FULL-LENGTH ARTICLE

Leadership Style and Academic Staff Job Satisfaction at Jimma University, Ethiopia

Befekadu Zeleke[1]* and Mekonnen Yazachew[2]

[1]Department of Educational Planning and Management, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
[2]Department of Educational Planning and Management, Mekelle University, Mekele, Ethiopia

Corresponding author: befekaduzk@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
This study explored the link between leadership style and academic staff's job satisfaction at Jimma University. A correlation research design was used to conduct the study. Data was collected from 291 academic staff selected using availability for leaders as their number was small, and proportionate stratified random sampling techniques for staff. Data was gathered using two standardized questionnaires: Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x) and the Job Satisfaction Survey questionnaire (JSS) and analyzed using mean, Standard Deviation (SD), an independent-test and Pearson's product-moment Correlation. Finally, the findings revealed a statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) and positive correlation between the transformational leadership style with all the dimensions of job satisfaction except supervision. Besides, there was a positive and significant correlation ($p < 0.05$) between transactional leadership style and staff's job satisfaction. Nonetheless, there was a negative and statistically significant correlation between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction. The transformational leadership style was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = 025$, $P < 0.05$). These findings may imply that academic job satisfaction would be improved in this university by enhancing the practice of transformational and transactional leadership styles. In this regard, better emphasis given to these two leadership styles in the university need to be encouraged. Hence, there is a need for leadership development training programs to advance the leadership skills of the leaders at the institution.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction; Laissez-faire Leadership; Transactional Leadership; Transformational Leadership

INTRODUCTION

Although studies on leadership and related issues began in the early 20th century, the literature on leadership shows a significant change from time to time. The theories of leadership start with a unique focus on the theory of trait/great man theory. The proponents of this theory assume that leaders are born and have innate qualities; therefore, leaders cannot be made. Initially, leaders were thought to be those having success stories that were largely associated with military men (Bolden, 2004). Early research on leadership further sheds light on the common traits that distinguish leaders from followers. The undefined philosophy pertained is that if anyone has traits such as adaptive, responsive, ambitious, achievement-oriented, assertive, decisive, energetic, persistent, self-confidence, etc., she/he is a leader or potential leader (Stogdill, 1974; McCall & Lombardo, 1983). Later, the leadership theories were more inclined towards behavioral styles that leaders exhibited in the past. As it was stated in Robbins et al., 2010), behavioral paradigms were stimulated to know the behavioral aspects of leaders so that people could be trained as leaders. This was followed by situational theories, which assumed that the appropriate leader's behavior varies from one situation to another. According to Griffin and Baterman (1986), the best course of action or leadership behavior is required following the situational variable. Subsequent and almost similar theories were proposed as contingency theory that was primarily concerned with specific environmental variables that determine the best leadership style suited to the situation.

Universities are complex organizations. To make a situation worse, universities hire highly qualified professionals who (1) demand to work in autonomy and freedom from supervision, (2) base their work on their skills and expertise, (3) have strong tensions between professional values and bureaucratic expectations that can intensify the conflict between professional employees and organizational leaders, (4) demand peer evaluation of their work, (5) feel only colleagues can judge their performance, and (6) reject the evaluations of non-collegial leaders even if those leaders are technically superior in the hierarchy (Cohen & March, 1974). In universities, leaders may have a particularly unique set of skills required for effectiveness, as opposed to those in other organizations. This is partly because colleges and universities have unique purposes in society, concerned with the knowledge of generation and the promotion of their learning and behavior. Universities, in particular, have an important role to play in producing future knowledge workers and leaders. So that it is important to have a motivated, positively oriented, empowered, and satisfied academic staff to be able to do their multiple roles (Coates et al., 2010). In the last two decades, leadership style has become an important topic of study in the leadership field (Fang, 2006). Particularly transformational, transactional and laissez-faire styles are considered the new leadership styles and are used by most academics who study organizational leaders (Bogler, 2002).

