

# Leadership Styles and Faculty Satisfaction of the Education College at a Saudi University

Dr. Mohammed Almutairi

---

## **Abstract**

*The goal of this research paper is to analyze the association between the leadership styles of administrators and the job satisfaction of the faculty in the education college at a Saudi Arabian university and how well they perform as a result of positive or negative job satisfaction. The research studies and explores the different styles of leadership, transformational, transactional and passive leadership, which along with the behavior of the administration towards the faculty ensure that the performance of the faculty improves which results in the better performance of the university and the students. The Education College at this university is found to be employing 312 full-time faculty members who were the focus of this study. The information on the topic of the research was gathered through quantitative methods and survey questionnaires and the target participants of the research including professors, instructors, lecturers, assistant and associate professors makes up the sampling frame. The types of leadership styles and role of leadership styles in promoting better performance through job satisfaction of the faculty staff was studied through using the Path Goal Theory (1971), to understand the concepts and other factors more clearly and be able to find a conclusion on which leadership style is suitable for faculty satisfaction of the Education College. The results of the study show that the transactional style of leadership is best suited for this Saudi university administrators, as it increases job satisfaction the most by having rewards and punishments given to the staff on their performance, allowing the faculty members to better cope with challenges and work more efficiently.*

**Keywords:** leadership styles, faculty satisfaction, transformational, transactional, passive, job satisfaction.

---

Date of Submission: 10-11-2023

Date of Acceptance: 25-11-2023

---

## **I. Introduction**

Leadership can be defined as a set of skills and techniques that an individual naturally possesses or develops over time and experience. Managing people through effective leadership is significant to the operation of modern organizations and the co-existence of various leadership styles can also impact how individuals work together (Kezar, 2010). Leadership, at its basic definition, is a social process which can influence people to pursue a goal or provide motivation and enthusiasm (Nanjundeswaraswamy & S, 2014). Whereas, the job satisfaction is the extent to which the faculty members have sense of security and acknowledgment of the job and their duties and how much they are contented from the work they are doing. It is therefore unsurprising that leadership styles can affect employee satisfaction as well.

The university is a large institution that has more than 70,000 enrolled students at any given time. Its wide array of academic programs requires a large number of full-time faculty members to operate successfully. Three hundred twelve full-time faculty members are employed in the education college. Their job satisfaction affects the success not only of the college itself but of the students that study in it. Therefore, it is important to establish a leadership style that is most effective at fostering job satisfaction among the faculty members. This study examined the effect of different leadership styles on faculties' job satisfaction.

## **II. METHODOLOGY**

The objective of this research is to examine the relationship between the university administrator's leadership styles and the job satisfaction of the university faculty to find out the best leadership style that creates the most satisfaction in the education college at a Saudi university. The quantitative approach was used to address the research question because this study was to examine the relationship between the independent and dependent variable. The sample was taken from the target population (n=312). The data was collected via email, social media that distributed by the university after the permission gathered (see Appendix E). The instruments included MLQ and JSS surveys in order to collect the data; the chapter presents the statistical analysis procedure multiple regression. This chapter concludes with a brief consideration of the ethical issues involved in the study, as well as the methodological limitations of the approach that the study utilized.

**Figure 1** Research Methodology

This study seeks to employ a quantitative design to examine the research questions and hypothesis highlighted above. A quantitative approach is feasible, especially where the researcher aims to collect data from a large pool of respondents (Creswell, 2013). In qualitative studies, the number of participants is small to allow an in-depth investigation of each respondent (Creswell, 2013). Accordingly, because the researcher in the current study hopes to collect data from more than 300 staff members at the education college of a Saudi university, a quantitative approach was the most suitable approach. Additionally, the use of a quantitative approach is suitable for research that seeks to examine the association between variables (Charles & Mertler, 2011). The current study is concerned with the relationships that exist between leadership style and job satisfaction of faculty members.

Consequently, quantitative instruments allowed the researcher to examine such associations and assess the significance in a way that qualitative tools may not. Thirdly, the choice of quantitative research is also informed by the nature of the research questions. The research questions are specific and necessitate a descriptive approach focused on testing a hypothesis. In this regard, the use of quantitative instruments such as surveys provided the researcher with more relevant data, with which to test the hypothesis of the study. Importantly, a qualitative approach is more relevant in research that requires exploration of the deeper meaning of a phenomenon (Queirós, Faria & Almeida, 2017). Accordingly, the researcher's choice of quantitative design is the most relevant approach for the current study.

### III. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter presents the findings obtained by the researcher from the respondents concerning the survey questions sent to the sampled faculty' population. Part of the data in this section are the statistical efficiencies of the different independent variables investigated in the study. For purposes of clear and accurate presentation of data, a range of data display methods have been adopted, and these include tables and figures. The research findings and results have been organized using descriptive statistics that reflects the seven independent variables under study and the assumptions made by the researcher regarding the data collected and its significance. In the end, the results displayed in this chapter are aimed at proving or disproving the hypothesis formulated at the beginning of the research study in line with the research question under investigation.

#### Research Question

Clearly, faculty satisfaction is seen as a critical factor that influences their motivation to increase their output, as well as determine the levels of commitment and loyalty while working within a certain working environment. Accordingly, the level of satisfaction, which is linked to their motivation to work, is linked with the support or lack of support that they receive from their leaders. In this study, therefore, the researcher sought to establish how the various elements of leadership and their manifestation in the work environment of the teachers influence their job satisfaction levels. In particular, the research evaluates whether there exists some predictive association between job satisfaction and the different leadership style. The main research question is: What leadership styles of administrators are associated with the faculty job satisfaction at the education college in a Saudi university, controlling for the effects of demographic factors (gender, position, age, experience)?

