Which Leadership Style to use? An Investigation of Conducive and Non-Conducive Leadership Style(s) to Faculty Job Satisfaction

Muhammad Amin
Ijaz Ahmad Tatlah
Ayaz Muhammad Khan

Abstract

The paper aims to investigate which leadership style(s) is/are more conducive and which can be a barrier to faculty job satisfaction in a Pakistani public university context. The study adopted qualitative approach to generate in-depth qualitative data. Fifteen faculty members were interviewed from five campuses out of total thirteen units of the chosen public university. The findings highlight that the participative leadership style and the behaviours associated with transformational style and the first dimension (contingent reward) of transactional leadership are perceived as conducive to faculty job satisfaction. Whereas, the practice of authoritative and laissez-faire leadership styles and the lack of exercise of leadership behaviours related to transformational and transactional (first dimension only) leadership are considered to be barriers to faculty job satisfaction. A cautious use of the findings is suggested because of the context specific nature of the leadership and its practices.

Key Words: Leadership Style, Job Satisfaction

Introduction

There is an array of leadership styles discussed in the literature (Northouse, 2010); however none of these is equally helpful to enhance the faculty job satisfaction in all cultural contexts (Al-Omari, 2007). In different contexts different leadership styles have been found to be conducive for faculty job satisfaction (Madlock, 2008), and the leadership styles that we take for granted may become distorted in different contexts (Shahin and Wright, 2004). The satisfied faculty might perform better to improve the quality and performance of an

educational institution (Toker, 2011). The various researchers, therefore, suggest the exercise of such leadership styles that are conducive to faculty job satisfaction in that particular context (Dimmock and Walker, 2005; Nguni *et al*., 2006). This highlights the need to explore the leadership styles that are conducive/not conducive to the faculty job satisfaction in a specific context – which is the focus of this study in a Pakistani public university context.

Leadership

Leadership can be defined through a number of ways (Dimmock and Walker, 2005; Northouse, 2010); according to Yukl (2002), Simkins (2005) and Dimmock and Walker (2005) the concept of leadership in terms of its definition is elusive, arbitrary and subjective. Northouse argues that "it is much like the words democracy, love and peace" (2010:2), which might be defined differently by different individuals. Regardless of its present significance, leadership has no agreed definition (Bush, 2003; Bush and Middlewood, 2005). However, there are several definitions that are more helpful as compared to other definitions for some people, although none of these could be recognised as being definitive (Yukl, 2002). According to Northouse (2010), some researchers conceptualize leadership from the trait aspect, which means a leader has a set of certain characteristics which make him/her a leader; for others, it is the behaviour of the leader which enables him/her to accomplish the goals of the institution. Northouse further argues that for some theorists leadership is a relationship between the leader and followers in terms of power; whereas, some theorists view leadership from the leader's capacity with respect to the skill and knowledge aspect. Bass (1990) defines leadership as a group process where the leader holds a central place and embodies the team members' will, which aligns better with the current research context where campus principals/divisional directors interact with their faculty members, and this process of interaction within the group shapes the leadership. Therefore the present study considers leadership as a process whereby a campus principal/ divisional director influences a team of faculty members to accomplish a shared aim of the institution.

There are a number of leadership definitions which consider leadership as a process through which a leader influences a team of followers to accomplish a shared goal (Davies *et al*., 2001; Dimmock and Walker, 2005; Hersey *et al*., 1996; Northouse, 2010; Yukl and Van Fleet, 1998). Leadership style in such cases is reflected in the leader's interaction or behaviour that s/he exerts while influencing followers in order to guide, structure and facilitate activities and relationships in an institution (Jago, 1982; Northouse, 2010). Some important elements related to leadership as a process are that it involves influence, it occurs in teams, and it involves shared objectives (Northouse, 2010).

Consideration of leadership as a 'process' means that it is a two-way phenomenon and both the leader and the followers are integral parts of leadership (Hollander, 1992). This approach understands leadership as an interactive phenomenon between a leader and followers, which is neither a highly structured top-down relationship nor confined to the person who is nominated within the team officially, rather it is accessible for each and every member of the team (Northouse, 2010; Simkins, 2005). Involvement of 'influence' in leadership implies the way a leader affects their subordinates/ colleagues. Leadership happens in 'teams', which means that the group is the setting/situation in which leadership takes place, and it is the team which allows the phenomenon of leadership to happen or to be complete (Northouse, 2010). This stresses the ethical aspect of leadership through considering the combined responsibility of both the leader and the followers, and has the potential to decrease the chance of unethical leadership behaviour towards subordinates (Northouse, 2010). Rost (1991) argues that it might also enhance the likelihood of joint effort by the leader and subordinates towards a common good. Different theorists and researchers broadly link leadership with vision, values, establishing the institutional culture, change and movement through maintaining direction, people and inspiration (Gunter, 2001; Kotter, 1990).

The field of "educational leadership research involves analysing the concept of leadership itself, the types and styles of leadership and their relevance to educational settings" (Briggs and Coleman, 2007:2). In spite of the increasing literature on leadership,

Ribbins and Gunter (2002) assert that research in the two essential fields of leadership has not been conducted sufficiently. Firstly, the research related to leading: "what individual leaders do... why they do... and with what outcomes" (Ribbins and Gunter, 2002:362). Secondly, the research related to leaders: "what leaders are, why and by whom they are shaped into what they are, and how they become leaders" (Ribbins and Gunter, 2002:362). The present study is located within the first category and it addresses 'what individual leaders do' and 'with what outcomes' in terms of leadership styles conducive and not conducive to the faculty job satisfaction.

