39-55.

Bragg, D.L. (2008).*The Application of Transformational Leadership among Christian School Leaders in the Southeast and the Mid-Atlantic North Regions*, unpublished thesis for the Doctor of Education program, Liberty University, School of Education.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research* Methods. (3rd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burns, J.D. (2007). *Analyses of Transactional and Transformational Leadership on Job Satisfaction of College Faculty*, unpublished thesis for the Doctor of Philosophy program, Northcentral University.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R.D., and Allen, J.S. (1995). Further Assessment of Bass's (1985) Conceptualization of Transactional and Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **80** (4), 68-478.

Carver, R.H. and Nash, J.G. (2005). *Doing Data Analysis with SPSS Version 12.0*. London: Curt Hinrichs.

Chen, J.C. and Silverthorne, C. (2005). .Leadership Effectiveness, Leadership Style and Employee Readiness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* **28** (4), 280-288.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. (6th ed.) London: Routledge.

Dastoor, B., Suwannachin, K. and Golding, A. (2003). *Transformational Leadership and Cultural Values in Thailand: Faculty Perceptions of University Administrators*. Clearwater: Academy of International Business Southeast.

Dimmock, C. and Walker, A. (2005). *Educational Leadership: Culture and Diversity.* London: Sage.

Dinham, S. and Scott, C. (2000)..Moving into the Third, Outer Domain of Teacher Satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, **38** (4), 379-396.

Dumdum, U.R., Lowe, K.B. and Avolio, B.J. (2002). A Meta-Analysis of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction: An Update and Extension, in Avolio, B.J. and Yammarino, F.J. (eds.) *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead.* Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Dusitsutirat, A. (2009).Factors Affecting on Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Rajamangala University of Technology Krung – Thep. Paper presented at the *International Conference on the Role of Universities in Hands-On Education*, Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Chiang-Mai.

Evans, L. (2001) .Delving Deeper into Morale,

Job Satisfaction and Motivation among Education Professionals: Re-examining the Leadership Dimension. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership,* **29** (3), 291-306.

Fields, F.E. and Herold, D.M. (1997).Using the Leadership Practices Inventory to Measure Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, **57** (4), 569-579.

Foskett, N. and Lumby, J. (2003). *Leading and Managing Education: International Dimensions.* London: Paul Chapman.

Fowler, W.J. (1991). *What are the Characteristics of Principals Identified as Effective by Teachers*? (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347695).

Geijsel, F., Sleegers, P., Leithwood, K. and Jantzi, D. (2003).Transformational leadership effects on teachers' commitment and effort toward school reform. *Journal of Educational Administration*, **41** (3), 228-256.

Gill, R. (2006).*Theory and Practice of Leadership.* London: SAGE Publications.

Grosso, F.A. (2008). *Motivating Faculty through Transformational Leadership: A Study of the Relationship between Presidential Leadership Behaviours and Faculty Behaviours*, unpublished thesis for the Doctor of Philosophy program, The Catholic University of America, Department of Education.

Gunter, H.M. (2001). *Leaders and Leadership in Education.* London: Paul Chapman.

Hater, J.J. and Bass, B.M. (1988).Superiors' Evaluation and Subordinates' Perception of Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **73** (4), 695-702.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. London: Sage.

House, R.J. (1976). A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership, in Hunt, J.G. and Larson L.L. (eds.) *Leadership: The Cutting Edge.* A Symposium Held at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.189-207. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

House R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman,

P.W., Gupta, V. and Associates (eds.) (2004) *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Howell, J.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1993).Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Locus of Control and Support for Innovation: Key Predictors of Consolidated-Business-Unit Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **78** (6), 891-902.

Jung, D.I., Bass, B.M. and Sosik, J.J. (1995).Bridging Leadership and Cultures: A Theoretical Consideration of Transformational Leadership and Collectivistic Cultures. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies*, **2** (4), 3-18.

Karimi, S. (2008) 'Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members of Bu-Ali Sina University'. *Scientific & Research Quarterly Journal of Mazandaran University*, **23** (6), 89-104.

Kirby, P.C., Paradise, L.V. and King, M.I. (1992) 'Extraordinary Leaders in Education: Understanding Transformational Leadership'. *Journal of Educational Research*, **85** (5), 303-311.

Klein, j. and Takeda-Tinker, B. (2009) 'The Impact of Leadership on Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction'. *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal*, **7** (2) (http://www.academicleadership.org/article/the-impact-of-leadership-on-community-college-faculty-job-satisfaction) Online accessed on 26 April 2011.

Leary, P.A., Sullivan, M.E. and Ray, D.A. (1999) .The Relationship of Leadership Styles of Selected West Virginia Deans and Department Chairs to Job Satisfaction of Departmental Faculty Members. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision*, **16** (4), 33-41.

Levine, M.F. (2000). *The Importance of Leadership: An Investigation of Presidential Style at Fifty National Universities*, unpublished dissertation for the doctor of philosophy program, University of North Texas, College of Education.

Little, A. (1996). Globalization and International Research: Whose Contexts Counts*?*.*International Journal of Educational Development*, **16** (4), 427-438.

Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G., and Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996).Effectiveness Correlates of Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Review of the MLQ Literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, **7** (3), 385-425.

Madlock, P.E. (2008) .The Link between Leadership Style, Communicator Competence, and Employee Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication,* **45** (1), 61-78.

McKee, J.G. (1990). Relationship between Community College Presidents' Leadership Styles and Faculty Job Satisfaction. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the *Eastern Educational Research Association*, Clearwater Beach, February, 1990.