#### Reliability Data Collection

In this study, the reliability of the data collection instruments is critical because of the need to have high levels of reproducibility of the data obtained. At all times, therefore, the choice of the data collection instrument sought to answer various key questions, including whether the questions and items on the survey would repeatedly produce similar responses at different times using respondents across different genders. In this case, table 6 below shows the reliability coefficient of the Arabic multifactor leadership questionnaire with a 0.84 coefficient level for this study and 0.80 for (Alenazi, 2017), based on 36 items. Hence, the coefficient levels for the MLQ is satisfactory as a measure of behaviours in relation to the transformational, transactional and passive leadership elements at the respondents' workplace. At the same time, the researcher used the job satisfaction survey (JSS), with a 0.98 reliability coefficient for this study and .86 for (Al-Faouri, Al-Ali & Al-Shorman, 2014), which is a highly satisfactory value as far as the measuring of the teachers' 36 items of satisfaction levels is concerned.

**Table 6**

*Scale of Reliability Coefficients of the Arabic version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire MLQ (N-179)*

Subscale	No. Of Items	Reliability Coefficient	
		Alenazi	Current Study
MLQ	36	.80	.84

*Scale of Reliability Coefficients of the Arabic version of the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire JSS (N-179)*

Subscale	No. Of Items	Reliability Coefficient	
		Al-Faouri	Current Study
JSS	36	.86	.98

**Descriptive Statistics**

The findings of this study were presented using descriptive statistics, which provide details of the sample population's demographics, together with the average percentages of the participants' responses. The descriptive statistical analysis for this study focused on various independent variables, which included gender, age, transformational, transactional, passive, positions, as well as their teaching experience.

Accordingly, table 7 below displays the descriptive statistical values for different independent variables in accordance with the measurement levels for the demographic characteristics of the population under study. In this case, the sampled faculty members included 135 male teachers and 82 female teachers, which represented 62.2 percent and 37.8 percent, respectively. This was a notable disparity that provided an important insight into the perception of the teaching career from the gender point of view in this region. It also emerged that teachers occupied different professional positions, which included lecturers, instructors, professors, assistant professors, and associate professors. The assistant professors constituted the majority of the faculty members' group with 64 teachers, which represented 29.5 percent of the total population. On the other hand, there were 35 professors and 31 associate professors, which was equivalent to 16.1 percent and 14.3 percent of the total number of faculty members respectively. The 56 lecturers sampled represented 25.8 percent of the respondents, whereas the 31 instructors constituted 14.3 percent of the sampled population.

As demonstrated in the table of the demographic details of the participants, most of the faculty sampled for the study were between 31 and 40 years old. In this case, 82 members, an equivalent of 44.1 percent belonged to this age bracket. Also, there were 39 members with between 41 and 50 years of age and 35 members of between 22 and 30 years old, translating to 21.3 percent and 19.1 percent respectively. The oldest group of the faculty ranged from 51 to 70 years of age, and it was represented by 27 members, which corresponded to 14.8 percent of the total respondents' population.

Another interesting variable investigated during the research was the number of years that the teachers had worked in their professional positions. Clearly, the motives for understanding this variable was influenced by the belief that the longer the teaching experience the faculty members had, the greater their opinion on the influence of leadership because they were most likely to have worked under different leaders with different styles of leadership applied. From the data collected from the respondents, it emerged that the majority of the respondents, 99 members, had been working for between 1 and 10 years, and this represented 54.4 percent of the total population. 55 members, 30.2 percent of the total, boasted of between 11 and 20 years of teaching experience, while 19 of the respondents, an equivalent of 10.4 percent had been teaching for between 21 and 30 years. As expected, only 9 teachers, equaling 4.9 percent, had a teaching experience of between 31 and 40 years.

**Table 7**  
*Demographics of the Study Participants*

Variables	(N=179)	
	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	135	62.2%
Female	82	37.8%
Position		
Professor	35	16.1%
Associate Professor	31	14.3%
Assistant Professor	64	29.5%
Instructor	31	14.3%
Lecturer	56	25.8%
Age		
22-30	35	19.1%
31-40	82	44.1%
41-50	39	21.3%
51-70	27	14.8%
Years of Experience		
1-10	99	54.4%
11-20	55	30.2%
21-30	19	10.4%

### **Data Collection and the Response Rate**

For this research, a survey approach was preferred in gathering valuable data on the teachers' perceptions of leadership styles and how they influenced their job satisfaction using (Qualtrics.com). Accordingly, the link for the survey questionnaires with close-ended questions were developed and sent to the 312 staff members sampled at the education college of the university. The target population was 312 members and only 217 respondents completed the survey questions and submitted their responses in time revealing a response rate of 69%, hence qualified as valid and complete respondents. The rest of the group either failed to return their filled questionnaires, submitted them after the set deadline, or submitted incomplete survey questionnaires, thus warranting disqualification and exclusion of their responses from the study. The online survey was preferred because of the ease and convenience of sending, receiving, and analysing of the data generated by the study.

### **Assumptions**

Like any other research, this study was founded on numerous assumptions that provided the necessary background for the data collection and analysis, as well as the thematic presentation and recommendations made from the research findings. In the end, the assumptions of the study form the basis for determining the predictions' accuracy. In this case, the multiple regression analysis was necessary for testing the four major assumptions when evaluating the extent to which variations in dependent variables influenced changes in independent variables. The main assumptions were that there were no substantive outliers, as well as the belief that there were normal distribution, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity throughout the research.