Transactional and transformational leadership has been of great interest to many researchers in the current era. Adopting either transformational or transactional leadership behavior helps in the success of any organization. This might be the reason that different authors considered transactional and transformational leadership as predicting variables and investigated their relatedness with other criterion variables. One of these variables is job satisfaction. According to Pachura et al. (2011), job satisfaction is on the top of the important targets for an establishment that is in the process of total quality. This is because the provision of total quality is based on the sincere commitment of employees to the work of their organization and being satisfied with their jobs. The role of motivation in productivity and efficiency is a topic that has been studied and debated for years. According to Evans and Maas in Sung and Choi (2007), to create a well-developed organizational leadership style, employee satisfaction should be considered. For higher education systems, instructors have been found in situations that caused satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their job. The factors that Frederick Herzberg in Sung & Choi (2012), associated with job satisfaction were not associated with job dissatisfaction. Herzberg's theory referred to factors to job satisfaction as intrinsic factors, while those causing job dissatisfaction as extrinsic factors. Those factors were not directly related to the job, but they affect short-and long-term job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. According to this theory, the primary job satisfiers were achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement. The primary sources of dissatisfaction were company policy, administration, supervision-technical, salary, interpersonal relations with supervisors, and working conditions (Sung & Choi, 2012). Here, both the intrinsic and extrinsic factors were considered to explore the academic staff's job satisfaction at Jimma University.

Scholars and researchers have been interested in leadership since the 19th century (Cantu, 1997). Leadership has been widely discussed, written about, and practiced for thousands of years and remains an active area of inquiry. Leadership is identified by researchers in a manner that fits their perspectives of leadership and contains the factors of interest to the researcher (Bass, 1990, 1997; Yukl, 2002). The main leadership styles, used in this study, are transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. These three styles are known as the new leadership theories and are used by most academics who study organizational leaders (Davis et al., 2004). According to Bass (1997, 1999) up until the late 1980s, leadership theory, research, education, and development concentrated on leadership as a transactional exchange between leader and followers. Changes in the marketplace and workforce since 1980 resulted in the need for leaders to become less transactional and more transformational. The paradigm was enlarged to incorporate transformational, transactional, and laissez-fair leadership as its observables. Organizational development is possible and can result from various mechanisms. One of the most important mechanisms is transformational leadership, which can affect organizational development through the articulation of leaders' vision, the acceptance of the vision by followers, and the creation of congruence between followers' self-interest and the vision. Transformational leadership is a reaction to a modern search for meaning, increasing, and rapid change. It considers the characteristics of the leader and manager shares with the group and stresses the importance of preparing people for change (Howell & Avolio, 1993; Pawar & Eastman, 1997; Tappen, 2001).

The transactional-transformational paradigm views leadership as either a matter of contingent reinforcement of followers by a transactional leader or the moving of followers beyond their self-interests for the good of the group, organization, or society by a transformational leader (Bryman, 1999; Bass, 1997). Bass (1999, 1985), view the transformation transactional leadership paradigm as comprised of complementary rather than polar constructs. According to Avolio et al. (1991) and Bass and Avolio (1990), transactional leaders define and communicate the work that must be done by followers how it will be done and the rewards followers will receive for completing a stated objective. Goal clarification and goal acceptance are critical for a transactional leader. In using this type of leadership, the leader relies on contingent reward and management by exception. It has been found that when contingent reinforcement is used, followers exhibit an increase in performance and satisfaction; followers believe that accomplishing objectives will result in receiving desired rewards (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1999; Schermerhon & Taylor-Bianco, 2006). Accordingly, these exchanges involve four dimensions: 1) contingent reward which provides various kinds of rewards in exchange for mutually agreed-upon goal accomplishment, 2) active management by exception which involves watching for deviations from rules and standards and taking corrective action, 3) passive management by exception which involves the intervention of the leader only if standards are not met, and 4) laissez-faire management which involves abdicating responsibilities and avoiding responsibilities. Field & Herold (1997) described transactional leadership as a reward-driven behavior in which the follower behaviors in such a manner as to elicit rewards or support from the leader. A transactional leader clarifies the performance criteria or articulates what is expected from the employee and what employees will receive in return (Burns, 1978; Flood et al., 2000; Bogler, 2002).