The debate on leadership can be traced back to the era of Aristotle (Northouse, 2010) and the literature written by Confucius, Plato, Plutarch, and Caesar highlights discussion on leadership (Ayman, 1992; Bass, 1981). A review of literature related to leadership unveils an evolving series of 'schools of thought' (Bolden *et al*., 2003). Early theories were focused upon leaders' traits and their personality, whereas later theories considered the followers and the situation into the phenomenon of leadership (Bolden *et al*., 2003). Thereafter, researchers directed their focus towards the leader's behaviour, and the movement of leadership theories shifted from the leader's personality to the leader's behaviour (style) (Kreitner, 1983).

Leadership Styles

It "focuses exclusively on what leaders do and how they act" (Northouse, 2010:69), that means it specifically emphasises the behaviour of the leader rather than the leader's personality traits (Bolden, 2004). Lewin *et al*. (1939) started to recognize different leadership styles, although later studies have found many specific leadership styles, Lewin *et al*.'s work is still considered seminal as it was they who identified three main styles of leadership: authoritarian, participative and laissez-faire. A leader with an authoritarian style presents targets and instructions very clearly to followers, such as what to do, when to do it, and how to do it (Lewin *et al*., 1939). The problem with this leadership style is that it is perceived that the leader has total control, behaves as a boss and dictates (Druskat and Wheeler, 2003; Fiedler, 1989; Sagie, 1997; Stogdill, 1974). A leader with the participative style contributes to the group and tries to be a member of

the team, provides guidance to the team members, and obtains participation from the members of the team in the decision making process, and because of this the participative style is commonly believed to be the more useful in practice (Druskat and Weeler, 2003; Koopman and Wierdsma, 1998; Lewin *et al.*, 1939). A laissez-faire leader renounces their liability, delays decisions, gives no feedback and offers less attention to assist subordinates to fulfil their needs (Northouse, 2010); in other words, there is no leadership in this style.

Moreover, significant research into the style approach was done by Blake and Mouton in 1964, 1978 and 1985. They utilised the concepts of 'concern for people' and 'concern for production' in their Managerial Grid, later renamed the Leadership Grid, which describes how a leader enables an institution to achieve its goal (Northouse, 2010). Concern for people considers how a leader treats the followers who are striving to attain their aims. It comprises promoting friendship, developing institutional dedication and trust, facilitating employees to accomplish their job through a conducive working environment, enhancing the followers through self-respect, and considering those issues which are concerned with employees, such as reasonable pay and good social environment (Blake and Mouton, 1964). Concern for production means a concern for accomplishing institutional activities/assignments towards attaining whatever an institution is trying to achieve for its success (Blake and Mouton, 1964).

Furthermore, important studies were conducted at two American universities: The Ohio State University (Campbell, 1956; Campbell and Gregg, 1957; Fiedler and Chemers, 1974; Scott, 1956; Stogdill, 1974; Stogdill and Coons, 1957), and the University of Michigan (Cartwright and Zander, 1960; Kahn and Katz, 1953; Likert, 1961 and 1967; Mann, 1965). The researchers at The Ohio State University were concerned with analysing the behaviour of leaders which influenced the satisfaction and efficiency of the team members. They maintain that leaders using the 'initiating structure' style try to provide supervision at each stage and maintain a very strict check to achieve excellent performance and standardized processes. The spirit of this style is to keep the focus on achieving the aims dominant (Grosso, 2008; Hack *et al*, 1971; Hoy and Miskel, 1991; Sergiovanni

and Carver, 1980). In contention, 'consideration' is leadership behaviour in which a leader prefers and maintains camaraderie, mutual trust and respect, liking and affection in the leader and subordinate relationships (Northouse, 2010; Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1971). This style of leader is worker-oriented; the leader is less concerned with task, and gives more importance to the relationship.

The researchers at the University of Michigan initially perceived that 'employee orientation' and 'production orientation' are at opposite ends of the same continuum; however, later they conceptualised these two concepts as independent, similar to the Ohio State investigators (Kahn, 1956). Thereafter, researchers from both Ohio State and Michigan universities carried out a large number of studies to find out "how leaders could best combine their task and relationship behaviours to maximise the impact of these behaviours on the satisfaction and performance of followers" (Northouse, 2010:72). The results were generally contradictory, unclear, and inconclusive (Yukl, 1994); however, these studies directed the focus of future research towards finding out the effects of leadership styles upon followers' satisfaction and performance (Grosso, 2008).

Furthermore, transformational and transactional are current and broadly researched styles to leadership (Northouse, 2010). Transformational 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 and Avolio, 2000; Avolio *et al*., 1995). 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; Avolio *et al*., 1995).

