Theses and Dissertations

2010

An analysis of the relationship between the perceived leadership styles of educational leaders and the job satisfaction of faculty members who serve under them within community colleges

Haifa Abou Harash

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd

Pepperdine University

Graduate School of Education and Psychology

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERCEIVED

LEADERSHIP STYLES OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERS AND THE JOB

SATISFACTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS WHO SERVE UNDER THEM

WITHIN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Haifa Abou Harash

September, 2010

Thomas Penderghast, D.B.A.–Dissertation Chairperson

This dissertation, written by

Haifa Abou Harash

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUACTION

_____
Thomas Penderghast, D.B.A.

_____
June Schmeider Ramirez, Ph.D.

_____
Doug Leigh, Ph.D.

_____
Eric R. Hamilton, Ph.D.
Associate Dean

_____
Margaret J. Weber, Ph.D.
Dean

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

DEDICATION

To my beloved husband

For supporting me in pursuing a lifelong dream

For his patience, sacrifice, and enthausiasm for my accomplishment

To my precious daughters

For being patient with me during the days that I could not have fun with them

For the nights that I could not see their beautiful faces before they sleep and get

a goodnight kiss

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is threefold: (a) identify the leadership practices of educational leaders at community colleges as rated by full-time and part-time faculty members and by using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire form 5x; (b) explore the relationship between the educational leaders' perceived leadership styles and the job satisfaction levels of full-time and part-time faculty members as measured by Paul Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey; (c) examine gender, educational level, years of teaching experience and employment status differences, if any, with regards to the total score of job satisfaction for full-time and part-time faculty.

This study's sample of full-time and part-time faculty was obtained from three community colleges in Southern California. Three survey instruments were utilized for this study: a demographic survey, the MLQ-5x, and the JSS. The surveys were administered to all the full-time and part-time faculty members in three selected colleges. A total of 131 respondents participated in this study.

Faculty members who worked for a transformational leader as well as a leader whose score were high on contingent reward (a subscale for transactional leadership style) had a higher correlation with their satisfaction with pay, promotion, supervision, contingent rewards, coworkers, and communication.

There were no significant differences in the overall satisfaction between full-time and part-time faculty members, nor between male and female faculty. Likewise, years of teaching experience was not related to any differences in the

total satisfaction scores. However, faculty with a doctorate degree scored significantly lower than their counterparts on the overall satisfaction score.

When considering the subscales for each leadership style, the highest overall satisfaction was reported for faculty members who work for a leader whose score was high on Individual Consideration, followed by Idealized Influence (Attribute) and Contingent Reward, and then by Inspirational Motivation. The lowest satisfaction was reported for faculty who worked for a leader who scored high on the subscale Management by Exception (Active).

These findings suggest that faculty members who work for a transformational leader had higher levels of job satisfaction than those who worked for a transactional leader, with the exception of transformational leaders who scored high on the transactional subscale of Contingent Rewards.

Chapter One: Background of the Study

Economies all around the world are experiencing substantial changes due to the effects of globalization and economic hardships. A number of empirical studies suggest that organizations that are engaged globally are less affected by financial constraints. They also tend to have better performance (Bridges & Guariglia, 2008; Guariglia & Mateut, 2005; Kumar, 1982).

Since the majority of the new jobs needed by the year 2014 will at least demand some postsecondary education (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2009), the demand for educated people keeps rising. This is caused by the ongoing need for a well developed and effective workforce. Community colleges are the access to the education world in the United States. They act as a catalyst for economic advancement (AACC, 2008). As a matter of fact, community colleges help serve about half of all the students in the United States. Some of these students are adults and desire to further their education.

A major asset for community colleges is the faculty. Faculty members should be satisfied with their jobs in order to perform highly (AACC, 2008). When the quality of the faculty suffers, the community college tends to be affected. Consideration of the factors that affect the job satisfaction levels of the faculty is critical to help retain quality faculty members. High job satisfaction levels can enhance growth and success, and tend to save colleges a lot of money along the process (Rosser & Townsend, 2006). Thus, researching the factors that affect job satisfaction among faculty members is vital for ensuring increased success in community colleges.

Problem Statement Background

Investigating the factors that contribute to the job satisfaction levels of faculty in community colleges is crucial for a variety of reasons (Milosheff, 1990). Previous studies indicated that university faculty members are reporting lower levels of job satisfaction. If given the option, they tend to choose a different profession (Willie & Stecklln, 1982). Consequently, the concern augments.

As people abandon the teaching profession, shortages increase (Mooney, 1989). Teachers who are dissatisfied with their jobs tend to retire early (Monahan & Greene, 1987). Because faculty members play a fundamental role in our society, it is essential to determine the factors that would affect their job satisfaction levels and work on them for enhancement. With such insight, leaders at the community colleges would be able to increase the effectiveness of what they do and how they do it when dealing with faculty satisfaction.

Some Facts About Community Colleges

There are 1,177 community colleges across the United States, 988 of which are public, 158 independent and 31 tribal. These schools enroll 11.7 million students. Those students are an essential part of the community and the economy. For instance, more than half the new nurses that graduate, as well as other health care workers, received their education at community colleges. By the year 2016, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that there will be a need for one million new and replacement nurses. Additionally, businesses and other organizations that hire students graduating from community colleges recommend that others do the same (AACC, 2009).

Equally important, 39% of all international students attend community colleges. Community colleges also provide credentialing for about 80% of firefighters and officers in the US law enforcement fields. Furthermore, community colleges provide chances for online education. After graduating with an Associate Degree from a community college, a student is expected to receive a lifetime earnings of $1.6 million, which is $400,000 more than a person who only has a high school degree (AACC, 2009). The above facts help shed the light on the importance of community colleges to our country. They play a vital role in preparing students for a brighter future.

Leaders and Institutional Effectiveness

A growing demand for considering institutional effectiveness is rising in community colleges. To be effective, community colleges need to satisfy and please the key stakeholders they deal with such as students, faculty, and the community. One way to achieve this is by hiring people who demonstrate high levels of energy and dedication when they perform their jobs (Wharton, 1997).

Wharton (1997) argues that similar quality efforts are affected by the leaders' behaviors in the community colleges. Not all leaders are aware of the incentives behind their behavior, or of how that affects the people they work with. As a result, some leaders become very confused, and their confusion reveals itself through their actions. Leaders' behaviors affect their followers' morale, how productive they are, their level of job satisfaction, and the service provided to stakeholders. Thus, instead of putting the leader's needs first, colleges need to

maximize performance level from staff and faculty not only as individuals, but also as team members.

Colleges increase their effectiveness with the help of behaviorally competent leaders. Leaders, who are behaviorally competent, do not usually make their personal needs dictate the way they professionally interact with their followers. They adapt their behaviors to the situation at hand. When leaders are conscious about the way they behave around their followers and treat them with respect, their followers have greater enthusiasm and are more willing to serve well. Hence, in a community college, leaders need to greatly consider what the needs and the expectations of their staff are. This can motivate followers to do their work more effectively (Wharton, 1997). "How companies view their employees—and, what is more important, how they act toward employees—largely determines how employees will serve customers" (Wharton, 1997 p. 161).

An increased demand for higher education services is expanding. One reason for that is population growth. Another is the demand for a more subtle education and training, which are driven by newer technologies that are always on the rise. If people do not keep up with the new demands of the market, by improving their skills and getting acquainted with new knowledge, they may suffer personally. On the long run, the whole society might suffer as well (Duderstadt, 2000).

In general, people consider education to be the door that leads them to success. They realize that they need education to improve their socioeconomic status. Without education in an age of knowledge, economic security is likely to

disappear. Due to growing market demands, more educational institutions are needed as a response to the call for such market forces (Duderstadt, 2007). Community colleges have been responding to the growing and changing needs of the society with a great degree of flexibility (AACC, 2009).

In any organization, leaders are concerned about turnover rates and ways to retain their employees. People usually stay in their jobs when they like what they do, and feel appreciated. Gallup's research, conducted on 1.5 million employees, shows that feeling powerful and engaged in one's work has a direct effect on positive business outcomes (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

When leaders strengthen their followers there is a boost in their work performance. When leaders make followers feel empowered, they become actively engaged in their jobs. A key factor that affects whether or not people stay in an organization and perform highly is their leaders. "People, in fact, don't generally quit companies, they quit managers" (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 283). Institutions, especially those in the education field, have a great responsibility to work diligently on raising their employees' job satisfaction levels. By enhancing their leadership practices, educational leaders may be able to raise the job satisfaction levels among faculty members in community colleges.

According to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2009), community colleges deliver services to about half of all undergraduate students in the United States. Such services include: open admittance to postsecondary education, preparing students to transfer to a four-year institution, allowing the students to develop and become part of America's workforce,

providing skill training, providing opportunities for second language learners to learn English, retraining students for new skills with new demands in the market, offering community enrichment programs, as well as setting activities that help raise cultural awareness. All this proves the indispensable role played by community colleges in our country.

Why Job Satisfaction

Most people spend the majority of their time at work. Therefore, it is useful for leaders to investigate factors that affect their employees' job satisfaction Enhancing the employees' feelings about their work could help them improve their well-being. Additionally, if job satisfaction levels are increased, organizations tend to have higher productivity and profitability rates (Gruneberg, 1979).

Many researchers suggest that job satisfaction and job morale are two sides of two different coins. While job morale refers to the well-being of a group, job satisfaction represents people's emotional reactions with respect to a certain job (Gruneberg, 1979). Although there is not a commonly accepted definition for job satisfaction, Locke (1976) defined it as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state, resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p.546).

Transactional and Transformational Leadership Styles

Bass (1990) summarized the differences between transactional and transformational leadership which are listed in Table1:

Table 1

Characteristics of Transformational and Transactional Leaders

Leadership Style	Characteristics of the Style
Transformational Leader	*Charisma:* Provides vision and sense of mission, instills pride, gains respect and trust.
	Inspiration: Communicates high expectations, uses symbols to focus efforts, and expresses important purposes in simple ways.
	Intellectual Stimulation: Promotes intelligence, rationality, and careful problem solving.
	Individualized Consideration: Gives personal attention, treats each employee individually, coaches, and advises.
Transactional Leader	*Contingent Reward:* Contacts exchange of rewards for effort, promises rewards for good performance recognizes accomplishments.
	Management by Exception (active): Watches and searches for deviations from rules and standards, take corrective action.
	Management by Exception (passive): Intervenes only if standards are not met.
	Laissez-Faire: Abdicates responsibilities, avoids making decisions.

Some leaders use a transformational leadership approach with their

followers. Others choose a transactional one. In either case, whenever leaders

gain an understanding of which leadership style, or attributes within a style, helps

motivate their followers attain specific outcomes, their organizations tend to

become more productive. If organizations can determine what leadership

attributes contribute to higher levels of job satisfaction, they tend to become more

competitive in their field. They can also better plan and develop their leadership

training programs. Therefore, they better serve their customers which, in turn, boost their profit margins. Hence, increased organizational effectiveness will most likely be achieved (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to determine if different leadership styles of educational leaders at community colleges are related to the level of job satisfaction of full-time and adjunct faculty members. A secondary purpose for this research is to determine if demographics, such as: gender, years of experience, employment status (full-time vs. part-time), and educational levels of faculty members are related to the overall level of job satisfaction of faculty members and their direct supervisor's leadership practices.

Problem Statement

What relationship, if any, exists between transactional and transformational leadership styles of academic leaders in community colleges and the job satisfaction of faculty members?

Research Questions

1. To what extent, if at all, does the job satisfaction of community college faculty members relate to the perception of their academic leader's five MLQ leadership style scores?

2. To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between full-time and part-time community college faculty members?

3. To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between male and female community college faculty members?

4. To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between community college faculty members at various educational levels?

5. To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between community college faculty members with various years of experience?

6. To what extent, if at all, do leadership attributes relate to the overall job satisfaction of faculty members?

Definition of Key Terms

The following section provides definitions for key terms that are specific to this study:

● *Community College*: According to Brawer and Cohen (1982), a community college is "any institution accredited to award the associate in arts or sciences as its highest degree" (pp. 5-6).

● *Contingent Reward*: here, leadership sets goals and objectives and assists and supports followers by rewarding behaviors that meet previously set expectations. This is done while people know that they are accountable and responsible for meeting the objectives (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

● *Idealized Influence (Attribute)*: it represents the ability of the leader to instill pride and to transform the self interest of the individual to one for the whole group. Leaders with this attribute have followers who display high levels of trust, power, and confidence (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

● *Idealized Influence (Behavior):* it represents the leader's ability to transcend the needs of his followers over his own. It also is a reflection of his values and beliefs as well as his ethics and principles (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

● *Individual Consideration:* individual consideration takes place when leaders act as coaches and mentors who seek the development of their employees' strength while considering their various needs (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

● *Inspirational Motivation*: it represents the leader's ability to motivate and inspire the followers through optimism, enthusiasm, and buying into a shared attractive vision as observed by the followers (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

● *Intellectual Stimulation:* it takes place when leaders motivate followers to seek new ways through which assumptions are questioned and problems are looked at from different angles (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

● *Job Satisfaction*: job satisfaction "represents a cluster of evaluative feelings about the job" (Spector, 1985, p. 695).

● *Leadership: it is "*the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives" (Yukl , 2002, p. 7).

● *Management-by-Exception (Active):* here, leadership makes sure that ineffective performances do not happen and if they do, they take corrective measures immediately (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

● *Management-by-Exception (Passive):* leadership here is reactive. Under this construct, leaders do not take actions until something goes wrong (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

● *Transactional Leadership*: it represents the leadership's definition of expectations as well as the leadership's ability to promote performance that is

directed towards achieving the desired levels. It happens through constructive and corrective types of transactions (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

● *Transformational Leadership*: it is a process whereby leaders influence followers by letting them be aware of the important things. They open the door for followers to view their roles, challenges and possibilities around them in a different way. Transformational leaders seek optimum development of the individual as well as the whole organization. They convince followers to seek potential, moral and ethical standards that are beyond mundane expectations (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Importance of the Study

Community colleges demonstrate a paramount role in the economic, social, and cultural development of communities (Anderson, 1997). This paramount role reveals itself through the five traditional functions of community colleges: (a) providing developmental education, (b) providing community education, such as continuing education programs, (c) allowing for collegiate education, or academic transfer, (d) offering career education, and (e) general education (Brawer & Cohen, 1996).

Since faculty members are the ones who directly deal with students to facilitate the delivery of the aforementioned services, understanding how leadership impacts their levels of job satisfaction becomes central. With such an understanding, the stage can be set for valuable professional training and organizational development. Likewise, according to Wharton (1997) community colleges are effective when they satisfy the stakeholders they serve. This is

facilitated by having staff members who are energetic, and who demonstrate dedicated performance in what they do.

Using validated instruments to measure the leadership styles of leaders in community colleges and studying how leadership style impacts faculty job satisfaction, provides a valuable insight for allowing the community college organization to continually improve leadership effectiveness. This also helps enhance the working environments, profitability, as well as increase job satisfaction (Dvir & Shamir, 2003).

In the state of California, community colleges are the leading providers of the state's workforce. They are important to achieving economic growth. Orange County Community College's (2009) statistics show that for every one dollar spent on community colleges, the local community gets back three dollars in return.

Assumptions

It was assumed that the three colleges selected to participate in this study would provide the lists of the email addresses of all faculty members (full-time and part-time). It was also assumed that participants would be honest and would complete all the questions in the surveys, knowing that their answers would remain confidential, anonymous to the researcher, and that individual respondents would not be tracked.

Limitations

This research focused on publically funded educational institutions in Southern California. As such, the study may not be generalizable to profit-driven

educational institutions due to the dissimilarities that drive the culture and motivation of the people in the two types of organizations. Moreover, because the study focused on educational institutions, results were not compared to those in other industries or business sectors.