1. The variance inflation factor (VIF) for this study was approximately one for all independent variables, which indicates that no proof for multicollinearity exists between the independent variables.
2. It is also assumed that the residuals were at all times distributed through the inspection of residual's histogram, thus satisfying the assumption for normality.
3. According to the frequency distribution for both the dependent and independent variables, the data sets did not have any notable outliers.
4. There were no correlations between residual's variance and predicted variables, which proved the satisfaction of the homoscedasticity assumption. At the same time, the residual's scatterplot did not reveal any pattern in the scatter in relation to the dependent variables predicted. Besides, there was uniformity in how the residuals spread based on the scatter's width, and this indicated that there was a constant variance of residual, thus satisfying the homoscedastic assumption.

### **Multiple Linear Regression Result**

This research used the multiple linear regression analysis in determining how the data obtained from the respondents predicted their faculty satisfaction with the three leadership styles employed by different leaders at the education college in a Saudi university. In this case, the analysis was based on seven independent variables, which were transformational leadership, transactional leadership, passive leadership, age, experience, position and gender. Accordingly, the results of the multiple linear regression were analyzed and put into table 8 below. From the results obtained, two leadership styles had coefficients with significant association with the levels of faculty satisfaction and these were transactional and passive leadership; whereas the transformational leadership style was not associated with satisfaction. Faculty member's position at the institution did not have a significant impact on how they were influenced by the leadership practices used by the institutional administrators. At the same time, there was no evidence to suggest that older or younger members experienced greater faculty satisfaction as a result of the leadership style used at the education college at a Saudi university. At the same time, both women and men demonstrated similar behaviours towards the different leadership styles in terms of their job satisfaction levels. Also, the faculty members' experience did not have a significant impact on the job satisfaction.

Transactional ( $p = .000$ ) leadership style, with a coefficient of 1.1 was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction, such that it was associated with the greatest job satisfaction. On this basis, it is understandable that the faculty members' responses revealed a substantive link between their satisfaction with their work and transactional leadership. The adjusted  $R^2$  for this variable was .285 indicating the model explained 2.85 % of the variance in faculty members' job satisfaction.

With a  $p = .024$ , passive leadership style becomes another impactful variable at the institution because of its effect on the teachers' faculty satisfaction. The coefficient of this variable was .445 indicating a predictor of job satisfaction. The adjusted  $R^2$  was .196, meaning the model explained 1.96% of the variance in faculty members' satisfaction.

Finally, the transformational leadership variable ( $P = .794$ ) was not associated with satisfaction showing a coefficient of .022 thus this IV was not a predictor of satisfaction. The adjusted  $R^2$  was .085, meaning the model explained less than 1 % of the variance in faculty members' satisfaction.

Table 8  
*Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction (N=179)*

<i>Model</i>	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	543.208	10.508		51.692	.000
Transformational	.022	.085	.026	.261	.794
Transactional	1.113	.285	.322	3.898	.000
Passive	.443	.196	.202	2.259	.024
Gender	-.218	2.045	-.008	-.107	.915
Age	-.092	.196	-.062	-.468	.641
Experience	-.182	.214	-.110	-.850	.396
Position	.305	.860	.029	.354	.724

*The multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict job satisfaction in Taibah university for the seven independent variables (i.e., gender, experience, position, age, transformational, transactional, passive). There were two IVs in the model, transactional ( $p = .000$ ), was statistically significant. The adjusted  $R^2$  for this variable was .285 indicating the model explained 2.85 of why some faculty members had more or less of satisfaction. The passive ( $p = .024$ ) was statistically significant. The adjusted  $R^2$  was .196, meaning the model explained 1.96% of why some faculty members had more or less of satisfaction.*

#### IV. Summary

The increasing acknowledgment of the human resources as the most valuable asset in an organization, as well as the evolving concept of leadership, makes this research significantly vital to modern learning institutions and other establishments in the corporate world. In particular, this study seeks to understand how the different styles employed by the institution's administrators and other leaders at various management levels can be linked to the teachers' job satisfaction, motivation, and willingness to continue working for the institution. In addition, the research investigates how the impact of the leadership style on the teachers' job satisfaction levels is connected to other independent variables, such as the teachers' age, gender, position, and experience. Such knowledge should enable institutional leadership to institute the most appropriate leadership practices that encourage optimal performances by increasing the teachers' desire and motivation to work towards the achievement of the organizational goals. Based on the research findings, passive and transactional are the leadership styles that had a positive association with the teachers' job satisfaction and motivation while working under different institutional leaders. On the other hand, age, gender, position, and years of working experience did not have a considerable statistical influence on the teachers' perception of leadership and its impact on job satisfaction, according to linear regression analyses carried out for the job satisfaction dimensions.

#### V. Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the leadership styles of administrators and job satisfaction of employees. Using the case study of the college of education at a Saudi university, the researcher was able to gain an empirical basis of understanding this phenomenon.

The researcher hypothesized that there is a correlation between administrative leadership and employee job satisfaction. In itself, leadership is a social construction that is all about influencing people to pursue goals by providing them with motivation and enthusiasm (Nanjundeswaraswamy, 2014). On the contrary, job satisfaction is the extent to which workers have a sense of security and acknowledgment of the job and how much they are contented with what they do. As a consequence, the type of leadership is significant when

measuring the level of employee satisfaction. However, different leadership styles can impact on individuals differently (Kezar, 2010).