Job Satisfaction and Relevant Theories
The definition of job satisfaction has developed over many years, however, "most versions share the belief that job satisfaction is a work

-related positive affective reaction" (Worrell, 2004:11). In the context of the present study, job satisfaction refers to the positive and favourable attitudes and feelings which faculty members have about their jobs (Armstrong, 2006). Some investigators have defined and measured job satisfaction as a general notion (Nguni *et al*., 2006; Worrell, 2004), and others (Al-Omari, 2008; Cerit, 2009) have defined and measured this concept "with two distinct facets, which include intrinsic (level of satisfaction with features associated with the job itself) and extrinsic (level of satisfaction with various features associated with the environment in which the work is performed) job satisfaction" (Nguni *et al*., 2006:152).

There are numerous theories attempting to explain job satisfaction" (Worrell, 2004:12), and different researchers classify theories of job satisfaction in different ways (Castillo and Cano, 2004; Dawis, 2004; Ololube, 2006; Ramatulasamma and Rao, 2003; Siripak, 2006; Worrell, 2004). Early theorists considered job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction to be at opposite ends of the same continuum, whereas later researchers perceive that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are on two different continua (Brown *et al*., 1998). The important classification that is more frequently discussed in the literature and covers three well-researched theoretical frames (content theories, process theories and situational theory) related to job satisfaction (Siripak, 2006; Worrell, 2004) is discussed here briefly.

The *content theories* are also called need-based theories (Ololube, 2006), and are based on the assumption that all people have a similar group of needs and hence define what features a job should possess. There are two important theories in this school of thought: Maslow's (1954) 'Need Hierarchy Theory' and Herzberg's (1974) 'two-factor theory' (Ololube, 2006). Maslow's (1954) 'Need Hierarchy Theory' is the basis in this theoretical framework which proposes that job satisfaction is achieved when an employee's needs or desires are fulfilled through his/her job and related work atmosphere (Siripak, 2006). Although a number of researchers have been attracted to this theory and found it interesting (Naylor, 1999), this approach has remained unsuccessful in gaining substantial support in its favour from the studies focused upon its validation (Ifinedo, 2003; Lawler and Suttle, 1972; Ololube, 2006). One of the reasons behind its failure

might be that this theory does not take into account situational and job-related factors in the job satisfaction phenomenon.

Based on Maslow's work, Herzberg (1959, 1966 and 1974) proposed a motivator-hygiene theory which suggests that the job itself might be the main cause of an individual's satisfaction within the said job. This theory argues that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not on the same continuum that moves from satisfaction to dissatisfaction, but rather are on two separate continua which do not depend on each other (Lawler, 1994). The continuum which addresses job satisfaction starts from satisfied and ends on neutral, and similarly the continuum which deals with job dissatisfaction starts from dissatisfied and ends on neutral. Therefore, an employee might feel satisfaction and dissatisfaction at the same time (Lawler, 1994). He recognized two types of factors: a) the factors that influence job satisfaction are called 'motivators' or also labelled as 'satisfiers' and are intrinsic in nature and relate to job or work itself; and b) the factors which must be fulfilled to avoid job dissatisfaction are called 'hygiene' and are extrinsic in nature and relate to working conditions or environment (Worrell, 2004). The motivators and hygiene factors are both variables that do not depend upon each other.

This theory has been investigated extensively (Castillo and Cano, 2004; Karimi, 2008), and it has been the main contributor to the theory of job satisfaction which has permitted comprehension of the nature of job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Herzberg's theory, however, has received criticism because of its view that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are mutually independent, that is, there is a question of whether these two dimensions are in reality independent or not. Locke (1976:1318) argues that these two aspects are theoretically and empirically separable but interdependent. Further, Locke *et al*. (1983) highlight that this theory is method dependent. Herzberg employed 'critical incident technique' in developing this theory, and this has been the lone method which constantly leads to findings which substantiate this theory. Locke and associates maintain that the researchers who used other applied methods of research found that motivators might be linked with job dissatisfaction and similarly hygiene might be related to job satisfaction (p.343-365). Therefore, it might be concluded that motivators and hygiene both might be the

sources of individuals' job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction (Oshagbemi, 1997; Bowen, 1980). There are also issues of interpretation (King, 1970:18-19; Tang and Gilbert, 1995) and the validity of this theory (House and Wigdor, 1967).

The *process theories* describe job satisfaction through considering how well the job fulfils an individual's expectations in terms of compensation with regard to the efforts invested. In this conceptual frame, Adams's (1963) and Vroom's (1964 and 1982) work is very important; Adams' work is also known by the name of the 'Equity Theory' of job satisfaction, where employees recognize their job in terms of a series of inputs and outcomes. The basic assumption which underpins this theory is that workers' job satisfaction is the result of their perception about to what extent they are being compensated fairly as compared to their colleagues. This theory does not consider other variables, such as situational and job-related factors, which might have an effect upon an employee's input and outcome, and a worker's satisfaction or dissatisfaction. It also does not address the issue of how a worker's compensation is decided if an employee or team which is being taken as standard or point of reference and an individual who wants to compare their outcomes, have different satisfaction levels with regards to outcomes.

Vroom's (1964) 'Expectancy Theory' of job satisfaction also emphasises the relationship between employees' input and compensation aspects. However, Vroom further included the facet of employee expectations. In essence, an employee expects that if he/she exerts more effort or input to increase performance, then he/she will be rewarded according to the effort exerted. Any difference between the anticipated reward and the actual reward leads towards job dissatisfaction. In Equity Theory it is the other employee's or team's reward (an employee or team which is taken as standard), which determines whether the received compensation by an employee is fair or not; whereas, Vroom maintains it is the personal expectation of an individual against their invested input that decides whether he/she is treated fairly or not in terms of compensation. Vroom (1982) considers an individual's personal and compensation-related factors as responsible for employee job satisfaction; however, Vroom does not

consider factors related to the situation, working environment and job in the phenomenon of job satisfaction.