Another limitation was related to the use of technology to collect data. The researcher used Survey Monkey. A link to the survey was emailed to each participant in the population. However, some of the emails may have been caught by spam filters or deleted without the content being checked. Another possibility was that some emails may have stayed unread, or were undeliverable. On the other hand, if some participants lack the experience in using the technology, this may have limited the number of responses that would have been received.

Nature of the Study

This research used a quantitative method by applying correlation analysis to determine if there was a relationship between any of the subcategories (pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication) of Paul Spector's (1994) Job Satisfaction Survey, and the leadership practices of the respondents' direct supervisors leadership style as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5-x published by Mind Garden Incorporated.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire form 5x has subscales that relate to two leadership styles: transformational and transactional. The subscales Idealized Influence (Attributes), Idealized Influence (Behaviors), Inspirational

Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized consideration relate to transformational leadership. Conversely, the subscales Contingent Reward, Management by Exception: Active, Management by Exception: Passive, and Lassie-faire, relate to transactional leadership.

In addition to these two survey instruments, participants were asked to complete a demographic survey to determine if gender, age, years of teaching experience, employment status (full-time vs. part-time) and educational level of respondents played any role in the level of job satisfaction of the employees at the participating community colleges.

Summary

Educational leaders play an important role in the growth of organizations, competing with other institutions, and meeting shareholders expectations (Rosser, Johnsrud, & Heck, 2003). When leaders in educational institutions identify the leadership behaviors that correlate to job satisfaction, they gain better insights as to which leadership programs should be developed to maximize the effectiveness of the organization (Avolio & Bass, 2004). As Wagner and Hollenbeck (2002) state, there is a direct relationship between leadership effectiveness and gaining competitive advantage. Therefore, this study could be used to help community college leaders raise the job satisfaction levels of faculty members by identifying which leadership styles have a positive effect on the faculty, and planning their leadership training programs accordingly.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

This chapter discusses empirical studies that deal with job satisfaction. It also reviews characteristics of effective leaders. Since this research is based on the transformational and transactional leadership styles, a thorough review of the literature is provided for the two styles. Also, a discussion as to how leaders, who use each of the two styles, interact with their followers is provided. Guidelines that these leaders employ in order to motivate and inspire their subordinates are examined in light of what the term leadership effectiveness means. Following that, an extensive review of job satisfaction and related theories are discussed. Finally, a review of the important job of academic leaders and economic benefits of attending community colleges are provided.

Job Satisfaction and Empirical Research

Research has established the existence of a relationship between employee job satisfaction and performance, how productive they are, their retention rate, and how often they tend to be absent from their jobs (Carsten & Spector, 1987; Locke, 1976). These studies show that when employees have high levels of job satisfaction, they are less absent from their jobs, have lower turnover rates, are less stressed, and would be more committed to the organizations than those employees with low job satisfaction levels. Therefore, to help organizations improve their productivity levels, it is essential to tend to the factors that contribute to job satisfaction and improve them.

Similarly, other research shows a relationship between job satisfaction and leadership characteristics. One such study was conducted in the health care

industry. Results revealed that organizations that had higher levels of job satisfaction had a retention rate for nurses that reached as high as 85% (Medley & Larochelle, 1995). Likewise Cohen & Cohen (1983) reached similar conclusion that leadership characteristics affect employee job satisfaction upon analyzing the relationship between the two.

Many studies show that variables such as leadership style (Medley & Larochelle, 1995), age (Anderson, Dibrito, & Morrell, 2000; William & Hazer, 1986), and education level (Battersby, 1990) have some impact on employees' job satisfaction level. Along similar lines, research shows that in two-year institutions gender plays a role in the satisfaction levels among faculty members (Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998; Hutton & Jobe, 1985).

Helping leaders in community colleges understand the importance of maintaining a high level of job satisfaction among the faculty members can assist them to tend to the faculty needs, and retain high quality faculty members. Faculty members in public two year colleges tend to leave their jobs if they are dissatisfied (Rosser & Townsend, 2006). Studies conclude that there is a direct connection between low levels of job satisfaction and voluntary turnover rates in two-year institutions (Cano & Miller, 1992; Glick, 1992; Simpson, 1984).

Faculty and students are both essential if the college is to achieve its mission (Baker, Roueche, & Gillett-Karam, 1990). When leaders improve the job satisfaction level of the faculty, faculty's job becomes easier with regards to enhancing the quality of instruction in the classroom. This improvement in job

satisfaction helps reduce the fear that low job satisfaction levels could affect the quality of education that the institution provides.

Some studies examined the effect of leadership on student achievement in the private career college sector. They found a significant relationship between leadership and student achievement (McComis, 2006). Others focused on how experience and the age of employees relate to their performance on the job (Avolio, Waldman, & McDaniel, 1990). In addition, some other studies investigated the impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002). Researchers also found a strong relationship between leadership style and employee job and communication satisfaction (Madlock, 2008).

Burns (2007) investigated how transactional and transformational leadership styles affected faculty at colleges and found that a total of four transactional and transformational leadership attributes account for about 83% of the variance in job satisfaction. In an attempt to collaborate the findings of other studies as well as to add to the existing literature, this study investigated which leadership style affects job satisfaction the most among faculty members at the community college level. Two styles were considered: transformational and transactional leadership.

Leadership Definitions

Many individuals attempt to define leadership. Some assume that a leader is one with power, dynamic, leads triumphant troops, guides huge corporations, or affects changes in the course of nations (Yukl, 2002). For a considerable

period of time leadership was a speculation subject. In the twentieth century leadership was approached from a scientific perspective. Researchers were interested in discovering what determines leadership effectiveness. People in the social sciences field were attracted to discover the aspects that shape the way in which a leader influences followers, and the factors that help a leader achieve the objectives set by a group (Bass & Stogdill, 1981; Burns, 1978; Jago, 1982). Hence, they studied not only traits and abilities, but also other aspects like behaviors, power sources, as well as the situation itself.

The study of leadership has made a lot of advancements. Yet, many questions still have no answers. Among researchers, the predominant interest is still leadership effectiveness. The following is an attempt to provide various definitions of leadership by prominent people in the field, as well as identify a leadership definition for the purpose of this study. It is not easy to define leadership. As Bennis and Nanus stated:

> Always, it seems, the concept of leadership eludes us or turns up in another form to taunt us again with its slipperiness and complexity. So we have invented an endless proliferation of terms to deal with it… and still the concept is not sufficiently defined (1985, p. 259).

Many researchers provided leadership definitions. According to Fiedler, "Leadership is, by definition, an interpersonal relationship in which power and influence are unevenly distributed so that one person is able to direct and control the actions and behaviors of others to a greater extent than they direct and control his" (1967, p. 11). Tucker (1989) stated that "Leadership is the ability to

influence or motivate an individual or a group of individuals to work willingly toward a given goal or objective under a specific set of circumstances" (p. 41).

Researchers such as Jago view leadership as involving a process and a property. Leadership is a process because it employs the use of noncompulsory effects to guide and organize the events of the individuals belonging to an organized group that has certain objectives and goals to achieve. Jago also views leadership as a property. He proposes that leaders are individuals who possess certain qualities and traits by which they successfully affect others. Leadership is described by one's actions when he interacts with people, and consequently has followers (Jago, 1982).

When the motivation and competence level of people are modified in a group, one can say that leadership is present in that group (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Bass further states that different kinds of leaders exist. They can be differentiated due to role, functional, or institutional differences. Zaleznik (2004) believes that leadership deals with influencing the thoughts and actions of others.

Bass and Stogdill (1990) reviewed different definitions and conceptions of leadership. They stated that different researchers conceive leadership differently. Leadership could be viewed as: (a) the focus of group processes, (b) a matter of personality, (c) an art of inducing compliance, (d) an exercise of influence, (e) specific behaviors, (f) a way for persuasion, (g) a power relation, (h), a method for goal achievement, (i) an emerging effect of interaction, (j) a differentiated role, or (k) an origination of structure.

For the purpose of this research, leadership is defined as: "the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives" (Yukl, 2002, p. 7).

Leadership versus Management

Because many people use the terms management and leadership interchangeably, a distinction between the two is useful. Leaders and managers differ in many aspects in the workplace. Managers put plans and set budgets. They set timelines and do not reveal their passion about the vision and objectives to be reached. On the other hand, leaders set the direction, develop the vision, and suggest strategic plans to reach the vision. Leaders show passion about the vision and the goals they want to achieve (Kotterman, 2006).

In terms of human development and networking, managers deal with maintaining structure, delegating responsibility and authority, and implementing the vision through policies and procedure they have established. They do so while displaying low levels of emotions. Conversely, leaders align the organization and make sure they explain and clarify the vision, the mission, and the direction. Leaders partner with their followers and reveal high levels of motivation and emotions. They also increase choices for the people they work with (Kotterman, 2006).

Regarding vision execution, managers control the process. They identify the problems and provide solutions. Then they monitor the results and take low-

risk style in solving the problems. By contrast, leaders motivate and inspire their followers and apply a high-risk style in solving problems (Kotterman, 2006).

Similarly, Zaleznik (2004) argues that managers and leaders show differences in terms of personality, attitudes towards goals, conception of work and relations with others. Managers assume passive attitudes when dealing with goals. They think that goals are not the outcome of a vision, rather the outcome of a necessity. Managers do not influence the people they work with; they have them follow orders because of rewards and punishments. Managers accept mundane work and lay low in terms of risk taking. On the other hand, leaders consider mundane work as a distress. They become very involved and show emotions towards achieving the goals and the vision. Leaders develop an intense relationship with their followers and chaos is the word to describe their working environment. They inspire their followers and seek high risk situations.

Kotter (2001) suggests that leaders and managers are distinct, yet complimentary. They complement one another in an always changing world. In organizations it is necessary to have people who promote stability, and this is what managers do. It is also important to have people who press for change, and this is the role of a leader. Kotter iterates that organizations that are good at promoting stability and pressing for change, can survive in difficult times. Management alone could generate purposeless bureaucracy, and leadership by itself may produce impractical change. Both are needed.

Leadership Theories

There are several theories that have different views of what constitutes good leadership (Northouse, 2007). Considering the various fields in social sciences, leadership may be among the ones that are mostly studied. Numerous researches have been conducted and various theories proposed. The trait theory claims that certain personal qualities and characteristics should be found in individuals in order for them to be called leaders. The style approach considers behavior exhibited by the leader as being composed of two kinds: task behavior and relationship behavior.

The contingency model suggests that for group performance to be effective, there should be a proper match between the leader's style and the degree of control given to the leader to deal with the situation at hand. The leader-member exchange theory focuses on establishing special relationships between the leader and the followers. Transactional leaders guide followers by clarifying role and task requirements. Last but not least, transformational leaders inspire followers and let them see the greater benefit of the group (Northouse, 2007). This research focuses on the last two, namely transactional and transformational leadership.

Important Characteristics of Leaders

Presently, it is not enough for a successful leader to be only a successful manager. Today's effective leaders manage and lead. Kotter (1999) believes that it is not too often that you find a person who is a leader and a manager at the same time. With today's' challenges, leaders who are effective understand how

to deal with the dynamic and the competitive nature of the business. They perform, or at least have the knowledge of, managerial functions such as planning and budgeting. But such functions are no more their single focus to be successful in the business. Today, effective leaders realize the importance of people as assets to the organization.

Additionally, other researchers believe that not only having managerial and leadership roles affect leadership, but traits affect leadership as well. They state that six traits differentiate people who can lead from those who cannot lead. The six traits are drive, the desire to lead, honesty/integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the business (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991, p. 49). The first three traits seem to be related to a transformational leader more than a transactional one, unlike the latter ones

First Trait: Drive

Drive is a broad term that includes subcategories of: achievement, motivation, ambition, energy, tenacity and initiative. Below is a discussion of each of the subcategories that are included within the drive trait (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991).

Achievement. The desire for achievement is intense among leaders. Leaders who are high achievers feel satisfied after finishing a task that is considered challenging, after developing excellence standards, and upon finding more effective ways to carry out their tasks. Their immense desire to achieve high positions helps them gain the technical experience needed, be it related to

experience or academia. They also have the ability to plan and pioneer a change plan that they can actually put to practice (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991).

Ambition. People who can lead have a strong desire to be famous, wealthy, or powerful. They have a set goal in mind that motivates them to push themselves and others to reach it. "Effective leaders are more ambitious than nonleaders" (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991, p. 50).

Energy. Leaders ought to have power or capacity for activities that feed high achievers' drive and make them move. Such leaders have a high level of stamina and are always dynamic and lively. Leaders have been characterized as "electric, vigorous, active, full of life as well as possessing the physical vitality to maintain a steadily productive work pace" (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991, p. 50).

Tenacity. When it comes to dealing with hardships, leaders know how to overcome them. They have power, enthusiasm, determination, and vigor. When change takes place in organizations, often the results are not seen the next day. It is a lengthy period before the benefits can be felt. Leaders' persistence in what they do to achieve their goals is essential to institutionalize the necessary change. "It is not just the direction of action that counts, but sticking to the direction chosen" (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991, p. 51).

Initiative. Being proactive is a characteristic that effective leaders know how to utilize. Instead of waiting for things to take place, or even instead of having to react to incidents, they commence changes by making choices and taking the lead. All this is to be topped by leaders wanting to lead (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991).

Second Trait: The Desire to Lead, or Leadership Motivation

Leaders exhibit a vast desire to lead others. They want to be followed instead of following others. They have a motivation to affect, persuade, control, and touch the hearts of others. They are willing to take responsibility and charge (Miner, 1978). Giving power to others is important because it adds not only to their own power, but also to the plans of what is to be achieved. Warren Bennis and colleague Burt Nanus state that "power is a leader's currency, or the primary means through which the leader gets things done in the organization" (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991, p. 52). Leaders, who are effective, do not compete for power. They know how to use it and distribute it to subordinates without losing their own. This helps them carry out their vision and goals.

Third Trait: Honesty and Integrity

Honesty and integrity are very pivotal among leaders. "Integrity is the correspondence between word and deed and honesty refers to being truthful or non-deceitful" (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991, p. 53). Both are crucial to build trust between leaders and those who follow them (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

Fourth Trait: Self-Confidence

Effective leaders have self-confidence. As a leader, one faces challenges almost every day. The leader should be able to gather and process information, solve problems, make decisions, convince followers to take specific actions, overcome setbacks, satisfy interests that compete in the organization, and take risks in uncertain conditions. If the leader doubts his abilities to carry out all the aforementioned tasks, it would be hard for subordinates to follow such a leader. It

is not only important for a leader to have self-confidence, it is also important that the followers sense the self-confidence in their leader (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The ability to choose effective decisions and to build trust are greatly influenced by the leader's self-confidence (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991).

Fifth Trait: Cognitive Ability

Leaders need to deal with a massive amount of data that they are expected to integrate and interpret. Cognitive ability helps leaders establish proper strategies, decide on answers, and take decisions that are appropriate (Bandura, 1986). "Leaders have often been characterized as being intelligent, but not necessarily brilliant, and as being conceptually skilled" (Kirkpatrick & Locke 1991, p. 56).

Sixth Trait: Knowledge of the Business

An extensive degree of knowledge regarding the company makes effective leaders special. Leaders who are highly knowledgeable about their work and their industry are usually effective because their decisions are well-informed. This helps them predict the implications of the decisions they make. If they also gain technical expertise, they are usually better able to relate to the concerns of their followers (Kotter, 1999).

Transactional Leadership and Transformational Leadership

Among the first researchers to differentiate between transactional and transformational leadership was Burns. Leaders, who are transactional, define tasks in a very clear manner and explain the way they should be executed. People who follow the leader carry out the tasks in return for a certain type of

recognition, be it material or psychological. Once the mission is clearly defined, and the rewards in return are designated, the leader checks to see if the job is being performed (Burns, 1978).