This chapter seeks to discuss and interpret the findings of the study in light of the considered literature materials. As a result, it starts with a brief summary of the findings to act as a preamble of the chapter. The next subsection contained a detailed discussion and interpretation of the findings in a bid to reflect on the research question, mirror the findings of other studies, and assess whether this study's result support or nullify the outlined hypotheses. Further, the chapter investigates the implication of the findings on the studied field and outlines several recommendations as well as the opportunities for future research. The final segment is the conclusion whose sole purpose is to reinforce the study purpose and findings by underpinning why it was important to examine the subject in general.

## **VI. Summary of the Findings**

The primary research question was on examining the leadership styles of administrators that are associated with the faculty job satisfaction at the education college in a Saudi university while controlling the effects of demographic factors, particularly gender, position, age, and experience. Administrators' leadership styles were the independent variables while job satisfaction of faculty members was the dependent variable. The study considered three major styles of leadership: transformation, transactional, and passive (*laissez-faire*).

With coefficients of 1.113 and 0.443 as well as correlational significance values of 0.000 and 0.024 respectively, both transactional and passive leadership showed that they had a predictive relationship with job satisfaction, with the latter having the strongest association. However, with a coefficient of 0.022 and significance of 0.794, transformational leadership was not found to be a predictor of job satisfaction. There was no evidence suggesting that the control variables (gender, position, age, and experience) had any impact on the dependent variable, that is, job satisfaction. Further, these results directly respond to the primary question that sought answers on what administrative leadership styles are associated with the faculty job satisfaction at the university's education college.

### **Discussion and Interpretation**

From the findings, it is evident that the study received a relatively high response rate. In fact, previous studies on the same subject that were considered by the researcher had a 50% response rate, which was found to be sufficient and representative (Alghamdi, 2016; Falokun, 2016). In this case, 312 faculty members were the targeted sample population and 217 respondents completed the survey questions and submitted their responses in good time, which represent a response rate of 69%. One of the major reasons why the study received such as good reception is the convenience introduced by the online survey tool as it was easy to fill the responses and send back at any suitable time. Further, the questionnaires only contained close-ended questions. According to Farrell (2016), respondents do not have to type so much when the survey is constituted of open-ended questions, which, in essence, leads to higher response rates. In this regard, these are some of the reasons attributable to the relatively good participation by respondents.

Another descriptive statistical aspect is that there were more male respondents than females. Specifically, of the total sample used (N=217), 62.2% (N=135) were male while 37.8% (N=82) were female teachers. It should be noted that in the entire faculty, the same case is replicated as males enjoy a majority. As a result, for the sample to be representative, it was expected that the proportion would be prorated as more men received the survey questionnaires. Nonetheless, the researcher had postulated that demographical data, including gender, could moderate the relationships between the primary variables. However, the findings revealed that both women and men demonstrated similar behaviors towards the different leadership styles in terms of their job satisfaction levels.

As the case with gender, other control variables, which include position, age, and experience, did not have a significant impact on job satisfaction. Particularly, the researcher had theorized that the longer the teaching experience the faculty members had, the greater their opinion on the influence of leadership because they were most likely to have worked under different leaders with different styles of leadership. This finding is interesting as it shows that all the respondents experienced the same relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction. In his research on Saudi secondary schools teachers, Al Tayyar (2014) found that demographic factors such as age, position (job grade), teaching experience, and in-service training did not generate statistically significant differences in job satisfaction among the respondents, an indication that this paper has affirmed these findings. However, a study conducted in Turkey on whether leadership practices of administrators can predict teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction found that job satisfaction was significantly correlated with position (level of education) and teaching experience but did not have a significant correlation with gender and age (Duyar et al., 2013). Likewise, research by Shen et al., (2012) found that the experience of holding leadership positions significantly affected job satisfaction of US teachers. Further, other

scholarly works had shown that there is a stereotype of older professors being passive-avoidant leaders and that they showed lower levels of enthusiasm at work (Zacher and Bal, 2012).

Consequently, it is evident that even though this study paralleled a few research studies regarding the effect of demographic factors on teachers' job satisfaction, it went contrary to the majority. However, it should be noted that unlike the above-mentioned studies that considered opinions from different institutions, this paper only focused on one university, a factor that may contribute to the homogeneity. As prescribed by its core values, the work culture at the university is largely about teamwork and belonging, which may have neutralized the effect of these control variables; what one brings on the table is more important than their individual characteristics.

However, other than the investigated factors, there are other variables that affect job satisfaction. In the case of teachers, studies have found that issues such as working conditions, the collegiality of staff members, support from administration, student behavior, empowerment, and collaborative practices affect teachers' job satisfaction (Duyar et al., 2013; Shen et al., 2012). A similar study sought to examine job satisfaction among the academic staff of King Faisal University, which is also a Saudi university. The results indicated that there were high job satisfaction rates (JSR) in aspects of interpersonal relationships, supervision, and responsibility, and low JSRs in domains such as the nature of work, advancement, salary, and working conditions (Al-Rubaish, Rahim, Abumadini, & Wosornu, 2009). Another research focusing on Saudi secondary schools teachers found that they derived job satisfaction from student progress, staff development, salary promotion, workload, interpersonal relationships, and administration (Tayyar, 2014). In other words, there is a host of other issues that might influence teachers' job satisfaction, most of which are common across the board.