According to Bass and Avolio (1994), the transactional leadership style has been further divided into sections. These are a contingent reward, management by exception active, management by exception passive, and laissez-faire. In contrast to transformational and transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership is a passive kind of leadership style. This type of leader generally gives his or her followers or employees complete freedom to make decisions or to complete a task in whichever way they deem fit and appropriate (Robbins et al., 2010). Hamidifar (2009) commented that leaders who are practicing this leadership style usually do not care and take no consideration and concern on issues that arise in an organization's environment. Laissez-faire leaders are said to relinquish responsibility, give no feedback, have delays in decision-making, and are not keen to help followers in satisfying their needs (Northouse, 2010). According to Landrum et al. (2000), the transformational leadership style inspires or motivates followers, gains commitment from followers, change attitudes, beliefs, and or goals of individuals, changes norms of the organization, makes subordinates feel they are being, treated as individuals, helps individuals see problems in new ways and communicates a new vision of the organization. A transformational leader focuses on transforming others to help each other, to look out for each other, to be encouraging and harmonious, and to look out for the organization as a whole. In this leadership, the leader enhances the motivation, morale, and performance of his follower group". Bass and Riggio (2006) stated that transformational leaders are those who stimulate and inspire followers to both achieve extraordinary outcomes and, in the process, develop their leadership capacity. There are four components of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration Transformational leadership is expected to be able to provide a clear vision and mission, inspire self-esteem, and gain trust and respect through charisma. A transformational leader would ask his or her subordinates to go beyond self-interest for the benefit of the team, organization as well as society. Furthermore, this type of leader will take serious consideration in the long-term need for self-improvement and development over a short term or current needs (Bass, 1990).

According to Singer and Singer (1990), the transformational leader motivates followers to do more than originally expected. Such a transformation can be achieved by i) raising an awareness of the importance and value of the designated values; ii) getting followers to transcend their self-interest; and iii) altering or expanding followers' needs on Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Job satisfaction refers to the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what is perceived as an offering (Luond, 2003). Jones and George (2004) stress that job satisfaction is the collection of feelings and beliefs that employees have about their jobs. An employees' general attitude towards his or her job is also referred

to as job satisfaction (Rezaiean et al., 2010). According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction can also be considered as a global feeling or attitude about various aspects or facets of the job.

Job satisfaction encompasses aspects such as pay, supervision, benefits, and promotion opportunities, working conditions, co-workers, and organizational practices (Griffin & Bateman, 1986). Mckenna (2000) describes job satisfaction as associated with how well peoples' expectations at work are aligned with outcomes. For Fincham and Rhodes (1999), there are two broad categories of job satisfaction theories namely content and process theories. The Content Theory is based on the premise that a similar set of needs can be attributed to all individuals (Fincham & Rhodes, 1999). These theories identify factors that lead to satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Staples & Higgens, 1998). Content theories focus on the needs and incentives that cause behavior (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1999). This study used Maslow's hierarchy of need theory and Herzberg's motivation theory. On the other hand, Process Theory emphasizes the differences in people's needs and the cognitive processes that create these differences and attempt to describe the interaction between variables on their relationship to job satisfaction (Fincham & Rhodes, 1999; Staples & Higgens, 1998). This study used the equity theory and the job characteristic theory of process theory.

Several studies were conducted during the 1950s and 1960s to investigate how leaders could use their leadership behaviors to increase employees' level of job satisfaction (Northouse, 2004). These studies confirmed the significance of leadership in making differences in employees' job satisfaction (Bass, 1990). Furthermore, Yousef (2000) showed that leadership behavior was positively related to job satisfaction and therefore leaders need to adopt appropriate leadership behavior to improve it. Leadership style affects a range of factors such as job satisfaction, performance, turnover intention, and stress (Chen & Silverthorne, 2005) and so contribute to organizational success (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006; Lok & John, 2004). A study by Silins & Mulford (2002) has also revealed a high level of teacher satisfaction and learning in school systems where transformational leadership is implemented. Further empirical studies such as Rossmiller (1992) revealed that teachers' perception of principals' transformational leadership skills has a significant impact on teachers' job satisfaction and often concluded that school principals practicing transformational leadership were more likely to foster and enhance job satisfaction among teachers, as compared to those principals who are not transformative in their leadership styles. Although much research has been done on the relationships between leadership styles and job satisfaction, little of this kind of research has been done on the academic staff of Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to assess the relationship between leadership style and staff's job satisfaction in Higher Education Institutions focusing on Jimma University. To achieve the purpose of the study, an attempt was made to answer the following basic questions: What is the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles and academic staff's job satisfaction variables at Jimma University? Are there statistically significant differences in job satisfaction across demographic variables of the academic staff at Jimma University?