Quarstein *et al*. put forward their *situational theory* in 1992, in which they proposed that job satisfaction is defined by two kinds of variables: 'situational characteristics' and 'situational occurrences'. These factors are similar to some of the 'motivators and hygiene' factors in the Herzberg theory. Situational characteristics are taken into account by workers generally when they are going to accept a job offer. Whereas, situational occurrences are factors that are faced by employees after accepting a job (Worrell, 2004). Quarstein *et al*. assert that employees' overall job satisfaction is more strongly predicted through combining both situational characteristics and situational occurrences. Oshagbemi (1997:355) highlights that "Quarstein *et al*.'s theory neglects the role of personal factors, such as age and education, in influencing job satisfaction". The study aims to investigate which leadership style(s) is/are more conducive and which can be a barrier to faculty job satisfaction in the Pakistani public university context as perceived by the faculty?

Methodology
The research has been carried out through adopting qualitative approach and semi-structured interview protocol has been utilised to collect in-depth qualitative data. Five campuses are selected, from a total of 13 units, of the chosen public university to generate qualitative data. Fifteen faculty members are interviewed from these 5 campuses (three from each campus) based upon their willingness and availability - convenience sampling (Cohen *et al*., 2007). The content analysis has been used to analyse the data, which is helpful to explore the similarities and differences across the participants' responses to report the key message of the data (Cohen *et al*., 2007).

Data Presentation, Findings and Discussion
A high majority of the participants believed that a democratic or participative leadership style was more conducive to faculty job satisfaction:

> *There should be [a] democratic leadership style*
> *because authoritative leadership style does not come up*

> *according to the expectations of the faculty. In [a] democratic [leadership style] opinion [and] work of [the] faculty is respected that leads to job satisfaction. When [a] leader shares responsibility and involves faculty members in decision making, it leads towards job satisfaction. In this style both the leader and faculty work together in the same way with harmony to achieve the specific targets and goals of the institution. So, this style is good for [faculty] job satisfaction in the Pakistani context. (R11)*

Another respondent argued:

> *If [a] leader is not cooperative with faculty, then there will be a problem. So, I think leader must make decision in a democratic way and should involve all faculty [members]. It is more better, because then people feel the empowerment when they are involved in decision making [process] and they think it is their own institution. [But] if there is autocracy it is not good for the institution. (R6)*

This is consistent with the previous research findings, which maintain that a democratic leadership style and the participation of teachers/faculty members in the decision-making process enhance their job satisfaction (Awan *et al*., 2008; Maeroff, 1988; Smylie *et al.,* 1996; Schneider, 1984; Tasnim, 2006) compared to autocratic leadership (Foels *et al*., 2000). Luekens *et al*. (2004) argue that no proper participation from teachers in the decision-making process leads towards job dissatisfaction. One of the participants, who critiqued the authoritative leadership style, suggested a number of transformational and transactional (contingent reward dimension only) leadership characteristics along with advocacy of the democratic or participative leadership style to increase faculty job satisfaction:

> *The authoritative leadership style is not effective, [and] decision should be done [taken] with the input from the faculty. There should be cooperation between leader and colleagues. Leader should behave professionally and should give adequate authority to the faculty for job execution. … Leader should give fair rewards to all,*

if the reward of my work is given, it increases job satisfaction, [and] if there is no reward but only criticism, this is not fair and it will affect my job satisfaction negatively. If the leader will not understand and solve the problems of the subordinates, and will not support them, then how can be worker [become] a good worker in that environment. (R2)

Hwa (2008) investigated the impact of a principal's transformational democratic leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. The results of this study highlight that principals who demonstrate democratic and transformational leadership characteristics achieve greater teacher satisfaction within their job (see also Cheah *et al.*, 2011). Rossmiller (1992) and Maerof (1988) also report that transformational leadership and participative decision making have positive relationships with job satisfaction. Hall *et al.* (1992), Sheppard (1996), and Poulin and Walter (1992) furthermore highlight that higher autonomy at work/empowerment, which is similar to leader behaviour highlighted above in that he/she *should give adequate authority to the faculty for job execution (R2)*, is linked to job satisfaction. Moreover, many studies endorse these findings by establishing the argument that supportive/cooperative and problem solving behavioural characteristics from a leader help the faculty/ colleagues feel satisfied within their jobs (Al-Omari, 2008; Clark and Astuto, 1994; Koh *et al.*, 1995; Patton and Kritsonis, 2006; Yukl, 2002). In this study also, most of the respondents maintained that transformational leadership style was more conducive to faculty job satisfaction. These participants did not specifically mention transformational leadership style, but almost all the characteristics they highlighted for the leadership style conducive to faculty job satisfaction characterised transformational leadership style:

Leader must be helping and should share power with [the] faculty, [and he/she] should involve [faculty members] in decision making. Leader should have good attitude… [and] good communication within the institution. [Leader] should develop faculty personally and professionally [and] should maintain high moral values. (R8) Leader must be highly qualified,

> *visionary... [and] should have [a] broad spectrum of leadership characteristics. (R3)*