Therefore, transactional leaders identify the actions for subordinates. The leader and the subordinates exchange things for what each one wants in return. "Transactional leaders engage their followers in a relationship of mutual dependence in which the contributions of both sides are acknowledged and rewarded" (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987, p. 649).

Despite the fact that transactional leadership is portrayed as a trade of tasks to reach desired results, researchers like Dienesch and Liden explain that the trades are not equivalent (1986). Other people in the field have found that transactions can be identified at two levels. Graen, Liden and Hoel (1982) discuss high-quality and low-quality exchange relationships. High-quality level transactions engage in relationships that support the group and exchange emotional resources when an interpersonal bond forms between leaders and followers. Low-quality transactions focus on the work hours, the pay in return and the contract, with no emotional involvement. It purely focuses on transactions.

Similarly, Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) also state that transactional leadership has different levels. According to Burns, those levels of transactions are arranged from the obvious to the less obvious. Obvious levels include examples like jobs for votes; whereas less obvious level examples include trust, exchange, and respect.

Likewise, Bass (1985) points out different transactions that transactional leaders employ. The most common one is when the leader defines the role of the subordinates, and outlines the requirements for the job to be fulfilled. This allows for the subordinates to be rewarded, and to achieve the organization's mission simultaneously. This is a lower-order transaction where the leader should be able to directly control the resources to deliver his promises. The less common type, according to Burns (1978), is when exchangeable values include things like respect and trust. According to him, these are called modal values. Here, the leader can control desirable exchanges because they involve no concrete rewards that he can deliver to keep the desired performance level the way it should be.

In sum, there are two factors that characterize modern leadership according to Bass (1990). One factor deals with the initiation and the organization of the work, in order to accomplish the tasks at hand. Another factor focuses on rewarding good performing employees, by showing them consideration and satisfying their self-interests. In contrast, leaders who use transformational leadership, which Bass refers to as superior leadership performance, broaden and raise their employees' interests by generating awareness and acceptance of the group's mission and purpose. They also help employees consider what is good for the whole group rather than focusing on their individual interests.

When considering transformational and transactional leadership, Yukl (2002) states that (a) the component behaviors that the leader uses to influence

his followers and (b) the effects that the leader has on his followers are the measures used to determine the two types of leadership. Followers of a transformational leader respect, admire, believe in, and are loyal to their leader. They are willing to walk the extra mile, even if they are not paid money to do that. They execute what is required of them according to the job description of their work, and also give more (Dvir et al., 2002).

Bass (1985) suggests that when leaders help followers understand the importance of their work results, consider the goodwill of the organization and their team members before their own interests, and try to achieve their higher order needs, such leaders are, in fact, transforming and motivating the people they are working with. Bass, however, does not undermine the importance of transactional leadership. He believes that the two are mutually exclusive. Organizations need leaders to motivate and increase performance of the workers. They also need to keep them on task (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Leaders that are effective, Bass adds, use a combination of the two.

Transformational and Transactional Leaders Behaviors

Bass (1990) summarized the differences between transactional and transformational leadership which are listed in Table 2:

Table 2

Characteristics of Transformational and Transactional Leaders

Leadership Style	Characteristics of the Style
Transformational Leader	*Charisma:* Provides vision and sense of mission, instills pride, gains respect and trust.

(*table continues*)

Leadership Style	Characteristics of the Style
	Inspiration: Communicates high expectations, uses symbols to focus efforts, and expresses important purposes in simple ways.
	Intellectual Stimulation: Promotes intelligence, rationality, and careful problem solving.
	Individualized Consideration: Gives personal attention, treats each employee individually, coaches, and advises.
Transactional Leader	*Contingent Reward:* Contacts exchange of rewards for effort, promises rewards for good performance recognizes accomplishments.
	Management by Exception (active): Watches and searches for deviations from rules and standards, take corrective action.
	Management by Exception (passive): Intervenes only if standards are not met.
	Laissez-Faire: Abdicates responsibilities, avoids making decisions.

To achieve superior leadership outcomes, transformational leaders may show charisma and inspire their subordinates. They also cognitively stimulate the followers, and meet the employees' emotional requisites (Northouse, 2007). Evidence suggests that there is a four-step process that charismatic leaders use to affect followers (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). This four-step process is as follows:

1. First, the leader articulates a vision that is attractive. According to Senge, "A shared vision is a vision that many people are truly committed to, because it reflects their own personal vision" (1990, p. 192). Based on this definition, it is clear that a shared vision is a genuine, meaningful one and if it is meaningful, it can motivate people to do their best. They may do so from the heart and not because they think it is an obligation imposed upon them.

2. After establishing a vision, performance expectations are stated and expression of confidence in the subordinates is emphasized. This leads to higher levels of self-esteem and self-confidence in subordinates.

3. Thirdly, the leader articulates and models the values that are desired. He models the way to be imitated.

4. Lastly, the leader reinforces actions and behaviors which are new and unconventional.

Transformational Leadership Guidelines to Produce Inspiration and Motivation in Followers

There are some guidelines that transformational leaders use to raise the motivation and inspiration level of followers (Yukl, 2002). These guidelines include: (a) articulation of a clear attractive vision, (b) convincing the followers that the vision is feasible, (c) demonstrating confidence and optimism in achieving the vision, (d) expression of trust in followers, (e) employing symbols and drama to stress important values, (f) modeling the way, and (g) empowering people. What follows is a discussion of each guideline.

Articulation of a Clear Attractive Vision

A strong clear vision assists members of the organization in establishing a shared vision. Vision unites the employees and stands to remind them of their common purpose. It also reminds them of the goals they are collectively trying to achieve. Employees then realize how the different activities they are performing

within the organizational structure converge (Caesar& Caesar, 2006; Cashman, 1998; Senge, 1990).

To be effective, the vision needs to be shared between the leader and all the stakeholders. A shared vision is important. It helps every person find meaning in what each member is doing (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Senge, 1990).

As a result, employees establish a sense of belonging and ownership within their organizations. They feel that they are all contributing to the established vision. "A shared vision is a vision that many people are truly committed to, because it reflects their own personal vision" (Senge, 1990, p. 58). Based on this definition, it is clear that a shared vision is a genuine, meaningful one that can motivate people to do their best. They do so from the heart and not because they *have to.* Their shared vision becomes a reflection of the uniqueness of their organization (Robbins & Judge, 2008)*.*

Senge explains that there are two kinds of vision: extrinsic which reflects being driven by an outside force or reason, and intrinsic which reflects inner forces or standards. This clarifies why people, who are motivated from within, keep working even if external motivation is minimal. They are driven from the inside and their satisfaction is not affected by external factors. Due to this, employees feel that they are not working for *a* company; it is *their* company that they are working for. According to Senge, a shared vision fosters courage, establishes a learning organization, helps in risk taking and experimentation, and assists in developing a long term commitment (1990).

Similarly, Kouzes and Posner (2002) state that, based on studies

conducted, if the vision is clearly communicated by the leader, employees or

members in the organization will have higher levels of job satisfaction,

motivation, commitment, loyalty, esprit de corps, clarity about the organization's

values, pride in the organization, and organizational productivity.

Convincing Followers That the Vision Is Feasible

To positively influence an organization's vision, regardless of a leader's

style, a leader needs to articulate the vision in a way that is appealing to others.

This means that the vision must be expressed as something that proposes a

better future for all. The leader articulates the vision in simple terms, so that the

organization sees it as an attainable goal. An effective leader also expresses his

or her trust in the organization. He shows this through revealing confidence that

the organization can achieve the vision. "A vision is likely to fail if it doesn't offer a

view of the future that is clearly and demonstrably better for the organization and

its members. Desirable visions fit the times and circumstances and reflect the

uniqueness of the organization" (Robbins & Judge, 2008, p.187).

Demonstrating Confidence and Optimism in Achieving the Vision

Powerful leaders believe in their visions. They assist the members of their

organizations in finding meaning in the vision and adopting it as their own.

Therefore, the most important role of visions in organizational life is to give focus

to human energy. Whether the leader leads a group of ten people in a certain

department, a group of ten thousand in a large business, or even a community

with a hundred thousand, what sets the agenda is the shared vision. It helps the

enterprise to have a purpose and a clear direction (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Expression of Trust in Followers

"Trust is a psychological state that provides a representation of how individuals understand their relationships with another party in situations that involve risk or vulnerability" (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001, p. 7). In general, a leader needs to be aware that without trust it is difficult to lead. People try harder if they believe that what they are doing has meaning to them, feel it can be done, and that they are motivated and rewarded (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

It is rewarding for followers to feel confident that they can achieve the vision. In their research, Kouzes and Posner found that the most significant predictor of individuals' satisfaction with their organizations is trust. A trusting leader nurtures openness, involvement, personal satisfaction, and great levels of commitment to excellence (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).Transformational leaders are very proficient at earning the trust of their followers.

Employing Symbols and Drama to Stress Important Values

Vision is the "what?", purpose is the "why?", and core values are the "how?" (Senge, 1990). What people want to achieve, and why they want to achieve it is very important. However, it cannot be executed without the "how?". Clarifying the principles that govern one's life, and the ends that can be reached, helps the person give purpose to his daily decisions (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Transformational leaders make personal values as well as organizational values crystal clear. They establish a common ground against which performance is assessed.

Moreover, effective leaders understand the importance of channels that are informal in conveying the messages of the organization. This is why they properly use artifacts such as posters, wall pictures, things on the desks…, to mention only a few. These artifacts constantly remind employees about the culture of their organization and its values (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Stories are also a form of communication. Through stories, people pass lessons from one generation to another and tell about the culture. In the workplace, incidents that are critical bring about great moral lessons that identify and line up with values and acceptable behaviors (Schein, 2004). Stories function as a type of mental map that assists people in realizing what is important such as their purpose and values. Stories also clarify how things are carried out in a particular group or organization (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Research in the field of speech communication suggests that when people listen to stories, they become active thinkers in order to decipher the meaning of the story and to make sense out of it. Other research shows that stories greatly influence the decision making of the individual (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Jameson, 2001).

Modeling the Way

"At the core of becoming a leader is the need to connect one's voice to one's touch" (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p.44). It is critical for leaders to model the way through their words and actions. The way for leaders to find their voice is by clarifying their personal values and by expressing themselves. By clarifying personal values, leaders are able to demonstrate strong beliefs about matters of

principle and are able to stand up for what they believe (Cashman, 1998).

Transformational leaders who can positively influence espoused values and beliefs walk the talk, speak from the heart, develop a foundation based on ethical values, and do what is right for the organization and its people (Robbins & Judge, 2008). Another important behavior that can influence an organization's values and beliefs is for the leader to be credible. A credible leader expresses himself in ways that are uniquely his own (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Empowering People

Empowering people to accomplish the objectives and reach their vision is an invaluable aspect of transformational leadership. Some examples of what empowerment means include:

1. Delegating authorities to make decisions

2. Allowing people to show the best means to achieve goals and implement strategies

3. Supporting followers in finding solutions to problems

4. Accepting differences in terms of how others could solve problems

5. Reducing bureaucratic constraints

6. Providing adequate resources for the work to be completed (Yukl, 2002).

Leadership Effectiveness

Just as it would be challenging to agree on one definition for the term leadership, agreeing on a specific set of concepts that make up leaders' effectiveness would also be difficult. The basis by which researchers select

certain criteria to assess effectiveness of leadership mirrors the way that

researchers define leadership. The majority of researchers assess it by

evaluating the leaders' behaviors and how that influences followers and the

stakeholders in their organizations. The outcomes they use for their assessments

include:

1. Achievement and growth of the followers or the organization as a

   whole

2. How prepared the organization is for challenging times

3. Satisfaction levels of the followers

4. Commitment of the followers to group objectives

5. Followers' psychological well-being as well as their development

6. Viewing the leaders as having high status in the group they lead

7. Advancement of the leader to higher ranks of power in the organization

   (Yukl, 2002).

According to Yukl (2002), how successfully a unit performs its mission and

achieves its goals and objectives is the most usual type of measure for

leadership effectiveness. Examples of achieving goals are: profits, increase in

sales numbers, high return on investments, increased levels of productivity, and

so on. Examples of measures that are subjective include: ratings of how effective

the leader is as measured by the colleagues, superiors, or followers.

Another way of knowing whether or not the leader is effective is by

checking the attitudes of the people that person leads (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

This is a common indicator used by many researchers. One would check for how

well the needs and expectations of the followers are being met or if the followers respect the leader, like him, and see him as a person worthy of being admired. Of importance also is the level of commitment versus the level of resistance, as portrayed by the followers (Yukl, 2002; Goleman, 2000).

There are many surveys and questionnaires that measure the attitudes of followers towards their leader and reveal whether or not there are high levels of dissatisfaction and hostility towards the person who leads them. Dissatisfaction and hostility would be an indicator of things like absenteeism, elective turnover, complaints, asking for transference from their department, a reduction in the speed or production of their work, in addition to abuse of the supplies, furnishings, or the facilities where they work (Yukl, 2002).

Importance of Job Satisfaction

According to Robbins and Judge (2008), a person who is satisfied with his job reveals positive feelings towards the job he performs. Job satisfaction can either be high (revealed by showing positive feelings), or low (revealed by negative emotions about work). The aforementioned authors affirm that not all people are equally satisfied with their jobs. Differences in levels of job satisfaction have various causes. Moreover, satisfied and dissatisfied employees influence organizations differently.

On the average, people are usually satisfied with their jobs. However, when one considers job satisfaction according to different facets, the levels may vary considerably depending on whether or not they are satisfied with the work itself, the pay, any promotions they get, supervision from their leaders, dealing

with their coworkers, or an overall satisfaction (Spector, 1997). When the work

has a challenging and stimulating nature, people tend to like it. Therefore, they

tend to be satisfied. Predictable and routine work does not help raise job

satisfaction levels (Robbins & Judge, 2008).

Another factor that plays a role in job satisfaction is personality (John,

Moffitt, Lucy, Adam, & Stevens, 2007). Some people are happier than others.

Workers with negative personalities are almost always cranky and critical and fail

to see positives. They usually have lower levels of job satisfaction (Robbins &

Judge, 2008).

There are certain outcomes for different levels of job satisfaction in an

organization (Robbins & Judge, 2008). Job satisfaction affects job performance.

In a review study conducted by Judge, Bono, Thoresen, and Patton (2001) 300

studies were investigated. Results determined that all the studies propounded a

strong correlation between job satisfaction and job performance. Other

researchers determine that organizations with employees who are satisfied with

their jobs have higher levels of effectiveness than those with employees who

have lower levels of job satisfaction (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002).

When investigating the relationship between job satisfaction and

organizational citizenship behavior, LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) suggested

that there is a relationship between the two. Satisfied employees not only

perform what they are asked to perform according to their job descriptions, but

they are willing to go above and beyond that to help others. They have positive

attitudes about their work. This contributes to the effectiveness of the organization.

Another area that is impacted by job satisfaction is customer satisfaction. In a study done by Griffith (2001) investigating whether or not satisfied employees satisfy customers, it was found that employees who deal directly with customers either increase, or decrease customers' satisfaction levels and loyalty. A series of studies suggested that how employees feel about their work affects the way they interact with customers. This influences the perceptions of those customers as well as how satisfied they are with the services provided (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994).

Employees with high job satisfaction act in a friendlier and more responsive manner. This is usually appreciated by customers (Robbins & Judge, 2008). Robbins and Judge further added that more satisfied employees have low levels of turnover, and as a result they gain more experience in their field of expertise. This directly translates into having satisfied customers who deal with the experienced employees with whom they are familiar. On the other end of the continuum, dissatisfied customers have a negative effect on how people feel about their jobs. It's a mutual relationship (Barry, 2002).