MATERIALS AND METHODS
A correlational research design was used to carry out this study since it is more appropriate to examine the links between the dependent and the independent variables i.e., the three leadership styles and job satisfaction variables.

Sampling Techniques
The target population of this study comprises 1200 academic staff and 68 academic leaders during the time of study from which 45 were in their respective offices during the data collection and included in the study using purposive and availability sampling procedures. Besides, a total of 291 academic staff members, which account for 24.25% were selected and included in the study based on the recommendations of Cohen et al. (2005). The sample respondents were selected from each department using proportionate stratified random and simple random sampling techniques.

Instruments
To gather data from academic leaders and staff members, two standardized questionnaires were used. The first questionnaire, a Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass & Avolio, 1995), was used to gather primary data from both the leaders and the academic staff. In this study, the revised MLQ 5X-

short consisting of 36 items designed based on the Full Range Leadership Model was used to assess the leadership behaviors of leaders. Three leadership behaviors namely transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership were measured using the questionnaire. There were nine sub-scales investigated under each of the three leadership behaviors. To assess each subscale, there were four items. Of the nine factors, five representing transformational leadership behavior, three were used to represent transactional leadership behavior. Transformational leadership behavior was represented by idealized influence (attribute), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Three of the factors representing transactional leadership behavior were contingent reward, management by exception (active), and management by exception (passive). Leaders were given a questionnaire written in the first person (I) point of view to let them rate themselves. On the other hand, the academic staff was given the one written in terms of third-person singular (he) perspective to rate their leaders.

The ratings of the items were based on five points scale. The numerical scale was 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often and 4 = frequently, if not always. The reliability of MLQ was tested many times in different places. It was reported that the reliability of MLQ was above 0.80 (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In addition, the validity of the tool was tested revealing that it is valid. Moreover, the reliability of the instrument in this study was computed and ranges from 0.77 to 0.86. This shows that the level of reliability of the questionnaire was acceptable. The second questionnaire used was the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) developed by Spector (1997). According to Spector (1997), JSS is used to assess the feelings of the employees towards nine facets of job satisfaction about their job related to payment, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworker, nature of work, and communication. Four items were developed to measure each of the facets of job satisfaction. The total number of items used to assess job satisfaction was 36. The response of each item was based on 6 points scale showing 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = moderately disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = slightly agree, 5 = moderately agree and 6=strongly agree. Among the 36 items, 19 were stated negatively. Therefore, these statements were reversed during scoring. The reliability of JSS was mentioned by Spector to be a Cronbach alpha (r) ranging from 0.60 to 0.82 for all the nine subscales of job satisfaction. The Cronbach Alpha (r) was also examined in the current study and was found to range from 0.73 for reward and 0.90 for co-workers and nature of work sections showing the reliability of the questionnaire used for the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Out of the total 291 academic staff and 45 leader respondents included in the study. From the total academic staff respondents, the majority 269(80.1%) of them were instructors, 37(11%) were assistant professors and the rest 30(8.9%) were assistant lecturers in their academic rank.

Perceived Leadership Styles at Jimma University

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Styles; N = 45 Leaders +291 Staff

Leadership Styles	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Transformational leadership	336	1.55	3.60	2.36	0.363
Transactional leadership	336	1.25	3.25	2.16	0.335
Laissez-faire leadership	336	0.00	4.00	2.10	0.862

As clearly portrayed in Table 1, the mean for leadership style showed 2.36, 2.16, and 2.10 for transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles, respectively. According to Bass (1998), the most ideal leadership scores from the MLQ are over 3 for the transformational scale, about 2.5 for the transactional scale, and under 1 on the laissez-faire scale. Based on the author's suggestion, however, Jimma University leadership was rated far from being transformational and most probably nearer to being a mix of transactional leadership with a high proportion of laissez-faire in their leadership style. These types of leaders usually do not care and take no consideration and concern on issues that arise in an organization's environment. They are said to abandon responsibility, give no feedback, have delays in decision-making, and are not keen to help followers in satisfying their needs (Hamidifar, 2009; Northouse, 2010).