Muijs, D. (2004) *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*. London: Sage.

Nguni, S., Sleegers, P. and Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and Transactional Leadership Effects on Teachers' Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Primary Schools: The Tanzanian Case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* **17** (2), 145-177.

Northouse, P.G. (1997) *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Northouse, P.G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*.( 4th ed.) London: Sage.

Northouse, P.G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. (*5th ed.) London: Sage.

Pallant, J. (2007) *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows*. 3rd ed. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Pavkov, T.W. and Piece, K.A. (1997) *Ready, Set, Go! A Guide to SPSS for Windows*. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Rad, A.M.M. and Yarmohammadian, M.H. (2006) .A Study of Relationship between Managers' Leadership Style and Employees' Job Satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services,* **19** (2), 11-28.

Rahim, M.A. and Afza, M. (1993).Leader Power, Commitment, Satisfaction, Compliance, and Propensity to Leave a Job among U.S. Accountants. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, **133** (5), 611-625.

Rodwell, S. (1998). Internationalisation or

Indigenisation of Educational Management Development? Some Issues of Cross-Cultural Transfer. *Comparative Education*, **34** (1), 41-54.

Roueche, J.E., Baker III, G.A. and Rose, R.R. (1989). *Shared Vision: Transformational Leadership in American Community Colleges*. Washington: Community College Press.

Seltzer, J. and Bass, B.M. (1990). Transformational Leadership: Beyond Initiation and Consideration. *Journal of Management*, **16** (4), 693-703.

Seseer, B. (2007). *Perceived Presidential Leadership Styles and Faculty Job Satisfaction at Mongolian Public Universities*, unpublished dissertation for the Doctor of Philosophy program, Purdue University, Educational Studies.

Shah, S. (2006a).Leading Multiethnic Schools: a new understanding of Muslim Youth Identity. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, **34** (2), 215-237.

Shah, S. (2006b). Educational Leadership: An Islamic Perspective. *British Educational Research Journal*, **32** (3), 363-385.

Shah, S. (2009).The Impact of Societal Culture on Practice: People Management in Colleges in Pakistan. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, **24** (2) 3-17.

Shah, S. (2010a).Re-thinking Educational Leadership: Exploring the Impact of Cultural and Belief Systems. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, **13**(1) 27-44.

Shahin, A.I. and Wright, P.L. (2004).Leadership in the Context of Culture. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* **25** (6), 499-511.

Sharma, R.D. and Jyoti, J. (2009). Job Satisfaction of University Teachers: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Services Research*, **9** (2), 51-80.

Shaw, M. (2005). The Cultural Context of Educational Leadership, in Coleman, M. and Earley, P. (eds.) *Leadership and Management in Education: Cultures, Change and Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Simkins, T. Sisum, C. and Memon, M. (2003), School leadership in Pakistan: exploring the headteacher's role. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, **14** (3), 275-292.

Smallwood, I.M. (2008) *A Case Study Investigation into the Effects of Increased Levels of Teacher Empowerment on Motivation and Job Satisfaction among University Language Centre Instructors,* unpublished dissertation for the M.Sc in Educational Leadership program, University of Leicester, School of Education.

Somech, A. (2005). Directive Versus Participative Leadership: Two Complementary Approaches to Managing School Effectiveness'. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* **41** (5), 777-800.

Stumpf, M. N. (2003). *The Relationship of Perceived Leadership Styles of North Carolina County Extension Directors' to Job Satisfaction of County Extension Professionals*, unpublished dissertation for the Doctor of Education Program, North Carolina State University, Adult and Community College.

Sung, C. (2007). *Relationship among Supervisors' Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles, And Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Taiwan Higher Education (China)*, unpublished thesis for the Doctor of Philosophy program, Lynn University.

Toker, B. (2011).Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff: An Empirical Study on Turkey'. *Quality Assurance in Education*, **19** (2), 156-169.

Tucker, M.L., Bass, B.M. and Daniel, L.G., Jr. (1992). Transformational Leadership's Impact on Higher Education Satisfaction, Effectiveness, and Extra Effort, in Clark, K.E., Clark, M.B. and Campbell, D.P. (eds.), *Impact of Leadership*. Greensboro: Centre for Creative Leadership.169-176

Waldman, D.A. and Bass, B.M. (1986). *Adding to Leader and Follower Transactions: The Augmenting Effect of Transformational Leadership (Working Paper No. 86-109)*. Binghamton: State University of New York, School of Management.

Webb, K.S. (2003). *Presidents' Leadership Behaviours Associated with Followers' Job Satisfaction, Motivation toward Extra Effort, And Presidential Effectiveness at Evangelical Colleges and Universities*, unpublished dissertation for the Doctor of Philosophy Program, University of North Texas, College of Education.

Wetherell K.M. (2002) *Principal Leadership*

*Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction*, unpublished dissertation for the Doctor of Education Program, Seton Hall University.

Woods, T.J. (2007) 'Motivating Faculty through Transactional and Transformational Leadership Strategies'. *Journal of Leadership Strategies*, **1** (2),.64-73.

Worrell, T.G (2004) *School Psychologists' Job Satisfaction: Ten Years Later*, unpublished thesis for the Doctor of Philosophy program, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Wright, T.A. and Cropanzano, R. (1997) .Shared Influence and Organizational Behaviour: A Meta Analysis of Situational Variable Expected to Moderate Participation Outcome Relationship'. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 364-371.