Other research conducted by Steel and Rentsch (1995) shows that a negative relationship exists between job satisfaction and the frequency of being absent from one's job. Satisfied employees do not miss work as much as dissatisfied ones do (Madlock, 2008). Turnover is also negatively related to job satisfaction (Robbins & Judge, 2008).

Theoretical Considerations for Job Satisfaction

Since this study focuses on the needs of faculty members at the community college level, it would be appropriate to discuss theoretical considerations for job satisfaction. This helps shed the light on the importance of job satisfaction as it relates to performance. Several theories are discussed below: (a) content theories: Maslow and Herzberg, (b) process theories, (c) expectations and equity theories, (d) reference group theories, and (e) needs/value fulfillment theories.

Theories Known as Content Theories

According to Maslow's theory, job satisfaction and individuals' needs fulfillment are two sides of the same coin (Gruneberg, 1979). Maslow's theory is among the first theories to consider the needs of individuals. According to Maslow, there is a hierarchy of needs that ranges between two ends that he called lower order needs and higher order needs. The three lower order needs are basic physiological needs, safety and security, and social or affection ones. The fourth and fifth higher order needs are esteem and self actualization, respectively (Maslow, 1943; 1954)

Thus, according to Maslow if a leader wants to motivate people, he needs to have an understanding of the individual's current state along Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Then, the leader focuses on satisfying the needs which are at the person's current or higher level. It is noteworthy to state that, according to Maslow, higher order needs are driven by internal satisfaction from the individual,

whereas lower order ones tend to be externally satisfied (Maslow, 1943; 1954). Not all individuals are motivated in the same way.

Along similar lines, Frederick Herzberg proposed a two-factor theory of job satisfaction which is also known as the motivation-hygiene theory. Herzberg stated that, with regards to job satisfaction, two groups of factors are involved. The first group is called motivators and it corresponds to Maslow's higher order needs. Motivator factors lead to satisfaction and their absence from a working situation does not mean that there will be dissatisfaction. Examples include things like achievement, recognition and interest in the work itself which is intrinsically driven (Herzberg, 1974).

Herzberg (1974) labels the second group of factors as hygiene factors. Hygiene factors correspond to Maslow's lower order needs and include examples like salary, security, work conditions, plus many others. When these factors are not adequate, job dissatisfaction levels rises. On the other hand, if these factors are adequate, it does not imply that job satisfaction levels will rise.

Herzberg was able to split the factors this way after organizing the data he obtained from investigating what people want from their job. He concluded that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are two distinctly different things. Hence based on the data he obtained from responding workers, Herzberg concluded that we cannot say that the opposite of satisfaction is dissatisfaction. He suggested that the opposite of satisfaction is no satisfaction and the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

To motivate people on their job, Herzberg et al. (1959) believes that managers should focus on the motivator factors rather than the hygiene. Motivator factors are intrinsically rewarding for employees, whereas hygiene factors are necessary, but not sufficient, for increasing job satisfaction.

Theories Known as Process Theories

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick (1970) believed that Maslow's and Herzberg's theories of job satisfaction are called content theories. They are labeled as such because their basic interest lies in distinguishing the factors that have to do with satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job.

Process theories, on the other hand, focus on variables and the interaction between them and checks to see how that relates to levels of satisfaction on the job. Process theorists believe that job nature and the context of the job are very important. However, they also consider three other things: needs, values and the expectations of employees. Process theories emphasize the importance of the relationship between individuals and their work environments (Gruneberg, 1979).

Theories Known as Expectations and Equity

Another angle for looking at job satisfaction includes the expectations of individuals. Gruneberg (1979) states that expectations provide individuals with what he calls a frame of reference. People use this frame of reference to judge many things around them. It is another way of saying that, what people expect about their environment, shapes their behavior. If what is happening around the individual does not fit in his frame of reference, unhappy feelings arise. The

individual could also start interpreting things in a weird way just to accommodate awkward facts.

Equity theory proposes that the notion of what individuals believe can be a proper reward for the effort they exert. The theory suggests that there is something called a psychological contract between the employer and the employee. This contract is set on the basis that for X amount of effort there should be a Y amount of reward. How does the individual know if the effort exerted is worth the reward received? The person checks it against what other individuals are receiving in terms of similar amount of effort exerted by them. If they are similar, then the person thinks he is getting a reasonable reward with regards to his efforts and satisfaction takes place. As soon as the individual detects a discrepancy between the effort he is making and the reward he is getting, he will decrease the quality of his work (Lawler & O'Gara, 1967).

Theories Known as Reference Group Theories

As previously noted, a critical aspect in equity theory is represented by the person's comparison of his effort and reward on a job to that of other employees. This is why other theorists started arguing that, in order to understand job satisfaction, it is critical to understand the reference group, or the group of individuals that one compares himself to at work (Hulin & Blood, 1968). Learning about the referent that a person compares himself to increases the complexity of this theory.

Theories Known as Needs/Value Fulfillment Theories

Expectations and feelings of equity do not provide a full frame in understanding job satisfaction. Theorists in the field of motivation believe that what people value in a job differs from one person to the other, which also leads to differences in the degree to which they are or are not satisfied (Kuhlen, 1963).

Vroom (1964) believes that employees have an increased level of motivation to do a better job when they associate the effort they extend with a positive performance appraisal from their employer. This, in turn, leads to being rewarded by the organization. The reward the person receives may or may not satisfy his personal goals. Hence, Vroom's theory takes into consideration three types of relationships: effort-performance, performance-reward, and rewards-personal goals relationships.

The Impact of Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction on a Variety of Factors

According to Gruneberg (1979), an obvious consequence of being dissatisfied with one's job is an increase in the possibility that the person withdraws from it. This withdrawal can be either temporary or permanent. Similarly, a number of studies concluded that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism (Vroom, 1964), but this relationship is a complex one. With regards to turnover, researchers found a positive relationship between employee turnover and job satisfaction (Porter & Steers, 1973). Hulin (1966) also found that employees who left the company had substantially lower levels of satisfaction on the job. Gruneberg (1979) added that there is a relationship between supervision, or leadership, and turnover rates of employees.

Levels of job satisfaction also have economic implications. Mirvis and Lawler (1977) suggest that with industrial jobs, frequent assumptions are made about the relationship between dissatisfaction and counterproductive work behavior. Mangione and Quinn (1975) found a significant relationship between job satisfaction levels and counterproductive behaviors of varying types. The results from their study showed a significant relationship between job dissatisfaction and behaviors like using drugs at work, damaging property and equipment, spreading rumors and gossip to make troubles in addition to other behaviors discussed in the study.

Another impact of job satisfaction is on the individual himself. Gruneberg (1979) stated that a number of studies propose that the person's physical well-being is affected by the results of job satisfaction, such as stress. Stress relates to a number of diseases like ulcers or heart illness. In his book, *Understanding Job Satisfaction,* he provides studies that prove the relationship between the two. Other research has shown a relationship between dissatisfaction and the mental health of individuals (Ferguson 1973; Hoppock, 1935).

Departmental Organizations

Departments in organizations vary from being *pure* to being *mixed*. A *pure* department houses faculty members who have common background and training. They share teaching within the same discipline such as English, Chemistry, and the like. Such departments are more likely to exist in larger colleges and universities. Mixed departments exist when there are not enough faculty members to substantiate the need for having a pure department. As a

result, many subject programs come together under one mixed department. This is more efficient for administrative and economic purposes. Sometimes the mixed departments are further subdivided into divisions that have either directors or chair persons reporting to a dean or a vice president. It all depends on how large the division is, or the institution as a whole (Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999).

Department Chairs: Custodians of Academic Success

It is quite challenging to deny the critical role chairpersons play. Even if some people in this position are not very well liked by some faculty member, they still acknowledge the important role department chairs play. Bennet and Figuli (1993) call department chairs 'custodians of academic success.' They state that it is the academic chair who defines the institutional academic tone. The chair is the person who other administrators depend on to assure academic integrity.

The chairpersons make sure that the curriculum is appropriate. They also ensure that the curriculum is aligned with the institution's mission and the demands of a constantly changing student body. The responsibility of putting the right talents in the right place also rests on the shoulders of chairpersons. They are the ones who encourage faculty members to continually seek professional growth as well as personal growth (Bennet & Figuli, 1993).

Racial and gender balance is also maintained by them. Chairpersons also verify the quality of instruction and research to determine their adequacy. Based on the aforementioned contributions of chairpersons, they are referred to as the

custodians of academic standards as relating to their departments or divisions (Bennet & Figuli, 1993).

Chairpersons and Curriculum

Chairpersons are the ones who constantly review programs to make sure that they are adequate for the students. If there is a change in the needs of society or that of the students, or even a change in the mission of the institution, chairpersons make sure that their courses reflect these changes. Chairpersons associate the proper faculties with the right students. They also develop appropriate disciplinary measures (Bennet & Figuli, 1993). Additionally, chairpersons may also review how instruction is delivered in classes or on-line. They are also involved in operational issues like the time and the day classes are provided, and how that fits their students' changing needs.

Chairpersons and Faculty

Dealing with faculty can be challenging, especially when they have different expectations of the role of a chairperson. Some faculty wants their chairperson to arrange to get printers, markers for their white boards and travel compensation…as if the chairperson were a clerk. Others depend on the chairperson to be the problem solver of anything that might go wrong. Leadership is not what they first think of when they consider the role of the chairperson (Bennet & Figuli, 1993). Further, chairpersons need to deal with other problems that faculty members must face due to the economic situation and budget cuts.

In summary, the chair's job is the most difficult on campus in many respects. First, the continuous need for attention to details, second the need to

make decisions which have an impact on the lives of those with whom you also deal on a personal basis, and third, when things go wrong the chairs carry directly or indirectly a good share of the responsibility (Bennet, 1982).

Leaders have the power to effect change in organizations. They make a difference. They play a pivotal role in making organizations effective. Colleges and universities are starting to consider the rank of a departmental chair with more thoughtfulness. Consequently, an increase of the roles and responsibilities that are performed by the department chair is currently taking place. For example, a survey conducted by Giles-Gee and McMahon (1997), revealed that responsibilities for chairpersons have increased by 79 percent. Those responsibilities now place a larger weight on effective administration, being accountable, proving productivity, and taking on leadership roles more than before.

Even though variations exist with regards to the role of the chair, be it in a research institution, a liberal arts college, or any other kind of educational organization, there are some guiding principles that all chairs apply if they want to make a difference in their department. These variations determine the leadership role they need to perform. The following guiding principles were derived from a study of chairs and deans from more than 175 colleges (Lucas, 2000):

1. Chairs are able to lead change productively
2. Chairs who are effective act as team leaders rather than autocrats
3. Effective chairs develop shared goals

4. Chairs motivate all team members

5. Effective chairs evaluate performance with regards to excellence as the standard

6. They cultivate a climate of trust

7. They act as problem solvers rather than being lead by the desire to win any conversation

8. Whenever they see fit, they employ participative decision making

9. They act as facilitators

10. They manage conflicts with great effectiveness

11. Chairs let the team be responsible for what they do

12. They always try to develop an increased self awareness

Economic Benefits of Attending a Community College

Challenges for success in future jobs are always on the rise. New skills are needed, and competition is rising. An important road that leads to success in the job market is that of education. Through education, individuals are able to develop and strengthen needed skills which, in turn, may allow them to get into a better job with higher pay (Liming & Wolf, 2008).

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and the U.S. Census Bureau, on the average, people whose educational attainment level is less than a high school diploma earn about $419 per week. Those who finished high school make about $595 a week compared to college graduates who make about $962 a week and those with associate degree who earn around $721 weekly. It is very clear that college graduates make more than double the amount of those

with less than a high school diploma and more than 40% of what people with a high school diploma make (Liming & Wolf, 2008). This data come from employed people whose ages range between 25 and 44.

A great incentive for students to further their education after high school stems from the commonly held belief that a bright future awaits them after graduating. In fact, this is supported by findings from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the year 2008. Their data shows that there is an increase in job openings for people with a bachelor degree or higher from 38 million in 2006 to more than 43 million by 2016. This is about a 15% growth rate which is a lot more than all other jobs or occupations. Additionally, earning a college degree has a strong correlation to the increase in the amount of money that people earn (Liming & Wolf, 2008).

One of the primary institutions that prepares students for either postsecondary training, or furthering their education and then transferring to an institution that provides bachelor's degree, is the community college. Community colleges are very attractive to students. This is due to many reasons, some of which are their open enrollment policy as well as their comparatively low tuition, which are important for students facing today's difficult economy (Liming & Wolf, 2008).

Summary

A substantial amount of research regarding transactional and transformational leadership styles supports the correlation between the effectiveness of an organization and the behaviors of its leaders (Antonakis,

Angerfelt, & Sivasubramaniam, 2005; Avolio & Bass, 2004, Barnett & McCormick, 2004; Chen, 2004; Kark & Shamir, 2002; Miner, 2007). If community colleges determine which leadership behaviors are important for staff satisfaction, they can better develop training programs that promote leadership training and then measure their effectiveness.

This chapter looked into empirical studies about job satisfaction, reviewed characteristics of effective leaders, presented a thorough review of the literature about the two leadership styles transformational and transactional, discussed how leaders who follow one of the two approaches interact with their followers, and addressed how leaders with different styles motivate and inspire their subordinates. Following that, an extensive review of job satisfaction and related theories were discussed, a discussion about the importance of academic leaders was also presented, and an explanation about the economic benefits of attending community colleges was provided.

Chapter Three: Methodology

In order to thoroughly examine how transformational and transactional leadership styles of academic leaders in community colleges relate to the job satisfaction level of full-time and adjunct/part-time faculty members, a quantitative research design was chosen with an event and then a post test model being applied. This chapter discusses the purpose of the whole study and states the hypotheses that are tested. It also provides a description of the research design, population, sample, data collection and data analysis methods. Descriptions of instruments used, as well as a list of variables, are further discussed.

Problem Statement

What relationship, if any, exists between transactional and transformational leadership styles of academic leaders in community colleges and the job satisfaction of faculty members?

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The primary purpose of this study is to determine if different leadership styles of educational leaders at community colleges are related to the level of job satisfaction of full-time and adjunct faculty members. A secondary purpose for this research is to determine if demographics, such as: gender, years of experience, employment status (full-time vs. part-time), and educational levels of faculty members are related to the overall level of job satisfaction of faculty members and their direct supervisor's leadership practices. The research questions that the researcher wanted to answer with this study are as follows:

Research Question 1

To what extent, if at all, does the job satisfaction of community college faculty members (as described by the ten subscales in the JSS) relate to the perception of their academic leader's five MLQ leadership style scores? This was tested with respect to the ten levels of job satisfaction.

- *Null hypothesis 1.1.* There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's pay satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation will be used with a significance level of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 1.2.* There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's promotion satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation will be used with a significance level of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 1.3.* There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's supervision satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation will be used with a significance level of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 1.4.* There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's fringe benefits satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation will be used with a significance level of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 1.5.* There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's contingent rewards satisfaction score and any of the five

MLQ leadership style scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation will be used with a significance level of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 1.6.* There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's operating conditions score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation will be used with a significance level of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 1.7.* There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's coworkers satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation will be used with a significance level of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 1.8.* There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's nature of work satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation will be used with a significance level of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 1.9.* There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's communication satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation will be used with a significance level of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 1.10.* There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's overall job satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation will be used with a significance level of .05.

Research Question 2

To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between full-time and part-time community college faculty members?

- *Null hypothesis 2.1.* There is not a significant difference between full-time and part-time faculty members with respect to overall job satisfaction. A t-test will be used to test this hypothesis with a level of significance of .05.

Research Question 3

To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between male and female community college faculty members?

- *Null hypothesis 3.1.* There is not a significant difference between male and female faculty members with regards to overall job satisfaction. A t- test will be used to test this hypothesis with a level of significance of .05

Research Question 4

To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between community college faculty members at various educational levels?