Current Status of Job satisfaction of the Academic Staff at Jimma University

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of Job satisfaction of Instructors

Job satisfaction	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pay	291	1.00	5.25	3.35	0.812
Promotion	291	1.50	5.50	3.64	0.767
Supervision	291	2.50	5.00	4.81	0.613
Fringe-Benefits	291	1.25	5.75	2.84	0.814
Contingent Reward	291	1.75	5.50	3.58	0.683
Operating Conditions	291	1.50	4.75	2.93	0.670
Coworkers	291	3.25	6.00	4.77	0.589
Nature of the work	291	3.50	6.00	4.77	0.558
Communication	291	2.50	6.00	4.37	0.721

According to the data in Table 2, the mean scores for supervision (4.81) were compared the highest to the other job satisfaction dimensions. This implies that employees in the college are highly satisfied with the supervision of leaders in the university. The mean score for the nature of the work dimension of job satisfaction was 4.77 and the maximum score was 5. This means that most of the academic staff at the university were satisfied with the type of work in which they were engaged. Concerning the coworker dimension, the mean score was 4.77. This indicates that instructors were satisfied with their coworker relationship. According to the data in the table, the mean score for communication was 4.37. This implies that most of the instructors are satisfied with the communication within the University. The mean scores for pay, promotion, and contingent reward were 3.36, 3.65, and 3.59, respectively. This indicates that most of the instructors are fairly (moderately) satisfied with the pay, promotion, and contingent rewards within the university. Besides, the mean scores for fringe benefits and operating conditions were 2.84 and 2.93, respectively, which were the lowest mean scores compared to the other dimensions of job satisfaction. This further indicates that many instructors to some extent are dissatisfied with the fringe benefits and operating conditions within the university. As indicated in the above finding, it will be difficult to expect staff's satisfaction with a laissez-faire style dominating in the university under study. A study by Silins and Mulford (2002) revealed a high level of teacher satisfaction and learning in school systems where transformational leadership is implemented. Besides, Rossmiller's (1992) finding revealed that teachers' perception of principals' transformational leadership skills has a significant impact on teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 3. Paired Samples t-tests between the Means of Leadership Styles and Total Job Satisfaction**.**

		Paired Differences							Sig.
				SE	95% CI of the Difference				(2-
		Mean	SD	Mean	Lower	Upper	t	Df	tailed)
Pair 1	Transformational leadership - Total Job Satisfaction	-1.534	0.378	0.022	-1.578	-1.491	-69.288	290	0.000
Pair 2	Transactional leadership - Total Job Satisfaction	-1.783	0.423	.025	-1.832	-1.734	-71.934	290	0.000
Pair 3	Laissez-faire leadership - Total Job Satisfaction	-1.867	1.052	.062	-1.988	-1.745	-30.278	290	0.000

CI = Confidence interval; SE = Standard error; SD = Standard deviation; Df = Degree of freedom.

As indicated in Table 3, a paired sample t-test was computed for the relationships between each of the leadership styles on the total job satisfaction of instructors. Accordingly, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of transformational (x = 2.36), transactional (x = 2.12), and laissez-faire (x = 2.03) leadership styles and the total job satisfaction (x = 3.9) of instructors (P <

0.05). The percent of variances accounted for by the transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles on the total job satisfaction was 94.3%, 94.7%, and 76%, respectively. Moreover, the magnitude of the difference in the means was large (eta squared = 0.94, 0.95, and 0.75 for transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire, respectively. Yousef (2000) also showed that leadership behavior was positively related to job satisfaction and therefore leaders need to adopt appropriate leadership behavior to improve it.

Table 4. Correlation Analysis of Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-faire Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction Variables

Variables		Transformational leadership	Transactional leadership	Laissez-faire leadership
Pay	r	0.200**	0.083	-0.182**
	P	0.001	0.157	0.002
	N	291	291	291
Promotion	r	0.232**	0.035	-0.211**
	P	0.000	0.553	0.000
	N	291	291	291
Supervision	r	0.111	-0.058	-0.193**
	P	0.058	0.326	0.001
	N	291	291	291
Fringe-Benefits	r	0.182**	-0.028	-0.111
	P	0.002	0.632	0.060
	N	291	291	291
Contingent Reward	r	0.060	0.032	-.129*
	P	0.310	0.592	0.028
	N	291	291	291
Operating Conditions	r	0.141*	0.079	-.173**
	P	0.016	0.177	0.003
	N	291	291	291
Coworkers	r	0.143*	0.086	-.151**
	P	0.015	0.145	0.010
	N	291	291	291
Nature of the work	r	0.220**	0.005	-.234**
	P	0.000	0.934	0.000
	N	291	291	291
Communication	r	0.320**	-0.006	-.295**
	P	0.000	0.922	0.000
	N	291	291	291
Total Job Satisfaction	r	0.410**	0.058	-0.419**
	P	0.000	0.324	0.000
	N	291	291	291

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); P = Significance level (2-tailed); r = Pearson Correlation coefficient; N stands for the number of respondents (i.e. 291) that rated the items.