Contrary to the findings of many scholarly works (Top et al., 2015; Aydin et al., 2013; Atmojo, 2015; Rughani, 2015), this study showed that transformational leadership style was not associated with job satisfaction. With a statistical significance of 0.794, transformational leadership is largely not a good predictor of job satisfaction. This result is the exact opposite of what a number of scholars found. Top et al. (2015) found that public servants and private employees in Turkish hospitals who work under transformational leaders have higher job satisfaction, act more involved, feel more empowered and motivated, and their trust and commitment to the organization were higher than those in organizations that did not practice this style. Similarly, a study that compared multiple leadership styles (transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire) used to lead teachers affirmed these findings and as it observed that there were high levels of job satisfaction and commitment whenever transformational leadership style was utilized (Aydin et al., 2013). In another study, though they found charisma to be statistically insignificant and individual consideration to be a negating factor in job satisfaction, it was evident that only intellectual stimulation had a significant positive effect on employee satisfaction (Hanaysha et al., 2012). Charisma, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation are aspects of transformational leadership. In most studies, the attention to individual needs is what made transformational leadership a source of job satisfaction (Atmojo, 2015). However, while sharply differing with these results, this study has shown that this style is not associated with job satisfaction, at least in the case of this University College of education.

The above findings affirm other studies that revealed that transactional leadership has a positive effect on job satisfaction. However, most scholarly works (Sun et al., 2016; Belias and Koustelios, 2014) paint this style as having a smaller effect on job satisfaction as they often generate this desirable outcome when the leader properly rewards the employees for their work. While comparing both transformational and transactional leadership styles and their effects, it was found that the former was widely adopted, particularly in the accounting sphere due to its results-based rewards, but researchers recommended transformational when dealing with an organization as a whole (Sun et al., 2016). To echo this argument, Belias and Koustelios (2014) revealed that even though the two styles have a positive effect on job satisfaction, transformational leadership has a stronger effect. Notably, other authors did not find a significant effect of transactional leadership on job satisfaction (Masa'deh et al., 2016). In other words, transactional leadership is portrayed as just a facilitator of job performance through job rewards and the sharing of knowledge amongst employees. However, among the three styles examined in this research, transactional leadership was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction, such that it was associated with the greatest job satisfaction. These findings recommend it as the most preferred choice, particularly in the faculty of education at this university. As noted earlier, transactional leadership is all about rewarding and punishing employees based on their performance. However, employees may perceive rewards differently. For instance, in the case of this university, the faculty members appear to feel appreciated acknowledged for their work when they are rewarded for what they are expected to do. However, in a different setting where the employees feel entitled to the rewards because they are well aware of the leadership style in place and know how it works, they may not see the rewards as appreciation, hence not derive job satisfaction from this practice.

In another twist, the findings revealed that passive leadership style is a positive contributor to job satisfaction. Though the topic is barely explored by scholars, the limited research studies that compare passive leadership with other styles associate it with lower levels of job satisfaction (Bormann & Abrahamson, 2014).

Additionally, it is seen as having a significant negative effect on job satisfaction of employees, with most researchers citing lack of relationship between the leader and the employee as the major reason (Watson, 2009; Hamidifar, 2010). In extreme cases, literature materials not only saw it as having a negative effect on job satisfaction but also as one of the factors in the loss of engagement and burnout of the employees (Leary et al., 2013). In this light, the findings by this study that passive leadership style was a predictor of job satisfaction ( $p = .024$ , coefficient = .445) was not expected. Nonetheless, owing to the high response rate, representative sample, and effective methodological design, this administrative approach ought to be considered as among the best in increasing employee satisfaction. At the university, the presence of passive leadership is arguably unintentional; it is a consequence of staff empowerment. The management and leadership are keen to empower the faculty members and it is actually a priority in Education College as leaders tend to reward the employees for their work. However, Northouse (2010) argues that the continuation of such a practice leads to passive leadership when the desired empowerment disappears. This situation is evident in the faculty as leaders do not rush to take actions unless the issue at hand is likely to affect the institution, which is a characteristic of this type of leadership.

Based on the above discussion, the findings support hypotheses (a) and disapprove hypotheses (b). With correlation significance values of 0.000 and 0.024 respectively, transactional and passive leadership have predictive relationships with job satisfaction, hence approving hypothesis (a) that says that “*there is a predictive relationship between leadership styles of administrators and job satisfaction among the faculty members at the education college in a Saudi university*”, and disapproving hypothesis (b), which is its exact opposite. Further, for the styles that depicted a positive correlation with job satisfaction (transactional and passive), there are different levels of job satisfaction. Transactional leadership variable explained at least 2.85 % of the variance in faculty members’ job satisfaction and 1.96% in the case of passive leadership.

The analyzed literature on teachers’ job satisfaction used samples from different countries other than Saudi Arabia, and this is significant when explaining why this study was different from them. Regarding Saudi Arabian culture, the fact that the country is an Islamic state means that the education system and perceptions of people about leadership areas significantly influenced by Islamic teachings, which can lead to variances in research findings when compared to studies in other countries. For instance, “adult education research in Saudi Arabia has grown to emphasize more social and gender issues in the last decade” (Alasmrai, 2016). As a result, demographic issues such as gender, social class, and work experience may be neutralized by recent efforts to attain social equality. Still, if this study incorporated case studies of other institutions, the results may change as there are notable cultural differences in Saudi Arabia (Alasmrai, 2016). In other words, the nature of these findings is largely attributable to the aspect of Saudi’s culture.