- *Null hypothesis 4.1.* There is not a significant difference among the educational levels of faculty members with respect to overall job satisfaction. An F-test will be used to test this hypothesis.

Research Question 5

To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between community college faculty members with various years of experience?

- *Null hypothesis 5.1.* There is not a significant difference among the
  three categories of the years of teaching experience of faculty
  members with respect to overall job satisfaction. An F-test will be used
  to test this hypothesis.

Research Question 6

To what extent, if at all, do leadership attributes (as described by the eight
subscales in the MLQ-5x) relate to the overall job satisfaction of faculty
members?

- *Null hypothesis 6.1.* There is not a significant correlation between the
  subscale of Idealized Influence (Attributes) (IIA) for an educational
  leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level
  of the faculty members who work under that leader. The coefficient of
  correlation test will be used with a level of significance of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 6.2.* There is not a significant correlation between the
  subscale of Idealized Influence (Behaviors) (IIB) for an educational
  leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level
  of the faculty members who work under that leader. The coefficient of
  correlation test will be used with a level of significance of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 6.3.* There is not a significant correlation between the
  subscale of Inspirational Motivation (IM) for an educational leader's
  perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the
  faculty members who work under that leader. The coefficient of
  correlation test will be used with a level of significance of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 6.4.* There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Intellectual Stimulation (Is) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. The coefficient of correlation test will be used with a level of significance of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 6.5.* There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Individual Consideration (IC) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. The coefficient of correlation test will be used with a level of significance of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 6.6.* There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Contingent Rewards (CR) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. The coefficient of correlation test will be used with a level of significance of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 6.7.* There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Management by Exception (Active) (MBEA) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. The coefficient of correlation test will be used with a level of significance of .05.

- *Null hypothesis 6.8:* There no significant correlation between the subscale of Management by Exception (Passive; MBEP) for an

educational leader's perceived leadership style and job satisfaction level of faculty members who work under that leader. The coefficient of correlation test will be used with a level of significance of 0.05.

Research Design

This is a quantitative study that involved full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty members who teach at three community colleges in Southern California. The study involved three survey instruments, (a) the Job Satisfaction Survey, (b) the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire5-x, and (c) a demographic survey. The demographic survey served the purpose of providing the researcher with data to analyze regarding the impact that demographic variables, may or may not, have on the job satisfaction of the respondents.

Table 3 provides a list of variables, dependent and independent:

Table 3

Dependent and Independent Variables Plus Abbreviations

Construct	Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Abbreviation
Satisfaction	Job Satisfaction		SAT
Transformational Leadership Style		Idealized Influence (Attributes) Idealized Influence (Behaviors) Inspirational Motivation Intellectual Stimulation Individual Consideration	IIA IIB IM IS IC

(*table continues*)

Construct	Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Abbreviation
Transactional Leadership Style		Contingent rewards	CR
		Management by Exception (Active)	MBEA
		Management by Exception (Passive)	MBEP
Demographic Characteristics		Age	Age
		Gender	Sex
		Full-time/Part-time	FT/PT
		Years of Experience	YOE
		Educational Level	EL

Population and Sample

This study targeted the entire population of full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty members who teach at three community colleges in Southern California. The number of full-time faculty at all three schools is 815. On the other hand, part time faculty totals 1423. For this research, although Survey Monkey shows that 220 surveys were started, the researcher only included the ones that were totally completed and these were 131 (45 males and 86 females).

IRB Application

The researcher did not proceed with the study before seeking the approval of the Institutional Review Board. The researcher also purchased the MLQ-5x instrument from Mind Garden Inc. and has attached the receipt as a proof of purchase and as approval to use the instrument. Also a letter from Paul Spector,

the author of the Job Satisfaction Survey, was added to the appendices (See Appendix D for all three letters mentioned above).

Data Collection

The participating colleges did not provide the researcher with a list of participants' names and their e-mail addresses. Instead, the links were forwarded to a specific point of contact in each participating college, and then the links from survey monkey were forwarded to all participants in their schools. Survey Monkey is an on-line surveying tool that was chosen for practicality reasons.

The questions from both the Job Satisfaction Survey and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-5x were put into a survey on Survey Monkey. A demographic survey was added to gather data with regards to gender, years of teaching experience, employment status, and level of education. A hyperlink to the surveys was included in an email that was sent to the entire population. Participants were informed that they have three weeks to fill out the surveys. After three days of emailing the surveys, a reminder was sent with the goal of seeking a larger percentage of the respondents. The data was exported to be analyzed using the statistical software SPSS.

Because one hyperlink was sent that included all three instruments, the demographic survey was placed first, followed by the Job Satisfaction Survey, and finally the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-5x. The rationale behind doing this was to eliminate the possibility that answering the MLQ5-x *first* would affect answering the JSS. This was done to eliminate any potential bias in the respondents' answers.

Instruments

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5x-Short

The MLQ-5x is a 45 item questionnaire that considers seven areas when assessing the leader's behaviors: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, and laissez-faire behaviors (see Appendix C). The higher the scores are with regards to individualized consideration and motivation factors, the more the leader displays transformational leadership behaviors (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

The MLQ-5x uses a five-point frequency rating scale where 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, and 4 = frequently, if not always. Three leadership styles with subscales for each are measured in this instrument. The first style is Transformational Leadership with five subscales. The second style is Transactional Leadership with three subscales. The following table summarizes the three leadership styles with the subscales that measure the specific component of each one (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Table 4

Leadership Styles and Subscales Used to Measures the Style

Leadership Styles	Subscales pertaining to each leadership style
Transformational Leadership Styles	Idealized Influence (Attributes) Idealized Influence (Behaviors) Inspirational Motivation Intellectual Stimulation Individualized consideration

(*table continues*)

Leadership Styles	Subscales pertaining to each leadership style
Transactional Leadership Styles	Contingent Reward Management by Exception: Active Management by Exception: Passive

The MLQ-5x also measures Outcomes of Leadership. It measures the leader's success by how often the evaluator perceives his leader as a motivating person who interacts at different levels of the organization, as well as how satisfied the evaluator is with the leader's ways of working with his people. The following table specifies which items in the questionnaire pertains to measuring the eight specific leadership styles. It also states which items measure Outcomes of Leadership, which is comprised of three parts: Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction. The scoring method for the two survey instruments is also discussed (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Table 5

Leadership Styles' Subscales, Their Relevant Items from the MLQ-5x and Scoring Method

Subscales for Leadership Styles	Items from the MLQ-5x that measure the subscale	Scoring Method
1. Idealized Influence (Attributes) (IIA)	10, 18, 21, 25	sum of items divided by 4

(*table continues*)

Subscales for Leadership Styles	Items from the MLQ-5x that measure the subscale	Scoring Method
2. Idealized Influence (Behaviors) (IIB)	6, 14, 23, 34	sum of items divided by 4
3. Inspirational Motivation (IM)	9, 13, 26, 36	sum of items divided by 4
4. Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	2, 8, 30, 32	sum of items divided by 4
5. Individualized Consideration (IC)	15, 19, 29, 31	sum of items divided by 4
6. Contingent Reward (CR)	1, 11, 16, 35	sum of items divided by 4
7. Management by Exception: Active (MBEA)	4, 22, 24, 27	sum of items divided by 4
8. Management by Exception: Passive (MBEP)	3, 12, 17, 20	sum of items divided by 4
9. Laisse-faire (LF)	5, 7, 28, 33	sum of items divided by 4
Outcomes of Leadership	Items from the MLQ-5x that measure the outcomes of leadership	
10. Extra Effort (EE)	39, 42, 44	sum of items divided by 3
11. Effectiveness (EFF)	37, 40, 43, 45	sum of items divided by 4
12. Satisfaction (SAT)	38, 41	sum of items divided by 2

Subscales 1–5 measure transformational leadership, subscales 6–7 measure transactional leadership, and subscales 8–9 measure passive/avoidant leadership styles. On the other hand, subscales 10–12 measure outcomes of leadership. The nine questions in the MLQ-5x that relate to this subscale

(outcomes of leadership) will be kept because of the possibility that taking them out might impact the validity and the reliability of the other subscales. Additionally, data might be used to analyze additional unhypothesized reasons.

Scoring the MLQ-5x

In order to get the total score for each construct in the MLQ-5x, the values for the choices that matched up to each construct were combined to get the average for each construct. For example, to determine if a leader is using a transformational style, the researcher evaluated the value of the scores for questions 10, 18, 21 and 25 which related to Idealized Influence (attributes) IIA; scores from questions 6, 14, 23, and 34 relate to Idealized Influence (Behavior) IIB; 9, 13, 26 and 36 relate to Inspirational Motivation (IM); 2, 8, 30, and 32 relate to Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 15, 19, 29, and 31 relate to Individualized Consideration (IC). A high score of these constructs reveal a behavior that is typical to a transformational leader.

To determine if a leader was using a transactional style, the researcher checked how high were the scores for questions 1, 11, 16, 35 (Contingent Reward), 4, 22, 24, 27 (Management by Exception active MBEA), and 3, 12, 17, 20 (Management by Exception Passive MBEP).

A 5-point scale for rating the frequency of the observed leader behavior was used where 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, and 4 = frequently, if not always. The score for each construct could vary from 0 to 16 for transformational leadership and from 0 to 16 for transactional leadership.

Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) is a measurement tool designed by Paul Spector. The author of the survey allows researchers to use it free of charge as long as it is used for noncommercial educational or research purposes and the results are shared with him (Spector, 1994).

The survey consists of 36 items to assess how employees feel about their job as well as assess their attitudes towards aspects of their job (see Appendix A). It is comprised of nine facets: pay (with alpha = .75), promotion (with alpha = .73), supervision (with alpha = .82), fringe benefits (with alpha = .73), contingent rewards (with alpha = .76), operating procedures (with alpha = .62), coworkers (with alpha = .60), nature of work (with alpha = .78), and communication (with alpha = .71). The internal consistency reliabilities (alpha) are based on a sample that consisted of 2,870 participants. Each facet is evaluated with four items from which the researcher gets a total score. Total alpha is .91 for all the facets (Spector, 1985). Typically, the literature suggests that the alpha level needs to be at least .70 to be considered to be a reliable scale. Without internal reliability, the validity of the scales are called into question (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006).

For each of the 36 items, respondents were given six options to choose from. The choices ranged between 1 and 6 where 1= disagree very much, 2= disagree moderately, 3 = disagree slightly, 4 = agree slightly, 5 = agree moderately and 6 = agree very much. The respondents circled the number that best reflected their opinions (Spector, 1985).

Some items on the JSS needed to be reversely scored. These are items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 29, 31, 32, 34, and 36. If a respondent circled 1 (which is interpreted as disagree very much) for any of these questions, it was reversed to 6 (which means agree very much). The same was done for choices 2, 3, 4, and 5 which were changed to 5, 4, 3, and 2 respectively (i.e. the rightmost values are replaced for the leftmost). This was done intentionally so that respondents did not detect a pattern when answering the survey questions (Spector, 1985).

Scores for the JSS ranged between 4 and 24 for each of the nine facets. Therefore, the scores for total job satisfaction varied between 36 and 216. Some items on the survey were negatively worded. Their values were reversed. The total score was obtained by adding up all the responses. The higher the scores were, the higher the levels of job satisfaction for the respondents.

Paul Spector states that one can assume that for the 4-item subscales, with a range from 4 to 24, the interpretation is as follows:

- scores from 4 to 12 represent dissatisfaction
- scores from 16 to 24 represent satisfaction,
- scores that fall between 12 and 16 are ambivalent.

For the 36-item total where scores range from 36 to 216 the interpretation is:

- scores from 36 to 108 represent dissatisfaction,
- scores from 144 to 216 represent satisfaction,
- scores between 108 and 144 stand for ambivalent (Spector, 1985).

T table 6 sums up the facets and the number of the items that corresponds to each facet (Spector, 1985).

Table 6

Job Satisfaction Subscales With Their Corresponding Items From the JSS

Subscale	Items representing the subscale
Pay	1, 10, 19, 28
Promotion	2, 11, 20, 33
Supervision	3, 12, 21, 30
Fringe Benefits	4, 13, 22, 29
Contingent rewards	5, 14, 23, 32
Operating conditions	6, 15, 24, 31
Coworkers	7, 16, 25, 34
Nature of work	8, 17, 27, 35
Communication	9, 18, 26, 36
Total satisfaction	1-36

Note. Adapted from "Instructions for Scoring the Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS page" by P.E.Spector, 1994, http://chuma.cas.usf.edu/~spector/scales/jsspag.html

Demographic Survey

For the purpose of this research, the researcher designed a demographic survey to collect information that related to the respondents' gender, employment status (full-time vs. part-time) educational level, and number of years of teaching experience at the selected organization. The survey can be found in Appendix B.

Data Analysis

After collecting the data, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences software (SPSS) was used to analyze it. Descriptive statistics were applied to determine how the sample related to the information that was gathered with the demographic survey. The demographic survey included information relating to gender, years of teaching experience, employment status, and educational level of the participants.

Correlation tests were used to (a) determine if there was a relationship between each category of job satisfaction from the Job Satisfaction Survey and the leadership practices of the direct supervisors of the participants in this study- as measured by the Multifactor Leadership questionnaire 5-x, and (b) to determine if demographic information related to the job satisfaction ratings as compared to the leadership characteristics of the respondent's direct supervisor.

Additionally, a comparative analysis was used to determine whether or not a significant statistical difference existed between full time and part-time/adjunct faculty members in view of job satisfaction. A t-test and an F-test were used to test for differences. Regressions analysis was applied to determine which leadership behaviors contributed most significantly to higher levels of job satisfaction among faculty. This all was performed by using the statistical software (SPSS) while evaluating each hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Lastly, since data was collected from several colleges, a test of homogeneity (to test the variance of the samples taken from each school to see if they are consistent) was run.

Summary

  This chapter discussed the purpose of the whole study and stated the hypotheses. It also provided a description of the research design, population, sample, data collection and data analysis methods. Descriptions of instruments used, as well as a list of variables, were further discussed. Results are presented in the following chapter.

Chapter Four: Results

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if different leadership styles of educational leaders at community colleges were related to the level of job satisfaction of full-time and adjunct faculty members. A secondary purpose for this research was to determine if demographics, such as: gender, years of experience, employment status (full-time vs. part-time), and educational levels of faculty members were related to the levels of job satisfaction of faculty members and their direct supervisor's leadership practices. A total of 131 respondents participated in this study.

Table 7 displays the frequency counts for selected variables. Faculty members from three community colleges (colleges here are referred to as A, B, and C) participated in this study. There were almost twice as many females (65.6%) as males (34.4%) in the sample. Most faculty members (72.5%) had master's degrees. Over half the sample (55.0%) had ten or more years of teaching experience. There were more full-time faculty (58.0%) than part-time (42.0%).

Table 7

Frequency Counts for Selected Variables

Variable	Category	n	%
College			
	A	17	13.0
	B	72	55.0

(*table continues*)

Variable	Category	n	%
	C	42	32.1
Gender			
	Male	45	34.4
	Female	86	65.6
Education Level			
	Less than a bachelor	5	3.8
	Bachelor	11	8.4
	Master's	95	72.5
	Doctorate	20	15.3
Teaching Experience			
	1-3 years	25	19.1
	4-10 years	34	26.0
	10 or more	72	55.0
Faculty Status			
	Full-time	76	58.0
	Part-time or Adjunct faculty	55	42.0

(N = 131)

Table 8 displays the psychometric characteristics for the 10 JSS scores and the 11 MLQ scores used in this study. The 21 Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients ranged in size from r = .55 to r = .95 with the median sized coefficient being r = .81. With the exception of the MLQ Transactional Leadership score (r = .55), all coefficients had acceptable levels of internal reliability (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was included in

Table 8 to determine the extent each of the scale constructs had adequate levels of internal reliability. Typically, the literature suggests that the alpha level needs to be at least .70 to be considered to be a reliable scale. Without internal reliability, the validity of the scales are called into question (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006).