Many respondents including R2, R3, R6, R8 & R11 in particular highlighted a number of transformational and transactional (contingent reward dimension only) leadership characteristics as conducive to faculty job satisfaction. They suggested, among others, respect for faculty members' opinions and work done, sharing authority and responsibility, faculty involvement in the decision-making process, working together with the faculty to achieve common institutional goals, cooperation, leader as problem solver, good attitude of the leader, good communication within the institution, faculty personal and professional development, high moral values maintained by the leader, visionary leadership, and fair rewards as significant elements in faculty job satisfaction. These elements are associated with five dimensions (idealized influence – attributed; idealized influence – behaviour; inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; and individual consideration) of the transformational leadership style and one dimension (contingent reward) of the transactional leadership style. These findings are also supported by a number of previous studies where transformational and transactional leadership behavioural characteristics are highlighted as enhancing teacher/ faculty job satisfaction (Bragg, 2008; Dastoor *et al.*, 2003; Dinham and Scott, 2000; Nguni *et al.*, 2006; Stumpf, 2003; Webb, 2003). Bogler (2001:666) also supports these findings by highlighting that "overall, teachers report greater satisfaction in their work when they perceive their principal as someone who shares information with others, delegates authority, and keeps open channels of communication with the teachers". However, a small number of interviewees interestingly argued that the autocratic or authoritative leadership style is more conducive to their job satisfaction:

> *Autocratic leadership style is more useful for job satisfaction than democratic leadership style, because in the democratic [style], leader has to listen and satisfy all the people, and just to satisfy the people, leader's decision might be in line of certain persons' opinion. So, the other [faculty members] might get dissatisfied. If the leader is competent enough and has*

the ability to tackle things …he/she should use autocratic leadership style. I am more satisfied with authoritative leadership style. It is difficult to agree with suggestions of all the faculty members if leader is to take feedback from faculty; but if leader is taking decision [alone], it will be accepted by all faculty members. (R14)

This is not consistent with prior research findings claiming that if the leader alone takes decisions and provides instructions to teachers/faculty members to act accordingly, it results in imperfect decisions and a decline in the teacher/faculty member performance and job satisfaction (Dunlap and Goldman, 1991; Gaziel, 1998; Kottkamp *et al.*, 1987). However, "educational leadership and its practices vary across societies and cultures" (Shah, 2010:29). For example, House *et al.* (2004) maintain that in the South Asian region, where Pakistan is located, authoritarian leaders are perceived as more appropriate than leaders who use the participative approach. This concurs with Simkins *et al.*'s (2003) observation in the educational setting that Pakistani society supports and emphasises the practice of an authoritarian approach to leadership.

Nevertheless, the majority of the research participants considered that the autocratic or authoritarian leadership style was a barrier to their job satisfaction:

Autocratic [leadership] style is a barrier to my job satisfaction because leader is all in all and he can do anything. Leader can take any decision without asking you [faculty member] or without discussing with you… and implement those [decisions], …these behaviours hamper my job satisfaction. So, this style is [a] barrier for my job satisfaction. (R13)

Most participants emphasised that a lack of transformational and transactional (contingent reward dimension only) leadership behaviour, and the exercise of an autocratic leadership style were barriers to their job satisfaction:

Lack of recognition by the leader against job done [and] if the leader is not delegating authority …not placing responsibility and not placing trust [upon

> *faculty] to do assignments, where most of the time leader imposes the decisions, and do not recognizes faculty's work, where there is no innovative ideas and assignments, where ...the whole power [is] within the leader – an authoritative leader, [and] where the leader has no vision to develop or increase the standards of the organization. All these are barriers to my job satisfaction. (R15)*

Another interviewee commented:

> *No proper growth to all the faculty members and no ...opportunities [for advancement] and promotions, no benefits in the job, [and] irregular distribution of the assignments [workload]. Injustice in the benefits for different faculty members is [a] barrier in job satisfaction. If there is no appreciation from the leader for [completing] assignment, or [if leader is] giving reward to another person who have not done that assignment. No respect from the leader. If a leader is not providing all these it is a barrier for [the faculty] job satisfaction. (R2)*

These findings are consistent with the previously presented findings regarding the practice of transformational and transactional (contingent reward dimension only) leadership behaviour to enhance faculty job satisfaction. Research in the educational context shows that teachers/faculty members are satisfied within their jobs in institutions where the leader demonstrates democratic behaviour compared to those institutions where the leader exhibits authoritative or autocratic leadership behaviour (Kottkamp *et al*., 1987; Smart, 1990). Unlike the autocratic leadership style, the participative leadership style allows for teacher/faculty member involvement in the decision-making process and thus enhances their job satisfaction (Imper *et al*., 1990; Rice and Schneider, 1994). Oshagbemi (1997) points out that the authoritative style leads university faculty members towards job dissatisfaction. Finally, a respondent who maintained that laissez-faire leadership style was a barrier for his/her job satisfaction remarked:

> *Laissez-faire leadership style is a barrier for my job satisfaction because it may enhance the satisfaction of*

> *the individual but it is not for the collectivism, because everybody has right to do whatever they want and leader is there just to see what people are doing, it leads towards individualism, people choose their own responsibility and they are responsible for their own to solve the problems. But there is no guidance from the leader and it leads towards loss of the institution which is a source of my job dissatisfaction. (R14)*

A number of prior studies support this finding by arguing that a strong negative relationship exists between the laissez-faire leadership style and faculty job satisfaction (Bass, 1999; Dastoor *et al*., 2003; Stumpf, 2003; Webb, 2003).