It is not always easy for a research study to capture the complexity of cultural differences, especially when it is not a variable under consideration. However, Tomar (2017) notes that culture –the collective attribute of a community– affects how people act or behave. As a result, when studying human subjects, as the case with this study, the issue of cultural differences is a concern. Suggestively, a replication of a study conducted in a different region may produce different findings because of the element of this aspect. Ideally, culture is attributed to how people perceive things, what they consider good or bad, and so forth. One can easily identify differences in culture by observing how people react to negative stimuli, dishonesty, and unfairness (Tomar, 2017). In this light, with the study examining how faculty members at the University felt affected by the leadership, their responses may have reflected their culture on the extent to which demographic factors affect their opinions. This perspective explains why a similar study in a different cultural setting may show contrary results. In other words, differences in culture is a major reason why this study differed with a majority of existing literature regarding the effect of demographic factors on teachers’ job satisfaction.

In my opinion, culture influences various empirical research methods. This assertion calls for the need to consider how it impacts research findings and how it can be addressed or controlled. In fact, certain studies have revealed ways in which “culture influences the interpretation of study findings” (Al-Bannay et al., 2013). In this light, to test the impact of Saudi’s culture on the findings of this study, it would be insightful to use a wider population that covers other institutions in a bid to examine whether there are variations within and across cultures in the various Saudi Universities. In the case that there are variances, different study designs can be adapted to control the impact of cultural factors. This includes modifying how hypotheses or research questions are conceptualized as well as the various methodological issues such as sampling and surveys.

## **VII. Conclusion**

To conclude, it is evident that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and leadership styles adopted by leaders in different sectors. Deliberating on the level of job satisfaction is important since research has shown that it is closely associated with not only performance level but also professional and personal growth. As a result, if there are leadership styles that are associated with job satisfaction, then it warrants a study to identify them and use the findings to inform decision making. However, different styles affect job satisfaction



level differently under various situations and work environment. Consequently, various studies have considered key industries in a bid to generate general inferences. However, an institutional-level study is important as it gives rise to specific findings that are free from generalization errors. In the case of this university, especially its education faculty, transactional and passive leadership styles were found to generate a prediction of satisfaction among faculty members.

## References

- [1]. Akhtar, C. S., Aamir, A., Khurshid, M. A., Abro, M. M., Hussain, J., & a\*. (2015). Total Rewards and Retention: Case Study of Higher Education Institutions in Pakistan. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science*, 210, 1-8.
- [2]. Akroyd, D., Bracken, S., & Chambers, C. (2011). A Comparison of Factors that Predict the Satisfaction of Community College Faculty by Gender. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 4(1), 1-18.
- [3]. Al-Bannay, H., Jarus, T., Jongbloed, L., Yazigi, M., & Dean, E. (2014). Culture as a variable in health research: Perspectives and caveats. *Health Promotion International*, 29(3): 549–557
- [4]. Al-Faouri, I., Al-Ali, N., & Al-Shorman, B. (2014). The influence of emotional intelligence training on nurses? Job satisfaction among Jordanian nurses. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 117(4), 486-494.
- [5]. Al-Rubaish, A. M., Rahim, S. I. A., Abumadani, M. S., and Wosornu, L. (2009). Job satisfaction among the academic staff of a Saudi university: An evaluative study. *Journal of Family & Community Medicine*, 16(3): 97-103.
- [6]. Alasmrai, M. A. (2016). The religious, social, and cultural constraints on adult education research and practices in Saudi Arabia. *Proceedings of the 8th Asian Diaspora Adult Education Pre-Conference*, Charlotte, NC
- [7]. Alavi, S. B., & Gill, C. (2017). Leading Change Authentically: How Authentic Leaders Influence Follower Responses to Complex Change. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 24(2), 1-16.
- [8]. Alenazi, F. A. (2017). The relationship between leadership, organizational commitment, and turnover in the Saudi Arabian banking sector, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.
- [9]. Alghamdi, M. (2016). The relationships among transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and academic service quality at al-baha university (Order No. 10155751). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1817664424). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1817664424?accountid=27800>
- [10]. Al Tayyar, K. (2014). Job satisfaction and motivation amongst secondary school teachers in Saudi Arabia, University of York, New York. Retrieved from <http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/6191/1/White%20rose%20K-Altayyar%20PhD%20final%20thesis%20submission.pdf>
- [11]. Artino, A. R., Rochelle, J.S., Dezee, K. J., & Gehlbach, H. (2014). Developing questionnaires for educational research: AMEE Guide No. 87. *Medical Teacher* 36(6), 463-474.
- [12]. Atmojo, M. (2015). The influence of transformational leadership on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and employee performance. *International Research Journal of Business Studies*, 5(2). Retrieved from <http://www.irjbs.com/index.php/jurnalirjbs/article/view/82>
- [13]. Avolio, B.J. & Bass, B.M. (2004). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set (3rd ed.). Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- [14]. Aydin, A., Sarier, Yi., & Uysal, S. (2013). The effect of school principals' leadership styles on teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13(2), 806–811.
- [15]. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). The multifactor leadership questionnaire–5x short form. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- [16]. Bateh, J. T. (2013). Leadership Styles and Faculty Satisfaction in the State University System of Florida. Diss. Walden University, 1-50.
- [17]. Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). Leadership and job satisfaction – a review. *European Scientific Journal*, ESJ, 10(8). Retrieved from <http://www.ejournal.org/index.php/esj/article/view/3005>
- [18]. Bodla, M. A., & Nawaz, M. M. (2010, May). Transformational leadership style and its relationship with satisfaction. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(1), 370-381.
- [19]. Bormann, L., & Abrahamson, K. (2014). Do staff nurse perceptions of nurse leadership behaviors influence staff nurse job satisfaction? The case of a hospital applying for Magnet® designation: JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration, 44(4), 219–225. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNA.0000000000000053>
- [20]. Breevaart, K., Bakker, A., Hetland, J., Demerouti, E., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2014). Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 138–157.
- [21]. Chamberlain, C. J. (2003). Organizational leadership's influence on social capital accumulation through community-based volunteer programs (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix, 2003, AAT 3106494).
- [22]. Charles, C. M., & Mertler, C. A. (2011). *Introduction to educational research*. New York: Longman.
- [23]. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- [24]. Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- [25]. Cronk, B. C. (2017). *How to use SPSS®: A step-by-step guide to analysis and interpretation*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- [26]. Duyar, I., Gumus, S., & Bellibas, M. S. (2013). Multilevel analysis of teacher work attitudes: The influence of principal leadership and teacher collaboration. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(7), 700–719. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-09-2012-0107>
- [27]. Fairholm, M. R. (2009). Leadership and Organizational Strategy. *The Innovation Journal*, 14(1), 1-16.
- [28]. Falokun, S. O. (2016). Educational leadership style and teacher job satisfaction (Order No. 10162025). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1842449374). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1842449374?accountid=27800>
- [29]. Farrell, S. (2016). Open-Ended vs. closed-ended questions in user research. Retrieved from <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/open-ended-questions/>
- [30]. Gui, L., Barriball, K. L., & While, A. E. (2009a). Job satisfaction of nurse teachers: A literature review. Part I: Measurement, levels and components. *Nurse Education Today*, 29(5), 469–476. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2008.11.002>
- [31]. Gui, L., Barriball, K. L., & While, A. E. (2009b). Job satisfaction of nurse teachers: A literature review. Part II: Effects and related factors. *Nurse Education Today*, 29(5), 477–487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2008.11.003>
- [32]. Hamidifar, F. (2010). A study of the relationship between leadership styles and employee job satisfaction at IAU in Tehran, Iran. *AU-GSB e-JOURNAL*, 3(1), 45–58.
- [33]. Hanaysha, J., Khalid, K., Kamariah Nik Mat, N., Sarassina, F., Yahya Bin Ab Rahman, M., & Szali Bin Zakaria, A. (2012).