Table 8

Psychometric Characteristics for Selected Scale Scores

Scale	Number of Items	*M*	*SD*	Low	High	Alpha
JSS Pay	4	3.65	1.29	1.00	6.00	.81
JSS Promotion	4	3.15	1.30	1.00	6.00	.82
JSS Supervision	4	4.96	1.25	1.00	6.00	.88
JSS Fringe Benefits	4	3.59	1.23	1.00	6.00	.76
JSS Contingent Rewards	4	3.96	1.26	1.00	6.00	.82
JSS Operating Conditions	4	3.49	1.24	1.00	6.00	.75
JSS Coworkers	4	4.87	1.03	1.75	6.00	.77
JSS Nature of Work	4	5.56	0.66	2.00	6.00	.77
JSS Communication	4	4.16	1.15	1.25	6.00	.76
JSS Total Satisfaction	36	4.15	0.76	2.00	5.86	.92
MLQ Idealized Influence – Attributed	4	3.55	1.01	1.00	5.00	.82
MLQ Idealized Influence – Behavior	4	3.48	0.93	1.00	5.00	.79

(*table continues*)

Scale	Number of Items	*M*	*SD*	Low	High	Alpha
MLQ Inspirational Motivation	4	3.64	1.03	1.00	5.00	.90
MLQ Intellectual Stimulation	4	3.27	0.96	1.00	5.00	.82
MLQ Individual Consideration	4	3.18	1.02	1.00	5.00	.74
MLQ Contingent Reward	4	3.41	1.04	1.00	5.00	.84
MLQ Management-by-Exception (Active)	4	2.51	0.95	1.00	4.75	.75
MLQ Management-by-Exception (Passive)	4	2.25	0.97	1.00	4.75	.81
MLQ Transformational Leadership	20	3.42	0.90	1.00	4.95	.95
MLQ Laissez-faire Leadership	4	1.91	0.89	1.00	4.00	.77
MLQ Transactional Leadership	8	2.96	0.62	1.00	4.63	.55

($N = 131$)

Note. JSS = Job Satisfaction Survey, MLQ = Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Table 9 displays the intercorrelations for the five MLQ leadership style scores. Inspection of the Table 9 revealed two clusters of correlations. Specifically, transformational and contingent leadership were highly correlated with each other ($r = .85$) while the other three style scores were positively correlated with each other but negatively correlated with transformational and contingent leadership.

Table 9 was not designed to test a hypothesis. It was done to show the reader how the five leadership style scores relate to each other. In some cases, the relationship is positive (transformational and contingent, r = .85) while other

times, the relationship is negative (contingent with management-by-exception-

active, r = -.23).

Table 9

Intercorrelations for the MLQ Leadership Style Scores

Score	1		2		3		4		5
1.Transformatiol Leadership	1.00								
2. Contingent Reward	.85	****	1.00						
3.Management-by-Exception (Active)	-.30	****	-.23	**	1.00				
4.Management-by-Exception (Passive)	-.54	****	-.43	****	.26	***	1.00		
5. Laissez-faire Leadership	-.65	****	-.55	****	.28	****	.76	****	1.00

(N = 131)
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .005$. **** $p < .001$.
Note. MLQ = Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Research Question 1

To what extent, if at all, does the job satisfaction of community college

faculty members (as described by the ten subscales in the JSS) relate to the

perception of their academic leader's five MLQ leadership style scores? Ten

specific hypotheses were developed to test this relationship using each of the ten

JSS scores as dependent variables.

- Null hypothesis 1.1. There is not a significant correlation between the

  respondent's pay satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership

  style scores. To test this hypothesis, Table 10 displays the relevant

correlations for the satisfaction score with the five MLQ leadership style scores. Pay satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership ($r = .24$, $p < .01$) and contingent leadership ($r = .27$, $p < .005$) and a significant negative correlation with management by exception – active leadership ($r = -.29$, $p < .001$). This set of findings provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 1.2. There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's promotion satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. To test this hypothesis, Table 10 displays the relevant correlations for the satisfaction score with the five MLQ leadership style scores. Promotion satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership ($r = .43$, $p < .001$) and contingent leadership ($r = .46$, $p < .001$) and significant negative correlations with management by exception – active leadership ($r = -.30$, $p < .001$), management by exception – passive leadership ($r = -.24$, $p < .01$), and laissez-faire leadership ($r = -.29$, $p < .001$). This set of findings provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 1.3. There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's supervision satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. To test this hypothesis, Table 10 displays the relevant correlations for the satisfaction score with the five MLQ leadership style scores. Supervision satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership ($r = .67$, $p < .001$)

and contingent leadership ($r = .60$, $p < .001$) and significant negative correlations with management by exception – active leadership ($r = -.42$, $p < .001$), management by exception – passive leadership ($r = -.55$, $p < .001$), and laissez-faire leadership ($r = -.61$, $p < .001$). This set of findings provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 1.4. There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's fringe benefits satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. To test this hypothesis, Table 10 displays the relevant correlations for the satisfaction score with the five MLQ leadership style scores. Fringe benefits satisfaction had a significant positive correlation with contingent leadership ($r = .18$, $p < .05$) and a significant negative correlation with management by exception – active leadership ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$). This set of findings provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 1.5. There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's contingent rewards satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. To test this hypothesis, Table 10 displays the relevant correlations for the satisfaction score with the five MLQ leadership style scores. Contingent rewards satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership ($r = .50$, $p < .001$) and contingent leadership ($r = .50$, $p < .001$) and significant negative correlations with management by exception – active leadership ($r = -.37$, $p < .001$), management by exception – passive leadership ($r = -$

.44, $p < .001$), and laissez-faire leadership ($r = -.40$, $p < .001$). This set of findings provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 1.6. There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's operating conditions satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. To test this hypothesis, Table 10 displays the relevant correlations for the satisfaction score with the five MLQ leadership style scores. Operating conditions satisfaction had no significant positive correlations, but had significant negative correlations with management by exception – passive leadership ($r = -.26$, $p < .005$), and laissez-faire leadership ($r = -.22$, $p < .01$). This set of findings provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 1.7. There is not significant correlation between the respondent's coworkers satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. To test this hypothesis, Table 10 displays the relevant correlations for the satisfaction score with the five MLQ leadership style scores. Coworkers satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership ($r = .34$, $p < .001$) and contingent leadership ($r = .32$, $p < .001$) and significant negative correlations with management by exception – active leadership ($r = -.22$, $p < .01$), management by exception – passive leadership ($r = -.42$, $p < .001$), and laissez-faire leadership ($r = -.39$, $p < .001$). This set of findings provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 1.8. There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's nature of work satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. To test this hypothesis, Table 10 displays the relevant correlations for the satisfaction score with the five MLQ leadership style scores. Nature of work satisfaction had no significant positive or negative correlations with the five MLQ scores since the strength of the correlation becomes higher as the correlation approaches either +1 or -1 from zero (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). This set of findings provided support to accept this null hypothesis. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2006), "a high positive value (e.g., .85, .90, .96) represents a high positive relationship; a low positive value (.15, .20, .08) a low positive relationship; a moderate negative value (-.40, -.37, -.52) a moderate negative relationship, a value of 0 no relationship, and so on" (p. 171).

- Null hypothesis 1.9. There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's communication satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. To test this hypothesis, Table 10 displays the relevant correlations for the satisfaction score with the five MLQ leadership style scores. Communication satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership ($r = .35$, $p < .001$) and contingent leadership ($r = .34$, $p < .001$) and significant negative correlations with management by exception – active leadership ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$), management by exception – passive leadership ($r = -.42$,

$p < .001$), and laissez-faire leadership ($r = -.47$, $p < .001$). This set of findings provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 1.10. There is not a significant correlation between the respondent's overall job satisfaction score and any of the five MLQ leadership style scores. To test this hypothesis, Table 10 displays the relevant correlations for the satisfaction score with the five MLQ leadership style scores. Overall satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership ($r = .50$, $p < .001$) and contingent leadership ($r = .49$, $p < .001$) and significant negative correlations with management by exception – active leadership ($r = -.39$, $p < .001$), management by exception – passive leadership ($r = -.43$, $p < .001$), and laissez-faire leadership ($r = -.44$, $p < .001$). This set of findings provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

Table 10

Correlations for JSS Scale Scores with MLQ Style Scores

	MLQ Style Score				
JSS Score	1	2	3	4	5
Pay	.24 **	.27 ***	-.29 ****	-.15	-.11
Promotion	.43 ****	.46 ****	-.30 ****	-.24 **	-.29 ****
Supervision	.67 ****	.60 ****	-.42 ****	-.55 ****	-.61 ****
Fringe Benefits	.11	.18 *	-.20 *	.08	.05

(*table continues*)

JSS Score	MLQ Style Score				
	1	2	3	4	5
Contingent Rewards	.50 ****	.50 ****	-.37 ****	-.44 ****	-.40 ****
Operating Conditions	.11	.05	-.10	-.26 ***	-.22 **
Coworkers	.34 ****	.32 ****	-.22 **	-.42 ****	-.39 ****
Nature of Work	.09	.05	-.12	-.11	-.05
Communication	.35 ****	.34 ****	-.19 *	-.42 ****	-.47 ****
Total	.50 ****	.49 ****	-.39 ****	-.43 ****	-.44 ****

(N = 131)

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .005$. **** $p < .001$.

Note. MLQ Style Score: 1 = *Transformational*; 2 = *Contingent Rewards*; 3 = *Management by Exception – Active*; 4 = *Management by Exception – Passive*; and 5 = *Laissez-faire.* JSS = *Job Satisfaction Survey,* MLQ = *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*

Research Question 2

To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between full-time and part-time community college faculty members?

- Null hypothesis 2.1. There is not a significant difference between full-time and part-time faculty members with respect to overall job satisfaction. To test this hypothesis, Table 11 displays the relevant t test for results. No significant difference was found ($p = .75$) which provides support to accept the null hypothesis.

Table 11

Overall Satisfaction Score Based on Faculty Status

Score	Faculty Status	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Overall Satisfaction					0.31	.75
	Full-time	76	4.14	0.78		
	Part-time or Adjunct faculty	55	4.18	0.72		

(*N* = 131)

<div align="center">

Research Question 3

</div>

To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between male and female community college faculty members?

- Null hypothesis 3.1. There is not a significant difference between male and female faculty members with regards to overall job satisfaction. To test this hypothesis, Table 12 displays the relevant *t* test results. No significant difference was found (*p* = .56) which provides support to accept the null hypothesis.

Table 12

Overall Satisfaction Score Based on Faculty Gender

Score	Gender	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Overall Satisfaction					0.59	.56
	Male	45	4.10	0.72		
	Female	86	4.18	0.78		

(*N* = 131)

Research Question 4

To what extent, if at all, does overall job satisfaction differ between community college faculty members with various educational levels?

- Null hypothesis 4.1. There is not a significant difference among the educational levels of faculty members with respect to overall job satisfaction. To test this hypothesis, Table 13 displays the relevant ANOVA test. Significant differences were found ($p = .03$) based on education level. The Scheffe post hoc tests found faculty with a bachelor's degree or less in education ($M = 4.52$) had significantly higher overall satisfaction ($p = .03$) than did faculty members with a doctoral degree ($M = 3.85$). This provided support to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 13

Overall Satisfaction Score Based on Faculty Education

Score	Education	n	M	SD	F	p
Overall Satisfaction [a]					3.66	.03
	1. Bachelor's or less	16	4.52	0.84		
	2. Master's	95	4.16	0.71		
	3. Doctorate	20	3.85	0.83		

($N = 131$)
[a] Scheffe post hoc tests: 1 > 3 ($p = .03$); no other pair of means were significantly different at the $p < .05$ level.

Research Question 5

To what extent, if at all, does job satisfaction differ between community college faculty members with various years of experience?

- Null hypothesis 5.1: There is not a significant difference among the

  three categories of the years of teaching experience of faculty

  members with respect to overall job satisfaction. To test this

  hypothesis, Table 14 displays the relevant ANOVA test. No significant

  differences were found (p = .85) based on years of experience. This

  which provided support to accept the null hypothesis.

Table 14

Overall Satisfaction Score Based on Faculty Teaching Experience

Score	Experience	n	M	SD	F	p
Overall Satisfaction [a]					0.17	.85
	1. 1-3 years	25	4.23	0.67		
	2. 4-10 years	34	4.13	0.64		
	3. 10 or more	72	4.14	0.84		

(N = 131)
Note. [a] Scheffe post hoc tests: No pair of means was significantly different at the
p < .05 level.

Research Question 6

To what extent, if at all, do leadership attributes (as described by the eight

subscales in the MLQ-5x) relate to the overall job satisfaction of faculty

members? A total of eight related hypotheses were tested using Pearson

product-moment correlations (see table 15).

- Null hypothesis 6.1. There is not a significant correlation between the

  subscale of Idealized Influence (Attributes) (IIA) for an educational

  leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level

  of the faculty members who work under that leader. To test this

hypothesis, Table 15 displays the relevant correlation. The correlation was significant ($r = .49$, $p < .001$) which provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 6.2. There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Idealized Influence (Behaviors) (IIB) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. To test this hypothesis, Table 15 displays the relevant correlation. The correlation was significant ($r = .36$, $p < .001$) which provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 6.3. There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Inspirational Motivation (IM) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. To test this hypothesis, Table 15 displays the relevant correlation. The correlation was significant ($r = .47$, $p < .001$) which provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 6.4. There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Intellectual Stimulation (Is) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. To test this hypothesis, Table 15 displays the relevant correlation. The correlation was

significant ($r = .45$, $p < .001$) which provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 6.5. There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Individual Consideration (IC) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. To test this hypothesis, Table 15 displays the relevant correlation. The correlation was significant ($r = .50$, $p < .001$) which provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 6.6. There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Contingent Rewards (CR) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. To test this hypothesis, Table 15 displays the relevant correlation. The correlation was significant ($r = .49$, $p < .001$) which provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 6.7. There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Management by Exception (Active) (MBEA) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. To test this hypothesis, Table 15 displays the relevant correlation. The correlation was inverse and was significant ($r = -.39$, $p < .001$) which provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

- Null hypothesis 6.8. There is not a significant correlation between the subscale of Management by Exception (Passive) (MBEP) for an educational leader's perceived leadership style and the overall job satisfaction level of the faculty members who work under that leader. To test this hypothesis, Table 15 displays the relevant correlation. The correlation was inverse and was significant ($r = -.43$, $p < .001$) which provided support to reject this null hypothesis.

Table 15

Correlations for Overall Satisfaction with Leadership Attributes

Attribute	Satisfaction	
	r	
Idealized Influence (Attributed)	.49	****
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	.36	****
Inspirational Motivation	.47	****
Intellectual Stimulation	.45	****
Individual Consideration	.50	****
Contingent Reward	.49	****
Management-by-Exception (Active)	-.39	****
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	-.43	****

($N = 131$)
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .005$. **** $p < .001$.

Additional Findings

Table 16 displays the ANOVA comparisons for overall satisfaction and transformational leadership based on the college where faculty members taught.

No differences were found for overall satisfaction ($p = .26$) or for transformational leadership ($p = .35$). In addition, the Levene's homogeneity of variance tests for both dependent variables were not significant suggesting the three sets of college instructors had similar perceptions.