As indicated in Table 4, a Pearson product-moment correlation (r) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) and job satisfaction variables. Accordingly, there was a weak but positive correlation between transformational and transactional leadership style and pay (r = 0.2 and 0.083, respectively), and the correlation was statistically significant for transformational leadership while it was not statistically significant for transactional leadership style. Nonetheless, there wereweak and negative correlations between laissez-faire leadership style and pay (r = -0.182, R < 0.01) and 3.3% coefficients of determinations). Medley and Larochelle (1995) found that there were no significant correlations between pay and transactional and transformational leadership. However, this study shows that there is a significant relationship

between transformational leadership style and a pay, which is different from the above research finding. This implies the demand to exercise a transformational leadership style by the leaders and improve employees' payment packages in the university.

According to Spector (1997), the correlation between the level of pay and job satisfaction is very small. Although the pay level is not an important issue, research has shown that pay fairness can be very important. Most employees are not concerned that people in other jobs earn more than they do, but rather that people in the same jobs earn more than them. Rice et al. (1990) found that people are likely to compare themselves to one another and to be dissatisfied if their salary is lower than others in the same job. The importance lies in the pay policies and procedures that should be administered fairly, even if this results in differential pay. From data in Table 4, it was clear that on average instructors with a transformational leader scored higher than ($r = 0.232$, $p < 0.01$ and 5.4% coefficients of determination) instructors with a transactional and laissez-faire leader ($r = 0.035$, -0.211, respectively). The correlation between transformational leadership and promotion was statistically significant. There was a weak but positive correlation between transactional and promotion, but the correlation was not statistically significant. There was a weak, negative but significant correlation between laissez-faire leadership style and the promotion dimension of job satisfaction. This implies that a laissez-faire leadership style does not relate to the promotion facet of job satisfaction in the university.

Clark (1996) found that the availability of opportunities for promotion had a positive effect on job satisfaction. Schneider et al. (1992) indicated that leaders could control opportunities on the job through the assignments they provide and the feedback they give to subordinates. Opportunities at work are mediated through supervisors in many ways. For example, supervisors provide feedback, assess employees' performance with ratings that may affect their future opportunities, and assign work that can influence the opportunities with which employees are presented. Kanter (1993) also found that career opportunities at all hierarchical levels accounted for the way people involved themselves in their work. Opportunities throughout an individual's tenure with an organization are reflected in an individual's satisfaction with promotion. According to the data in Table 4, there was a positive, but weak correlation between transformational ($r = 0.11$) and transactional ($r = -0.058$) leadership style and supervision respectively. The correlations for both leadership styles were not statistically significant. There was a negative and weak correlation ($r = -0.193$) between laissez-faire leadership and supervision. However, the correlation was statistically significant ($P = 0.001$).

According to Spector (1997), supervisors are the biggest source of constraints seen by subordinates in terms of the organization. Supervisors play a vital role in subordinate job satisfaction. Employees are more likely to enjoy their jobs when they understand the direction of the company and are confident that senior leadership in the organization can meet objectives designed by strategy (O'Malley, 2000). According to Smith (1994), supervisors' ability to demonstrate trust and confidence in employees, ability to talk one-on-one, and ability to show personal interest in others are strongly correlated to job satisfaction together with leadership style and leaders' efforts to motivate subordinates. According to Bassett (1994), small close-knit work groups exhibit greater satisfaction with socially sensitive, non-authoritarian supervisors, whereas larger groups whose supervisors are socially distant from workers are more satisfied with a formal task-oriented leadership style. Small workgroups with a limited supervisory span are likely to require less formal order and permit more flexibility of response. On the other hand, large workgroups with a broader supervisory span may need formality and structure to get the job done effectively.