The qualitative data highlight some more leadership behaviours, which are roughly similar to the certain characteristics of the transactional style, as barriers to the faculty job satisfaction:

> *If the leader is fail to implement the real policies of the institution, and there is communication gap [and] lack of trust between leader and faculty, and if leader do [sic] not respond to the needs of the faculty, so it is a big barrier to increase the faculty job satisfaction. (R5)*

There are also a number of previous studies which highlight that these behaviours have an insignificant relationship with faculty job satisfaction or have a negative effect upon job satisfaction (Bass and Avolio, 2000; Gaspar, 1992; Levine, 2000; Stumpf, 2003).

In conclusion, the participative leadership style and the behaviours associated with transformational style and the first dimension (contingent reward) of transactional leadership are perceived as conducive to faculty job satisfaction. Whereas, the practice of authoritative and laissez-faire leadership styles and the lack of exercise of leadership behaviours related to transformational and transactional (contingent reward) leadership are considered to be barriers to faculty job satisfaction. However, these findings are specific to a Pakistani public university context and may not be generalised as such in different setting because the leadership concept and its practices are defined by the particular organizational and societal context (Shah, 2010).

Suggestions

The findings highlight that the campus heads and divisional directors of the university under investigation might practice the participative leadership style and the behaviours associated with transformational style and the first dimension (contingent reward) of transactional leadership to enhance faculty job satisfaction. Moreover, the campus heads and divisional directors may avoid the practice of authoritative and laissez-faire leadership styles to keep the faculty members satisfied within their job. The readers of the paper, however, need to keep in view that these findings are context specific and may not be applied in different setting as such due to the fact that the particular organizational and societal culture define the notion of leadership and inform its practice.

Reference

- Adams, J.S. (1963) 'Toward and Understanding of Inequity'. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67 (5), pp.422-436.
- Al-Omari, A. (2007) 'Leadership Styles of Department Chairs at the Hashemite University'. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 8 (3), pp.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), pp.101-124.
- Armstrong, M. (2006) *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. 10th ed. London: Kogan Page.
- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M. and Jung, D.I. (1995) *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Technical report*. Redwood City: Mind Garden.
- Awan, R., Zaidi, N.R. and Bigger, S. (2008) 'Relationships between Higher Education Leaders and Subordinates in Pakistan: A Path-Goal Approach'. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 30 (2), pp.29-44.
- Ayman, R. (1992) *Establishing a Global View of Leadership: East meets West*, in Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Applied Psychology (pp.95-95). Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B.M. (1981) *Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press.

- Bass, B.M. (1985) *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990) Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications. 3rd ed. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1999) 'Two Decades of Research and Development in Transformational Leadership'. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8 (1), pp.9-32.
- 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.
- Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S. (1964) *The Managerial Grid*. Houston: Gulf.
- Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S. (1978) *The New Managerial Grid*. Houston: Gulf.
- Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S. (1985) *The Managerial Grid III*. Houston: Gulf.
- Bogler, R. (2001) 'The Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher Job Satisfaction'. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 37 (5), pp.662-683.
- Bolden, R. (2004) *What is Leadership*? Exeter: Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter.
- Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A. and Dennison, P. (2003) *A Review of Leadership Theory and Competency Frameworks.* Exeter: Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter.
- Bowen, B.E. (1980) *Job Satisfaction of Teacher Educators in Agriculture,* unpublished thesis for the Doctor of Philosophy program, The Ohio State University.
- 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.
- Briggs, A.R.J. and Coleman, M. (2007) Introduction, in Briggs, A.R.J. and Coleman, M. (eds.) *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management*. 2nd ed. London: Paul Chapman.
- Brown, M., Hohenshil, T.H. and Brown, D. (1998) 'School Psychologists' Job Satisfaction in the USA: A National Study'. *School Psychology International Journal,* 19 (1), pp.79-89.
- Bush, T. (2003) *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management.* 3rd ed. London: Sage.

- Bush, T. and Middlewood, D. (2005) *Leading and Managing People in Education.* London: Sage.
- Campbell, D.T. (1956) *Leadership and its Effect upon the Group.* Columbus: Ohio State University.
- Campbell, R.F. and Gregg, R.T. (1957) *Administrative Behaviour in Education*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Cartwright, D. and Zander, A. (1960) *Group Dynamics Research and Theory*. Evanston: Row, Peterson.
- Castillo, J.X. and Cano, J. (2004) Factors Explaining Job Satisfaction among Faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45 (3), pp.74-75.
- Cerit, Y. (2009) 'The Effects of Servant Leadership Behaviours of School Principals on Teachers' Job Satisfaction'. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership,* 37 (5), pp.600-623.
- Cheah, L.H., Yoong, S. and Abdullah, A.G. (2011) *Principal's Transformational Democratic Leadership: The Impact of Principal's Transformational Democratic Leadership Style on Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Commitment*. Saarbrücken: LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Clark, D.L. and Astuto, T.A. (1994) 'Redirecting Reform: Challenges to Popular Assumptions about Teachers and Students'. *Phi Delta Kavvan*, 75 (7), pp.512-520.
- 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.
- Davies, J., Hides, M.T. and Casey, S. (2001) 'Leadership in Higher Education'. *Journal of Total Quality Management & Business Excellence,* 12 (7), pp.1025-1030.
- Dawis, R.V. (2004) The Minnesota Theory of Work Adjustment, in Brown, S.D. and Lent, R.W. (eds.), *Career Development: Putting Theory and Research into Practice*. Hoboken: John Wiley.
- 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), pp.379-396.