Table 16

Overall Satisfaction and Transformational Leadership Scores Based on College

Score	School	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Overall Satisfaction [a, b]					1.35	.26
	A	17	3.92	0.82		
	B	72	4.24	0.79		
	C	42	4.10	0.66		
Transformational Leadership [a, b]					1.05	.35
	A	17	3.27	0.80		
	B	72	3.37	0.91		
	C	42	3.58	0.92		

($N = 131$)
[a] Scheffe post hoc tests: No pair of means was significantly different at the $p < .05$ level. [b] Levene's homogeneity of variance test was not significant.

Summary

In summary, nine of the ten null hypotheses for Research Question One (relation of satisfaction with leadership style) were rejected (Table 10). Overall satisfaction was not related to faculty status (Research Question Two; Table 11), faculty gender (Research Question Three; Table 12) or years of teaching experience (Research Question Five; Table 14). Faculty with bachelor's degrees

had more satisfaction than did doctoral level faculty (Research Question Four; Table 13). Finally, all eight leadership attributes were significantly related to overall satisfaction (Research Question Six; Table 15).

Chapter Five: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter reports the major findings, and compares them to prior research to allow for drawing reasonable conclusions. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the limitations as well as implications for future research.

Summary of Key Findings

1. Pay satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership and the subscale contingent reward of a transactional style, and a significant negative correlation with the subscale management by exception – active of a transactional style.

2. Promotion satisfaction, supervision satisfaction, contingent rewards satisfaction form the JSS, coworkers satisfaction, communication satisfaction, as well as overall satisfaction had significant positive correlations with transformational leadership and the MLQ contingent reward subscale of a transactional style and significant negative correlations with management by exception-active, management by exception-passive, and laissez-faire subscales.

3. Fringe benefits satisfaction had a significant positive correlation with contingent reward subscale and a significant negative correlation with management by exception-active.

4. Operating conditions satisfaction had no significant positive correlations but had significant negative correlations with management by exception-passive, and laissez-faire subscales of transactional style.

5. Nature of work satisfaction had no significant positive or negative correlations with the five MLQ scores.

6. No significant differences were found between full-time and part-time community college faculty members with respect to job satisfaction. This does not support results from previous research findings (Antonakis & House as cited in Avolio & Yammarino, 2002) that showed that full time employees had a higher degree of job satisfaction.

7. No significant differences were found between males and females which does not support previous studies that showed that teacher's gender had an influence on their job satisfaction (Green, 1992; Wu, 2003).

8. Results from this study are in contrast to previous research that indicate that teaching experience is related to job satisfaction (Green, 1992; McKee, 1991; Woodruff, 1992).

9. Significant differences were found based on education level. Faculty with a bachelor's degree or less in education had significantly higher overall satisfaction than did faculty members with a doctoral degree. While previous research suggested that a teacher's educational level was strongly related to job satisfaction (Woodruff, 1992) this study also has similar conclusion, however, unlike the previous research, in this study, faculty with less education had greater job satisfaction.

10. Keeping with the literature, results revealed that the variable that positively contributed the most to the overall job satisfaction was Individual Consideration (IC) which relates to transformational leadership (Dvir et al., 2002; Madlock, 2008; Medley & Larochelle, 1995). However, the transformational variable Idealized Influence Attributes (IIA) and the transactional variable Contingent reward (CR) contributed equally to the overall job satisfaction. Such results are somewhat contrasting to the literature because Contingent reward is classified as a transactional attribute. According to Avolio and Bass (2004) transformational leadership attributes are stronger indicators of job satisfaction than transactional leadership attributes. This study indicates that the attribute Contingent Reward was as preferred as that of Idealized Influence attribute.

11. In support to the literature, this study indicated that two subscales under transactional leadership negatively correlated to the overall job satisfaction: Management by Exception (Active) (MBEA) and Management by Exception (Passive) (MBEP). Most of the research supports the notion that transformational leadership better predicts job satisfaction (Avolio & Bass, 2004)

12. ANOVA comparisons for overall satisfaction and transformational leadership based on which college that faculty member taught in showed no differences for overall satisfaction or for transformational

style preferences. In addition, the three sets of college instructors had similar perception.

Recommendations for Community College Leaders

Leaders in community colleges should consider improving and/or developing leadership training that takes into consideration the various findings from the leadership literature. Colleges increase their effectiveness with the help of behaviorally competent leaders (Wharton, 1997). If job satisfaction levels are increased, organizations tend to have higher productivity and profitability rates (Gruneberg, 1979).

Whenever leaders gain an understanding of which leadership style, or attributes within a style, help motivate their followers attain specific outcomes, their organizations tend to become more productive. If organizations can determine what leadership attributes contribute to higher levels of job satisfaction, they tend to become more competitive in their field. They can also better plan and develop their leadership training programs. Therefore, they better serve their customers which, in turn, boost their profit margins. Hence, increased organizational effectiveness will most likely be achieved (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

There are certain outcomes for different levels of job satisfaction in an organization (Robbins & Judge, 2008). Job satisfaction affects job performance. Organizations with employees who are satisfied with their jobs have higher levels of effectiveness than organizations with employees who have lower levels of job satisfaction (Harter, Shmidt, & Hayes, 2002). Satisfied employees also act in a friendlier and more responsive manner (Robbins & Judge, 2008). Additionally,

satisfied employees do not miss work as much as dissatisfied ones do (Madlock, 2008). Gruneberg (1979) added that there is a relationship between supervision, or leadership, and turnover rates of employees.

Work nature also impacts the satisfaction level of employees with regards to their jobs. When the work has a challenging and stimulating nature, people tend to like it. Therefore, they tend to be satisfied. Predictable and routine work does not help raise job satisfaction levels (Robbins & Judge, 2008).

Research has established the existence of a relationship between employee job satisfaction and performance, how productive they are, their retention rate, and how often they tend to be absent from their jobs (Carsten & Spector, 1997; Locke, 1976). These studies show that when employees have high levels of job satisfaction, they are less absent from their jobs, have lower turnover rates, are less stressed, and would be more committed to the organizations than those employees with low job satisfaction levels. Therefore, to help the community college organizations improve their productivity levels, it is essential for leaders to tend to the factors that contribute to job satisfaction and improve them.

Many studies show that variables such as leadership style (Medley & Larochelle, 1995), age (Anderson, et al., 2000; William & Hazer, 1986), and education level (Battersby, 1990) have some impact on employees' job satisfaction level. Along similar lines, research shows that in two-year institutions gender plays a role in the satisfaction levels among faculty members (Finkelstein et al., 1998; Hutton & Jobe, 1985).

Faculty members in public two year colleges tend to leave their jobs if they are dissatisfied (Rosser & Townsend, 2006). Studies conclude that there is a direct connection between low levels of job satisfaction and voluntary turnover rates in two-year institutions (Cano & Miller, 1992; Glick, 1992; Simpson, 1984).

Limitations

A key improvement for this study would have been to use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire form 5x to measure satisfaction, rather than using the JSS (which is an additional 36 item survey) to measure it. Besides measuring leadership attributes, the MLQ-5x can also measure Outcomes of Leadership. It measures the leader's success by how often the evaluator perceives his or her leader as a motivating person who interacts at different levels of the organization, as well as how satisfied the evaluator is with the leader's ways of working with his people. The following table specifies which items in the questionnaire can be used to measure Outcomes of Leadership, which is comprised of three parts: Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Table 17

Outcomes of Leadership

Outcomes of Leadership	Items from the MLQ-5x that measure the outcomes of leadership
Extra Effort (EE)	39, 42, 44
Effectiveness (EFF)	37, 40, 43, 45
Satisfaction (SAT)	38, 41

By reducing the number of instruments used, a better completion rate could have been achieved because several participants stated that many questions were repetitive even though they were worded differently.

A second limitation is that, although the data reflected the perceptions of full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty of their leaders, their perceptions may not necessarily reflect the actual leadership behavior's of their immediate supervisors. Perceptions and reality are not necessarily the same (Robbbins & Judge, 2008).

The third limitation is related to survey completion rate. Although Survey Monkey showed that 220 surveys were started by the participants, only 131 were totally completed. There could be important differences between those who responded and those who did not, especially that the self-selection nature of the study might have led to skewed responses.

The fourth limitation is with the use of technology. Although the schools forwarded the link to the surveys to ensure a higher response rate, participants might have forgotten about it after the third day. Only one school sent out a reminder after the third day and the response rate form that school was significantly higher from the other two. To this end, future researchers should consider sending out a reminder on the third day instead of waiting for ten days.

The fifth limitation is that the study results may or may not be generalizable to profit driven colleges due to differences in their business models and culture. Conducting the same study on profit driven colleges would allow researchers to learn how results for both schools may or may not correlate. The

organization's culture plays a key role in how employees feel about their jobs (Schein, 2004; Senge, 1990).

Recommendations for Future Research

Further research is needed in the study of leadership styles and job satisfaction in community colleges. Leaders at the participating schools were not provided the opportunity to rate their own leadership style. As such, faculty perceptions might be different than the actual leadership practices of the leaders themselves. That said, it would be useful if future researchers included the MLQ-5x rater form for faculty and the self form for the leaders.

Furthermore, since full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty members were not asked to provide the names of their leaders, it would be difficult to determine who among the leaders need leadership training.

Allowing for a longer period for data collection could provide for a larger response rate. Similarly, since the researcher gave the option to participants to leave questions unanswered in all three surveys, an alternative would have been to set preferences in a way that participants *are required* to answer all the questions. They would not be able to proceed to another section without completing the previous one in its entirety. This can be done through Survey Monkey and would probably allow for all the surveys to be used instead of having to filter the responses and include only those who totally answered all three surveys.

Finally, a comparison between the perception of the leaders about their own leadership styles and how this may or may not be similar to the perception

of faculty about their leaders' leadership styles would have been very useful in further analyzing the results.

Conclusion

Educational leaders play an important role in the growth of organizations, competing with other institutions, and meeting shareholders expectations (Rosser et al., 2003). A substantial amount of research regarding transactional and transformational leadership styles supports the correlation between the behaviors of leaders and that of followers (Antonakis, et al., 2005; Avolio & Bass, 2004, Barnett & McCormick, 2004, Chen, 2004; Kark & Shamir, 2002; Miner, 2007).

When leaders in educational institutions identify the leadership behaviors that correlate to job satisfaction, they gain better insights as to which leadership programs should be developed to maximize the effectiveness of the organization (Avolio & Bass, 2004). There is a direct relationship between leadership effectiveness and gaining competitive advantage (Wagner & Hollenbeck, 2002).

Using validated instruments to measure the leadership styles of leaders in community colleges and studying how their style impact faculty job satisfaction, can provide valuable insights for community college organizations to continually improve their leadership effectiveness. This could also enhance their working environments, profitability, as well as increasing the job satisfaction of their faculty (Dvir & Shamir, 2003).

Since findings from this study reveal that faculty with a doctoral degree are the least satisfied with their jobs, there is a pressing need for leaders in the

community college organization to further explore the reasons behind such results, and find a way to ratify it. It may be that these faculties who hold doctoral degrees prefer to work with transformational leaders whereas they are currently working under the supervision of transactional leaders.

It may also be that working at a community college does not make them feel as proud and as appreciated as it would have been if they worked in a four-year institution. Another explanation may also lay in the fact that faculty who hold a Bachelor's degree or less are content to have *a job* that pays the bills. So if colleges want to attract faculty with higher qualifications, they should start exploring the factors that make this pool of employees more satisfied with their jobs.

Another important finding suggest that further research is needed to discover why contingent rewards – a transactional leadership style subscale almost always positively related to high scores for job satisfaction of faculty, just as the other subscales under transformational leadership did. It could be that we need to reexamine if transformational leaders will always score high on this subscale and, may be, then suggest that contingent reward is a subscale that can also be under the transformational leadership style. It may also be a style on its own.

This research indicates that in order for the community college organization to boost the job satisfaction levels of their faculty members, it is imperative that educational leaders espouse transformational practices. Transformational leaders develop employees at every level of the organization

which is essential to achieving the goals of the organization, and making it rise to the top. Additionally, when hiring for leadership positions, it is important for leaders to understand the personalities of their faculties, either by administering the Meyers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) or other instruments to better understand the personalities of their employees once they hire them. Then, they match them with the right leader. They can also coach those who have personality types that do not match the position very well in order to set them up for success. Finding the right leader, or the right faculty to work with a specific leader, may help retain quality full-time and part-time employees, who may otherwise consider leaving the job if their job satisfaction levels are low.

Likewise, educational leaders always aim at providing developmental support for faculty. Learning which aspects of transformational and transactional leadership are better preferred by faculty can help in building the skills and behaviors necessary for a better engagement of faculty in transformational change. Facing budget constraints, more accountability, different student clientele, advances in technology, in addition to a host of other different challenges that higher education organizations are facing, leadership training becomes very essential. The leader is no more playing the manager's role. Instead, building leadership capacities in community colleges is necessary to transform them in times of difficulties where every person in the organization is doing more for less due to economic constraints.

As such, by carefully examining the hiring criteria, based on the leader's competencies and the faculty's needs, and proper succession planning, better

choices can be made in choosing candidates that most closely align with the

knowledge, skills, abilities, and personalities required for the job.

REFERENCES

American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], (2008). *CC STATS.* Retrieved September 20, 2008, from http://www2.aacc.nche.edu/ research/index.htm

American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], (2009). *Community college trends and statistics.* Retrieved October,23, 2009, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Trends/Pages/default.aspx

Anderson, J. E., Guido-DiBrito, F., & Morrell, J. S. (2000). Factors that influence satisfaction for student affairs administrators. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2000*(105), 99.

Anderson, J. A. (1997). Leadership training initiatives for community college administrators: A focused synthesis of the literature. *Community College Review, 24*(4), 27.

Antonakis, J., Angerfelt, M., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2005). *Biasing effects on leadership ratings : Gender, context, and organizational performance cues.* Institute of International Management (IUMI), HEC, University of Lausanne.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Red Wood, CA: Mind Garden.

Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & McDaniel, M. A. (1990). Age and work performance in nonmanagerial jobs: The effects of experience and occupational type. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(2), 407-422.

Avolio, B. J., & Yammarino, F. J. (2002). *Transformational and charismatic leadership : The road ahead.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier Science.

Baker, G. A., Roueche, J. E., & Gillett-Karam, R. (1990). *Teaching as leading: Profiles of excellence in the open-door college.* Washington, D.C: Community College Press.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action : A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.

Barnett, K., & McCormick, J. (2004). Leadership and individual principal-teacher relationships in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(3), 406-434.

Barry, D. A. (2002). Job satisfaction and leadership style: A study of Michigan high school principals. Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University,

United States—Michigan. Retrieved June 5, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 3065396).

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

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19-31.

Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass and stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Battersby, D. (1990). *Factors influencing the turnover and retention of registered nurses in new south wales hospitals : A report to the new south wales college of nursing*. Glebe, N.S.W: New South Wales College of Nursing.

Bennett, J. B. (1982). Inside a Department Chairperson. *Agb Reports, 24,* 3, 39-42.

Bennett, J. B., & Figuli, D. J. (1993). *Enhancing departmental leadership : The roles of the chairperson*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders : The strategies for taking charge* (1st ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Bridges, S., & Guariglia, A. (2008). Financial constraints, global engagement, and firm survival in the united kingdom: Evidence from micro data. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy, 55*(4), 444-464.

Burns, J. D. (2007). *Analyses of transactional and transformational leadership on job satisfaction of college faculty*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University, Prescott Valley, AZ.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Oxford, England: Harper & Row.

Caesar, V., & Caesar, C. A. (2006). *The high achiever's guide to happiness*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Campbell, J. J., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., & Weick, K. E. (1970). *Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness*. New York,: McGraw-Hill.

Cano, J., & Miller, G. (1992). A gender analysis of job satisfaction, job satisfier factors, and job dissatisfier factors of agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 33*(3), 40-46.

Carsten, J. M., & Spector, P. E. (1987). Unemployment, job satisfaction, and employee turnover: A meta-analytic test of the muchinsky model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(3), 374-381.