The data from Table 4 further indicated a significant correlation between the transformational leadership style of leaders and the fringe benefits dimension of job satisfaction ($r = 0.182$, $P = 0.002$). Transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles were negatively correlated with fringe benefits and the correlation was not statistically significant, which would have been the other way for transactional leadership style. Fringe benefits play an important role in determining the job satisfaction of subordinates. According to O'Malley (2000), some organizations do not actively encourage the use of the fringe benefits that are offered, stating that this might lead to distractions from work performance. Without supportive leadership, many employees will not take advantage of their organization's fringe benefits. It can be seen from data in table 4 that on average instructors with a transformational leader scored higher on the

contingent reward dimensions than instructors with transactional and laissez-faire leaders, and the point-biserial correlation coefficient that measures the strength of the association was statistically significant ($r = 0.182$, $P = 0.002$). According to the results, there was a weak and negative correlation between transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles of leaders and the dimension of the contingent reward of job satisfaction ($r = -0.028$ and -0.111, respectively). Their correlations were not statistically significant. According to Locke and Latham (1990), rewards for performance fall into two broad categories namely those that are self-administered and those that are administered by others. Self-administered rewards stem from appraisals, which individuals make of themselves in comparing their performance to their internal goals or standards.

Rewards administered by others following performance can be divided into two sub-categories, namely non-contingent (i.e. do not depend on performance) and contingent (given in proportion to performance). Employees, who can achieve success at work, are rewards equitably by the organization for high performance and receive equitable non-contingent rewards, will generally be satisfied with their job. Employees who feel unsuccessful whose rewards are inequitable or inadequate will feel dissatisfied with their jobs (Locke & Latham, 1990). From data in Table 4, it is clear that on average instructors with a transformational leader scored higher than the instructors with transactional and laissez-faire leaders. What is more, there was a statistically significant and positive correlation between transformational leadership and operating conditions ($r = 0.141$, $P = 0.02$); and a positive correlation between transactional leadership and operating conditions, but with no significant correlation (0.18). Laissez-faire leadership style has a negative significant correlation with operating conditions ($r = -0.173$, $P = 0.003$). Medley and Larochelle (1995) also found a positive correlation between organizational policies and transformational leadership styles. Therefore, this study also confirmed their findings.

The data further showed a positive and statistically significant correlation between transformational leadership style and coworker dimension of job satisfaction ($r = 0.143$, $P = 0.02$, and coefficient of determination = 2.1%). Moreover, the strength of the correlation was small. There was also a positive correlation between transactional leadership and coworker, however, the correlation was not statistically significant ($r = 0.09$, $P = 0.15$). According to data in Table 5, there was a negative but significant correlation between laissez-faire leadership style and the coworker dimension of job satisfaction. According to Schneider et al (1992), people seek friendly, warm, and cooperative relationships with others not only for what they produce in an immediate sense but also for the social support they provide. Coworker relationships usually exist for networking purposes. Networks are established at work not necessarily for what they provide but rather for what they have the potential to produce Data in table 4 further indicated a positive and significant correlation between the transformational leadership style and the nature of the work dimension of job satisfaction ($r = 0.22$, $P = 0.00$). Clark (1996) also found that leadership responsibilities were positively correlated with the work itself implying that the nature of the work has an impact on job satisfaction.

Correlation between Demographic Factors and Intrinsic, Extrinsic and Total Job satisfaction

Table 5. Correlation Analysis of Demographic Factors (Gender, Educational Qualification, Experience and Academic Rank) and Intrinsic, Extrinsic and Total Job Satisfaction.

Variable		Gender	Educational Qualification	Year of service in University as an Instructor	Academic Rank	Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	Extrinsic Job Satisfaction
Sex	r	1	-0.060	-0.039	0.090	0.077	0.095
	P		0.270	0.472	0.100	0.190	0.106
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products of	14.330	-1.643	-1.634	2.152	1.892	2.445
	Covariance	0.043	-0.005	-0.005	0.006	0.007	0.008
	N	336	336	336	336	291	291
Educational Qualification	r	-0.060	1	0.559**	-0.826**	0.075	0.144*
	P	0.270		0.000	0.000	0.204	0.014
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	-1.643	51.810	44.071	-37.548	3.503	7.055
	Covariance	-0.005	0.155	0.132	-0.112	0.012	0.024
	N	336	336	336	336	291	291
Year of service in University as an Instructor	r	-0.039	0.559**	1	-0.414**	0.101	0.154**
	P	0.472	0.000		0.000	0.085	0.008
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	-1.634	44.071	119.973	-28.670	6.798	10.881
	Covariance	-0.005	0.132	0.358	-0.086	0.023	0.038
	N	336	336	336	336	291	291
Academic Rank	r	0.090	-0.826**	-0.414**	1	-0.043	-.085
	P	0.100	0.000	0.000		0.465	0.150
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	2.152	-37.548	-28.670	39.926	-1.765	-3.645
	Covariance	.006	-0.112	-0.086	0.119	-0.006	-0.013
	N	336	336	336	336	291	291

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); P = Significance level (2-tailed); r = Pearson Correlation coefficient.