- Druskat, V.U. and Wheeler, J.V. (2003) 'Managing from the Boundary: the Effective Leadership of Self-Managing Work Teams'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46 (4), pp.435-457.
- Dunlap, D.C. and Goldman, P. (1991) 'Rethinking Power in Schools'. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27 (1), pp.5-29.
- Fiedler, F.E. and Chemers, M.M. (1974) *Leadership and Effective Management*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Foels, R., Driskell, J.E., Mullen, B. and Salas, E. (2000) 'The Effect of Democratic Leadership on Group Member Satisfaction: An Interaction'. *Small Group Research*, 31 (6), pp.676-701.
- Gaspar, S. (1992) *Transformational Leadership: An Integrative Review of the Literature*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53 (08A) 2619.
- Gaziel, H. (1998) 'School-Based Management as a Factor in School Effectiveness'. *International Review of Education*, 44 (4), pp.319-333.
- 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.
- Hack, W.G., Ramseyer, J.A., Gephart, W.J. and Heck, J.B. (1971) *Educational administration: selected readings*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hall, B.W., Pearson, L.C. and Carroll, D. (1992) 'Teachers' Long-Range Teaching Plans: A Discriminant Analysis'. *Journal of Educational Research*, 85 (4), pp.221-225.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K.H. and Johnson, D.E. (1996) *Management of Organizational Behaviour: Utilizing Human Resources*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Herzberg, F. (1959) *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Herzberg, F. (1966) *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland: World Publishing.
- Herzberg, F. (1974) 'Motivation-Hygiene Profiles'. *Organizational Dynamics*, 3 (2), pp.18-29.
- Hollander, E.P. (1992) 'Leadership, Followership, Self, and Others'. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3 (1), pp.43-54.

- House, R.J. and Wigdor, L.A. (1967) 'Herzberg's Dual-factor Theory of Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Review of the Evidence and a Criticism'. *Personnel Psychology*, 20 (4), pp.369-389.

- 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.

- Hoy and Miskel. (1991) *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice*. 4th ed. New York: Random House.

- Hwa, C.L. (2008) *The Impact of Principal's Transformational Democratic Leadership Style on Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Commitment,* unpublished thesis for the Doctor of Philosophy program, Universiti Sains Malaysia.

- Ifinedo, P. (2003) *Employee Motivation and Job Satisfaction in Finnish Organizations: A Study of Employees in the Oulu Region, Finland,* unpublished thesis for the Master of Business Administration program, University of London.

- Imper, M., Neidt, W.A. and Reyes, P. (1990) 'Factors Contributing to Teacher Satisfaction with Participative Decision Making'. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 23 (4), pp.216-225.

- Jago, A.G. (1982) 'Leadership: Perspectives in Theory and Research'. *Management Science*, 28 (3), pp.315-336.

- Kahn, R.L. (1956) 'The Prediction of Productivity'. *Journal of Social Issues*, 12 (2), pp.41-49.

- Kahn, R.L. and Katz, D. (1953) Leadership Practices in Relation to Productivity and Morale, in Cooper, C.L. (ed.) *Classics in Management Thought* (vol. 1). Northampton: Edward Elgar.

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

- King, N. (1970) 'Clarification and Evaluation of the Two-factor Theory of Job Satisfaction'. *Psychological Bulletin*, 74 (1), pp.18-31.

- Koh, W.L., Steers, R.M. and Terborg, J.R. (1995) 'The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Teacher Attitudes and Student Performance in Singapore'. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 16 (4), pp.319-333.

- Koopman, P.L. and Wierdsma, A.F.M. (1998) Participative Management, in Doentu, P.J.D., Thierry, H. and De-Wolf, C.J. (eds.) *Personnel Psychology: Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology* (vol. 3). Hove: Psychology Press.

- Kotter, J.P (1990) *A Force for Change: How Leadership differs from Management*. New York: Free Press.
- Kottkamp, R.B., Mulhern, J.A. and Hoy, K. (1987) 'Secondary School Climate: A Revision of the OCDQ'. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 23 (3), pp.31-48.
- Kreitner, R. (1983) *Management*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lawler, E.E. (1994) *Motivations in Work Organizations*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. and Suttle, J. (1972) 'A Casual Correlation Test of the Need Hierarchy Concept'. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 7 (2), pp. 265-287.
- 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.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R. and white, R.K. (1939) 'Patterns of Aggressive Behaviour in Experimentally Created Social Climates'. *Journal of social psychology,* 10 (2), pp.271-301.
- Likert, R. (1961) *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R. (1967) *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Locke, E.A. (1976) The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction, in Dunnette, M.D. (ed.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing.
- Locke, E.A., Fitzpatrick, W. and White, F.M. (1983) 'Job Satisfaction and Role Clarity among University and College Faculty'. *The Review of Higher Education,* 6 (4), pp.343-365.
- Luekens, M.T., Lyter, D.M. and Fox, E.E. (2004) *Teacher Attrition and Mobility, Results from the Teacher Follow-Up Survey, 2000-01* (NCES 2004-301). Washington: National Centre for Education Statistics.
- Madlock, P.E. (2008) 'The Link between Leadership Style, Communicator Competence, and Employee Satisfaction'. *Journal of Business Communication,* 45 (1), pp.61-78.
- Maeroff, G. (1988) *The Empowerment of Teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Mann F.C. (1965) Towards an Understanding of the Leadership Role in the Formal Organization, in Dublin, R. *Leadership and Productivity*. San Francisco: Chandler.