- Transformational Leadership and Job Satisfaction. *American Journal of Economics*, 2(4), 145–148. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.economics.20120001.32>
- [34]. Harpell, J., & Andrews, J. (2010). Administrative leadership in the age of inclusion: promoting best practices and teacher empowerment. *The Journal of Educational Thought (JET) / Revue de La Pensée Éducative*, 44(2), 189–210.
- [35]. Harrison, L. M. (2011). Transformational leadership, integrity, and power. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2011(135), 45–52.
- [36]. Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S., & Liu, Y. (2008). The Effects of Transformational and Change Leadership on Employees' Commitment to a Change: A Multilevel Study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 1-6.
- [37]. House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1975). *Path Goal Theory of Leadership*. Washington: NTIIS.
- [38]. Hussein, A. (2015). The use of triangulation in social sciences research: Can qualitative and quantitative methods be combined? *Journal of Comparative Social Work*, 4(1), 1-12.
- [39]. Iqbal N, A. S. (2015). Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Performance. *Arabian J Bus Manag Review*, 5, 1-6.
- [40]. Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., Podsakoff, N. P., Shaw, J. C., & Rich, B. L. (2010). The Relationship Between Pay and Job Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis of the Literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 1-8.
- [41]. Kebede, A. M., & Demeke, G. W. (2017). The influence of leadership styles on employees' job satisfaction in Ethiopian public universities. *Contemporary Management Research*, 13(3).
- [42]. Kezar, A. (2010). Leadership for a Better World: Understanding the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (review). *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81(5), 1-2.
- [43]. Kolesnikova, Y. (2012). Effective hotel leadership: the MLQ and its predictive effects on LMX, extra effort, effectiveness, satisfaction, commitment, motivation and turnover intentions. Retrieved from <https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/185222/Kolesnikova%2c%20Yulia.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- [44]. Leary, T. G., Green, R., Denson, K., Schoenfeld, G., Henley, T., & Langford, H. (2013). The relationship among dysfunctional leadership dispositions, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and burnout. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 16(2), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0094961>
- [45]. Levy, P. S., & Lemeshow, S. (2013). *Sampling of populations: Methods and applications*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [46]. Lysenko, L. V., Abrami, P. C., Bernard, R. M., & Dagenais, C. (2015). Research use in education: An online survey of school practitioners. *Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 25(1), 35-54.
- [47]. Masa'deh, R., Obeidat, B. Y., & Tarhini, A. (2016). A Jordanian empirical study of the associations among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, knowledge sharing, job performance, and firm performance: A structural equation modelling approach. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(5), 681–705. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2015-0134>
- [48]. Mehmet Top, M. A. (2015). Examining transformational leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational trust in Turkish hospitals: public servants versus private sector employees. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(9), 1259-1282.
- [49]. Menon, M. E. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership, perceived leader effectiveness and teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(4), 509–528. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-01-2013-0014>
- [50]. Mertler, C. A., & Reinhart, R. V. (2017). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods practical application and interpretation* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [51]. Miller, T. (2011). Integrity in transactional leadership. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2011(135), 35–44.
- [52]. Morris, T. L., & Laipple, J. S. (2015). How prepared are academic administrators? Leadership and job satisfaction within US research universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37(2), 241–251.
- [53]. Nanjundeswaraswamy, T., & R, S. (2014). Leadership Styles. *Advances in Management*, 7(2), 1-5.
- [54]. Neuman, W. L. (2011). *Basics of social research*. Toronto: Pearson Canada.
- [55]. Newhall, S. (2011). Preparing Our Leaders for the Future. *Strategic HR Review*, 11(1), 1-7.
- [56]. Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). CA: Thousand Oaks.
- [57]. Parvin, M., & Kabir, M. (2011). Factors affecting employee job satisfaction of the pharmaceutical sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 113-123. Doi: 10.19/23i1n9a13a
- [58]. Queirós, A., Faria, D., & Almeida, F. (2017). Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research methods. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 3(9), 369-387.
- [59]. Rahman, K., Akhter, W., & Khan, S. (2017). Factors affecting employee job satisfaction: A comparative study of conventional and Islamic insurance. *Cogent Business & Management*, 4(1). Doi: 10.1080/23311975.2016.1273082
- [60]. Rizi, R.M., Azadi, A., Farsani, M.E. & Aroufzad, S. (2013). Relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction among physical education organizations employees. *European Journal of Sports and Exercise Science*, 2 (1), 7-11.
- [61]. Rughani, A. (2015). Transformational leadership is for everyone. *Education for Primary Care*, 26(5), 286–288.
- [62]. Rukh, L., Choudhary, M., & Abbasi, S. (2015). Analysis of factors affecting employee satisfaction: A case study from Pakistan. *Work Journal*, 52(1), 137-152. Doi: 10.3233/wor-152039
- [63]. Sabharwal, M. (2009). Faculty Job Satisfaction Across Gender and Discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, 46(3), 5-25.
- [64]. Salahuddin, M. M. (2010). Generational Differences Impact on Leadership Style and Organizational Success. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 5(2), 1-14.
- [65]. Saleem, H. (2015). The impact of leadership styles on job satisfaction and mediating role of perceived organizational politics. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 172, 563 – 569.
- [66]. Schroder, R. (2008). Job satisfaction of employees at a Christian university. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 17(2), 225–246.
- [67]. Setia, M. S. (2016). Methodology series module 3: Cross-sectional studies. *Indian journal of dermatology*, 61(3), 261-264.
- [68]. Shen, J., Leslie, J. M., Spybrook, J. K., & Ma, X. (2012). Are principal background and school processes related to teacher job satisfaction? A multilevel study using schools and staffing survey 2003-04. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(2), 200–230. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211419949>
- [69]. Shurbagi, A. M. A. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership style job satisfaction and the effect of organizational commitment. *International Business Research*, 7(11), 126. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v7n11p126>
- [70]. Sowmya, K. R., & Panchanatham, N. (2011). Factors influencing job satisfaction of banking sector employees in Chennai, India. *Journal of Law and Conflict Resolution*, 3(5), 76–79.
- [71]. Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [72]. Spector, P. E. (1986). Assessing employee job satisfaction with the job satisfaction survey. *Mental Retardation Systems*, 3, 5-13.
- [73]. Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- [74]. Sun, Y., Gergen, E., Avila, M., & Green, M. (2016). Leadership and job satisfaction: implications for leaders of accountants.