Cashman, K. (1998). *Leadership from the inside out : Becoming a leader for life*. Provo, UT: Executive Excellence.

Chen, L. Y. (2004). Examining the effects of organizational culture and leadership behaviors on organizational committment, job satisfaction and job performance at small and middle sized firms in taiwan. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 5*, 432-438.

Brawer, F. B., & Cohen, A. M. (1982). *The American community college*. The Jossey-Bass series in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brawer, F. B., & Cohen, A. M. (1996). *The American community college*. The Jossey-Bass higher and adult education series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cohen, P., & Cohen, J. (1983). In *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 618-634.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization Science, 12*(4), 450-467.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2000). *A university for the 21st century*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2007). In *The view from the helm: Leading the American university during an era of change*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(4), 735-744.

Dvir, T., & Shamir, B. (2003). Follower developmental characteristics as predicting transformational leadership: A longitudinal field study. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(3), 327-344.

Ferguson, D. (1973). A study of occupational stress and health. *Ergonomics, 16*(5), 649-664.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R. K., & Schuster, J. H. (1998). *The new academic generation: A profession in transformation.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press

Giles-Gee, H., & McMahon, M. J. (1997). System-wide and institutional development programs for chairpersons. *The Department Chair, 8*(1), 18-19.

Glick, N. L. (1992). Job satisfaction among academic administrators. *Research in Higher Education, 33*(5), 625-39.

Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review, 78*(2), 78-90.

Graen, G. B., Liden, R. C., & Hoel, W. (1982). Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*(6), 868-872.

Green, G. (1992). The relationship between high school athletic administrators' job satisfaction and job related stress. Ph.D. dissertation, The Florida State University, United States—Florida. Retrieved July 6, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 9306233).

Griffith, J. (2001). Do satisfied employees satisfy customers? support-services staff morale and satisfaction among public school administrators, students, and parents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*(8), 1627-1658.

Gruneberg, M. M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. New York: Wiley.

Guariglia, A., & Mateut, S. (2005). *Inventory investment, global engagement and financial constraints in the UK evidence from microdata. Scottish Journal of Political Economy, 55 (4), 444-464.*

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and

business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 268-279.

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. (1994). *Emotional contagion.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hecht, I. W. D., Higgerson, M. L., Gmelch, W. H., & Tucker, A. (1999). *The department chair as academic leader.* Phonex, AZ.: The Oryx Press.

Herzberg, F. (1974). Motivation-hygiene profiles: Pinpointing what ails the organization. *Organizational Dynamics, 3*(2), 18-29.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work (2nd ed.).* Oxford England: John Wiley.

Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction.* Oxford England: Harper.

Hulin, C. L. (1966). Job satisfaction and turnover in female clerical population. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 50*(4), 280-285.

Hulin, C. L., & Blood, M. R. (1968). Job enlargement, individual differences, and worker responses. *Psychological Bulletin, 69*(1), 41-55.

Hutton, J. B., & Jobe, M. E. (1985). Job satisfaction of community college faculty. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 9*(4), 317-24.

Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science, 28*(3), 315-336.

Jameson, D. A. (2001). Narrative discourse and management action. *Journal of Business Communication, 38*(4), 476-511.

John W JL, L., Moffitt, L. L., Lucy W LG, G., Adam W AD, D., & Stevens, M. M. (2007). An investigation of personality traits in relation to job and career satisfaction of information technology professionals. *Journal of Information Technology (Palgrave Macmillan), 22*(2), 174-183.

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

Kark, R., & Shamir, B. (2002). The influence of transformational leadership on followers' relational versus collective self-concept. *Academy of Management Proceedings & Membership Directory* , D1-D6.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive, 5*(2), 48-60.

Kotter, J. P. (1999). What effective general managers really do. *Harvard Business Review, 77*(2), 145-159.

Kotter, J. P. (2001). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review, 79*(11), 85-96.

Kotterman, J. (2006). Leadership versus management: What's the difference? *Journal for Quality & Participation, 29*(2), 13-17.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuhlen, R. G. (1963). Needs, perceived need satisfaction opportunities and satisfaction with occupation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 47*(1), 56-64.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A Constructive/Developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(4), 648-657.

Kumar, M. S., & University of Cambridge. (1982). *Growth, acquisitions, investment and foreign markets : A sutdy of united kingdom quoted companies 1960-1976*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lawler, E. E., & O'Gara, P. W. (1967). Effects of inequity produced by underpayment on work output, work quality, and attitudes toward the work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 51*(5), 403-410.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 52-65.

Liming, D., & Wolf, M. (Fall 2008). Job outlook by education 2006-16. *Occupational Outlook Quarterly Online, 25*(3), 2-29. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/opub/ooq/2008/fall/art01.htm

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lucas, A. F. (2000). *Leading academic change: Essential roles for department chairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Madlock, P. E. (2008). The link between leadership style, communicator

competence, and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication, 45*(1), 61-78.

Mangione, T. W., & Quinn, R. P. (1975). Job satisfaction, counterproductive behavior, and drug use at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(1), 114-116.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370-396.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. Oxford England: Harpers.

McComis, M. S. (2006). *Does leadership matter?: The relationship between leadership characteristics and student achievement in private career colleges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education : Evidence-based inquiry* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Medley, F., & Larochelle, D. R. (1995). Transformational leadership and job satisfaction. *Nursing Management, 26*(9), 64JJ-64NN.

Miner, J. B. (1978). Twenty years of research on role-motivation theory of managerial effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology, 31*(4), 739-760.

Miner, J. B. (2007). *Organizational behavior. 4, from theory to practice*. Armonk, N.Y: M.E. Sharpe.

Mirvis, P. H., & Lawler, E. E. (1977). Measuring the financial impact of employee attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*(1), 1-8.

Monahan, D. J., & Greene, V. L. (1987). Predictors of early retirement among university faculty. *The Gerontologist, 27*, 46-52.

Mooney, C., J. (1989). Uncertainty is rampant as colleges begin to to brace for faculty shortage expected to begin in 1990's. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 35*(20), A14.

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Orange County Community Colleges Legislative Task Force. (2009). Retrieved December, 2009, from http://www.socccd.edu/ocltf/index.html

Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin, 80*(2), 151-176.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2008). *Essentials of organizational behavior*. New Jersy: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Rosser, V. J., Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (2003). Academic deans and directors: Assessing their effectiveness from individual and institutional perspective. *Journal of Higher Education, 74*(1), 1-25.

Rosser, V. J., & Townsend, B. K. (2006). Determining public 2-year college faculty's intent to leave: An empirical model. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 124-147.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday Currency.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science, 4*(4), 577-594.

Simpson, W. M. (1984). Division heads and role strain perception. *Community College Review, 12*(1), 21-26.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13*(6), 693-713.

Spector, P. E. (1994). *Job satisfaction survey, JSS page.* Retrieved October, 20, 2008, from http://chuma.cas.usf.edu/~spector/scales/jsspag.html

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Tucker, A. (1989). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Oxford, England: Wiley.

Wagner, J. A., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (2002). *Organizational behavior : Securing competitive advantage* (4th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College.

Wharton, L. E. (1997). Observations on community college leadership. *Community College Review, 25*(1), 15-28.

Williams, L. J., & Hazer, J. T. (1986). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment in turnover models: A reanalysis using latent variable structural equation methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(2), 219-231.

Willie, R., & Stecklin, J. E. (1982). A three-decade comparison of college faculty characteristics, satisfactions, activities, and attitudes. *Research in Higher Education, 16*(1), 81-93.

Woodruff, Mary Martha (1992). Relationship between faculty participation in the decision-making process and job satisfaction at urban, private universities in Connecticut. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Bridgeport, United States—Connecticut. Retrieved June 5, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 9236147).

Wu, M.T. (2003). A study of presidential leadership style and teacher job satisfaction in institutes of technology in Taiwan. Ph.D. dissertation, University of the Incarnate Word, United States—Texas. Retrieved May 23, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 3103636).

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Zaleznik, A. (2004). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review, 82*(1), 74-81.

APPENDIX A: Job Satisfaction Survey

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Paul E. Spector
Department of Psychology
University of South Florida

E. Spector 1994

	PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.	Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately	Agree very much
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	I like the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

	PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT. Paul E. Spector 1994	Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately	Agree very much
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30	I like my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31	I have too much paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX B: Demographic Survey

Please choose a single response for each item.

Gender: ❑ Male   ❑ Female

**Educational
Level:**   ❑ Less than a   ❑ Bachelor   ❑Masters   ❑Doctorate
          Bachelor

**Years of Teaching
Experience at this
College:**   ❑ 1-3   ❑ 4-10   ❑ 10 or more

Faculty Status: ❑ Full-Time   ❑ Part-Time or Adjunct Faculty

APPENDIX C: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x)

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Leader Form

My Name: _____Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____Leader ID #: _____

This questionnaire is to describe your leadership style as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. **If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.**

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

Use the following rating scale:

Not at all	Once in awhile	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts 0 1 2 3 4
2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate........................... 0 1 2 3 4
3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious 0 1 2 3 4
4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards 0 1 2 3 4
5. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise 0 1 2 3 4
6. I talk about my most important values and beliefs.. 0 1 2 3 4
7. I am absent when needed. 0 1 2 3 4
8. I seek differing perspectives when solving problems 0 1 2 3 4
9. I talk optimistically about the future 0 1 2 3 4
10. I instill pride in others for being associated with me 0 1 2 3 4
11. I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets 0 1 2 3 4
12. I wait for things to go wrong before taking action... 0 1 2 3 4
13. I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished 0 1 2 3 4
14. I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.. 0 1 2 3 4
15. I spend time teaching and coaching 0 1 2 3 4
16. I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved 0 1 2 3 4
17. I show that I am a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." 0 1 2 34
18. I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group... 0 1 2 34
19. I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group 0 1 2 3 4
20. I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action 0 1 2 3 4
21. I act in ways that build others' respect for me 0 1 2 3 4
22. I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures................ 0 1 2 34
23. I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions 0 1 2 3 4
24. I keep track of all mistakes 0 1 2 3 4
25. I display a sense of power and confidence.. 0 1 2 34
26. I articulate a compelling vision of the future 0 1 2 3 4
27. I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards 0 1 2 3 4
28. I avoid making decisions 0 1 2 3 4
29. I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others 0 1 2 3 4
30. I get others to look at problems from many different angles 0 1 2 3 4
31. I help others to develop their strengths 0 1 2 3 4
32. I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments 0 1 2 3 4
33. I delay responding to urgent questions 0 1 2 3 4
34. I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission.. 0 1 2 3 4
35. I express satisfaction when others meet expectations 0 1 2 3 4
36. I express confidence that goals will be achieved 0 1 2 34
37. I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs.. 0 1 2 3 4
38. I use methods of leadership that are satisfying 0 1 2 3 4
39. I get others to do more than they expected to do 0 1 2 3 4

40. I am effective in representing others to higher authority 0 1 2 3 4
41. I work with others in a satisfactory way 0 1 2 3 4
42. I heighten others' desire to succeed..0 1 2 34
43. I am effective in meeting organizational requirements...0 1 2 3 4
44. I increase others' willingness to try harder 0 1 2 34
45. I lead a group that is effective...0 1 2 34

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Rater Form

Name of Leader: _____Date: _____
Organization ID #: _____Leader ID #: _____

This questionnaire is used to describe the leadership style of the above-mentioned individual as you perceive it. Answer all items on this answer sheet. **If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.** Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing. Use the following rating scale:

Not at all   Once in awhile   Sometimes   Fairly often   Frequently, if not always
        0   1   2   3   4

The Person I Am Rating…

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts...0 1 2 3 4
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate 0 1 2 3 4
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious..0 1 2 3 4
4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards 0 1 2 3 4
5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise 0 1 2 3 4
6. Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs 0 1 2 3 4
7. Is absent when needed 0 1 2 3 4
8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems..0 1 2 3 4
9. Talks optimistically about the future...0 1 2 3 4
10. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her 0 1 2 3 4
11. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets 0 1 2 3 4
12. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action..0 1 2 3 4
13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished...0 1 2 3 4
14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose..0 1 2 3 4
15. Spends time teaching and coaching 0 1 2 34
16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved 0 1 2 3 4
17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."...0 1 2 3 4
18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group...0 1 2 3 4
19. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group 0 1 2 3 4
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action 0 1 2 3 4
21. Acts in ways that builds my respect...0 1 2 34
22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures.........................0 1 2 3 4
23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions 0 1 2 3 4
24. Keeps track of all mistakes 0 1 2 3 4
25. Displays a sense of power and confidence..0 1 2 3 4
26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future...0 1 2 3 4
27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards 0 1 2 34
28. Avoids making decisions..0 1 2 3 4
29. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others......................................0 1 2 3 4

30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles 0 1 2 3 4
31. Helps me to develop my strengths 0 1 2 3 4
32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments 0 1 2 3 4
33. Delays responding to urgent questions 0 1 2 3 4
34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission 0 1 2 3 4
35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations..0 1 2 3 4
36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved..0 1 2 3 4
37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs 0 1 2 3 4
38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying 0 1 2 34
39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do..0 1 2 3 4
40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority 0 1 2 3 4
41. Works with me in a satisfactory way..0 1 2 3 4
42. Heightens my desire to succeed 0 1 2 3 4
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements 0 1 2 3 4
44. Increases my willingness to try harder...0 1 2 34
45. Leads a group that is effective 0 1 2 3 4

APPENDIX D: Approvals to Conduct Research

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY

Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board

February 2, 2010

Haifa Abou Harash
PO Box 4324
Anaheim, CA 92803

Protocol #: E0110D07
Project Title: *An Analysis of the Relationship between Different Leadership Styles of Educational Leaders and the Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members within Community Colleges*

Dear Ms. Abou Harash,

Thank you for submitting the revisions requested by Pepperdine University's Graduate and Professional Schools IRB (GPS IRB) for your study, *An Analysis of the Relationship between Different Leadership Styles of Educational Leaders and the Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members within Community Colleges.* The IRB has reviewed your revisions and found them acceptable. You may proceed with your study. The IRB has determined that the above entitled project meets the requirements for exemption under the federal regulations 45 CFR 46 - http://www.nihtraining.com/ohsrsite/guidelines/45cfr46.html that govern the protections of human subjects. Specifically, section 45 CFR 46.101(b) (2) states:

> (b) Unless otherwise required by Department or Agency heads, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from this policy:

> **Category (2) of 45 CFR 46.101**, research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: a) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

In addition, your request to waive documentation of informed consent, as indicated in your **Application for Waiver or Alteration of Informed Consent Procedures** form has been **approved**.

Your research must be conducted according to the proposal that was submitted to the IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before implementation. For any proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit a **Request for Modification Form** to the GPS IRB. Because your study falls under exemption, there is no requirement for continuing IRB review of your project. Please be aware that changes to your protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for exemption from 45 CFR 46.101 and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the GPS IRB.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite our best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the GPS

6100 Center Drive, Los Angeles, California 90045 ▪ 310-568-5600

IRB as soon as possible. We will ask for a complete explanation of the event and your response. Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event. Details regarding the timeframe in which adverse events must be reported to the GPS IRB and the appropriate form to be used to report this information can be found in the *Pepperdine University Protection of Human Participants in Research: Policies and Procedures Manual* (see link to "policy material" at http://www.pepperdine.edu/irb/graduate/).

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all further communication or correspondence related to this approval. Should you have additional questions, please contact me. On behalf of the GPS IRB, I wish you success in this scholarly pursuit.

Sincerely,

Doug Leigh, Ph.D. Associate Professor of Education
Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education and Psychology
6100 Center Dr. 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
dleigh@pepperdine.edu
(310) 568-2389