- Maslow, A.H. (1954) *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Naylor, J. (1999) *Management.* Harlow: Prentice hall.
- 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), pp.145-177.
- Northouse, P.G. (2010) *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 5th ed. London: Sage.
- Ololube, N.P. (2006) 'Teachers Job Satisfaction and Motivation for School Effectiveness: An Assessment', *Essays In Education (EIE)*, (vol. 18), Article 9, Fall 2006 [ISSN: 1527-9359].
- Oshagbemi, T. (1997) 'Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in Higher Education'. *Education + Training*, 39 (9), pp.354-359.
- Patton, M. and Kritsonis, W. (2006) 'The Law of Increasing Returns: A Process for Retaining Teachers-National Recommendations'. *Doctoral forum: National Journal for Publishing and Mentoring Doctoral Student Research,* 3 (1), pp.1-9.
- Poulin, J.E., and Walter, C.A. (1992) 'Retention Plans and Job Satisfaction of Gerontological Social Workers'. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 19 (1), pp.99-114.
- Quarstein, V.A., McAfee, R.B. and Glassman, M. (1992) 'The Situational Occurrences Theory of Job Satisfaction'. *Human Relations,* 45 (8), pp.859-873.
- Ramatulasamma, K. and Rao, D.B. (2003) *Job Satisfaction of Teacher Educators*. Delhi: Oscar Publications.
- Ribbins, P. and Gunter, H.M. (2002) 'Mapping Leadership Studies in Education: Towards a Topology of Knowledge Domains'. *Educational Management and Administration*, 30 (4), pp.359-386.
- Rice, E.M. and Schneider, G.T. (1994) 'A Decade of Teacher Empowerment: An Empirical Analysis of Teacher involvement in Decision Making, 1980-1991'. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32 (1), pp.43-58.
- Rossmiller, R.A. (1992) 'The Secondary School Principal and Teachers' Quality of Work life'. *Educational Management and Administration*, 20 (3), pp.132-146.
- Rost, J.C. (1991) *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Praeger.

- Schneider, G.T. (1984) 'Teacher Involvement in Decision Making Zones of Acceptance, Decision Conditions, and Job Satisfaction'. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 18 (1), pp.25-32.

- Scott, E.L. (1956) *Leadership and Perceptions of Organization*. Columbus: Ohio State University.

- Sergiovanni, T.J. and Starratt, R.J. (1971) *Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Sergiovanni, T.J. and Carver, F.D. (1980) *The New School Executive, a Theory of Administration*. 2nd edition. New York: Harper and Row.

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

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

- Sheppard, B. (1996) 'Exploring the Transformational Nature of Instructional Leadership'. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42 (4), pp.325-344.

- Simkins, T. (2005) 'Leadership in Education: 'What Works' or 'What Makes Sense'? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership,* 33 (1), pp.9-26.

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

- Siripak, S. (2006) *Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff in Mahidol University*, unpublished Thesis for the Degree of Master of Education in Educational Management, Mahidol University, Faculty of Graduates Studies.

- Smart, J.C. (1990) 'A Causal Model of Faculty Turnover Intentions'. *Research in Higher Education,* 31 (5), pp.405-424.

- Smylie, M.A., Lazarus, V. and Brownlee-Conyers, J. (1996) 'Instrumental Outcomes of School-Based Participative Decision Making'. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18 (3), pp.181-198.

- Stogdill, R.M. (1974) *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of the Literature*. New York: Free Press.

- Stogdill, R.M. and Coons, A.E. (1957) *Leader Behaviour: its Description and Measurement*. Columbus: Ohio State University.

- 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.
- Tang, T.L. and Gilbert, P.R. (1995) 'Attitudes toward Money as Related to Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction, Stress and Work-Related Attitudes'. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19 (3), pp.327-332.
- Tasnim, S. (2006) Job *Satisfaction among Female Teachers: A Study on Primary Schools in Bangladesh*, unpublished thesis for the Master of Philosophy program, University of Bergen, Department of Administration and Organization Theory.
- Toker, B. (2011) 'Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff: An Empirical Study on Turkey'. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 19 (2), pp.156-169.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964) *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Vroom, V.H. (1982). *Work and motivation* (Rev. ed.). Malabar: Robert E. Krieger
- Publishing Company.
- 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.
- 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.
- Yukl, G.A. (1994) *Leadership in Organizations*. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G.A. (2002) *Leadership in Organizations*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G.A. and Van Fleet, D.D. (1998) Theory and Research on Leadership in Organizations, in Dunnette, M.D. and Hough, L.M. (eds.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Mumbai: Jaico Publishing House.

EMPTY