- American Journal of Industrial and Business Management, 06(03), 268. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajibm.2016.63024>
- [75]. Sušanj, Z., & Jakopec, A. (2012). Fairness perceptions and job satisfaction as mediators of the relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment. *Psychological Topics*, 21(3), 509–526.
- [76]. Thompson, J. (2012). Transformational leadership can improve workforce competencies. *Nursing Management* (harrow, London, England : 1994), 18(10), 21-4.
- [77]. Tomar, S. (2017). How does culture influence behavior. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@tomarsamar/how-does-culture-influence-behaviour-27223c4c32f9>
- [78]. Top, M., Akdere, M., & Tarcan, M. (2015). Examining transformational leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational trust in Turkish hospitals: public servants versus private sector employees. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(9), 1259–1282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.939987>
- [79]. Tsai, Y. (2011). Relationship between organizational culture, leadership behavior and job satisfaction. *BMC Health Services Research*, 11(1).
- [80]. Tu, Y., Lu, X., & Yu, Y. (2017). Supervisors' ethical leadership and employee job satisfaction: A social cognitive perspective. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 18(1), 229–245.
- [81]. ÜREDİ, D. L. (2017). Investigating the Relationship between Job Satisfaction Levels of the Teachers in Educational Institutions and Their Attitudes towards Teaching Profession. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(12), 175-182.
- [82]. Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 458–495. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321502>
- [83]. Watson, L. M. (2009). Leadership's influence on job satisfaction. *Radiologic Technology*, 80(4), 297–308.
- [84]. Wells, J. E., & Peachey, J. W. (2011). Turnover intentions: Do leadership behaviors and satisfaction with the leader matter? *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 17(1/2), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13527591111114693>
- [85]. Woodrow, L. (2014). *Writing about quantitative research in applied linguistics*. New York, NY: Springer.
- [86]. Xu, X.-D., Zhong, J. A., & Wang, X.-Y. (2013). The impact of substitutes for leadership on job satisfaction and performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 41(4), 675–685.
- [87]. Yidong Tu, X. L. (2017). Supervisors' Ethical Leadership and Employee Job Satisfaction: A Social Cognitive Perspective. *J Happiness Stud*, 18, 229-245.
- [88]. Yuki, G. (2010). Effective Leadership Behavior: What We Know and What Questions Need More Attention. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), 1-10.
- [89]. Zacher, H., & Bal, P. M. (2012). Professor age and research assistant ratings of passive-avoidant and proactive leadership: The role of age-related work concerns and age stereotypes. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(7), 875–896.