According to data in Table 4, there was also a positive correlation between transactional leadership and the nature of the work, but the correlation was not significant (r = 0.01 and sig. (2 tailed) = 0.93). There was also a negative but significant correlation between laissez-faire leadership style and the nature of the work dimension of job satisfaction. The findings also showed that there was a positive and statistically significant correlation between transformational leadership style and communication dimension of job satisfaction (r = 0.32, P = 0.00, Coefficients of determination = 10.2%). Bass (1981) found strong positive links between communication effectiveness of leaders, such as careful transmission, two-way communication, attentive listening, and trustworthiness and increased satisfaction and effectiveness of the workgroup. It was also found that increased efficiency reduced grievances and absenteeism associated with employees' ratings of the communicating effectiveness of their leaders (*Ibid*). Such communication effectiveness included supervisors who were attentive, easy to talk to, receptive to ideas and suggestions, and showed their subordinates how to improve performance. Medley and Larochelle (1995) found that there is a correlation between communication and the transformational leadership style of leaders. As indicated in Table 5, a Pearson product-moment correlation (r) was carried out to examine the relationship between demographic factors and job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic). Accordingly, there was a positive correlation between gender and intrinsic, extrinsic, and total job satisfaction, however, the correlation was not significant (r = 0.08, 0.10, and 0.11, respectively). There was also a positive and significant correlation between educational qualification and extrinsic job satisfaction (r = 0.144, P = 0.014). However, there was no significant relationship between educational qualification and intrinsic job satisfaction observed in the study. The findings of this study revealed that there was a positive and statistically significant relationship between experience and extrinsic and total job satisfaction of instructors. There was also a negative correlation between academic rank and job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic); however, the correlation was not significant. Generally, according to the findings, educational qualification and year of service had a positive and statistically significant correlation with extrinsic job satisfaction (r = 0.144 and 0.154, respectively). According to Spector (1997), older workers are more satisfied with their jobs because they accept authority more and expect less from their jobs. They also have better jobs and more skills than their younger counterparts.

Regression Analysis of Leadership Styles and Intrinsic Job Satisfaction

Table 6. Linear Regression Analysis between leadership styles (Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire) and Job satisfaction (intrinsic).

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	SE of the Estimate	The change statistics				
					R^2 Change	F Change	Df1	Df2	P (F Change)
1	0.320[a]	0.102	0.099	0.363	0.102	32.95	1	289	0.000
2	0.347[b]	0.121	0.115	0.360	0.018	6.02	1	288	.015

SE = Standard Error; Df = Degree of freedom.
a. Predictors: (Constant), Transformational leadership
b. Predictors: (Constant), Transformational leadership, Laissez-faire leadership
c. Dependent Variable: Intrinsic Job Satisfaction

As indicated in Table 6, while transformational leadership style accounts for 10.2% variability on intrinsic job satisfaction, laissez-fare leadership accounts for 12.1% variability on intrinsic job satisfaction (R^2 = 0.102 and 0.121, respectively). This implies that the contributions of both transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles to employees' intrinsic job satisfaction are minimal.

Table 7. Linear Regression Analysis between Leadership Styles and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction**.**

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	SE of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R^2 Change	F Change	Df1	Df2	P (F Change)
1	0.371[a]	0.138	0.135	0.373	0.138	46.189	1	289	0.000
2	0.398[b]	0.159	0.153	0.369	0.021	7.156	1	288	0.008

SE = Standard Error; Df = Degree of freedom.
a. Predictors: (Constant), Laissez-faire leadership
b. Predictors: (Constant), Laissez-faire leadership, Transformational leadership
c. Dependent Variable: I Extrinsic Job Satisfaction

As indicated in data in Table 7, while the laissez-faire leadership style accounts for 13.8% variability on extrinsic job satisfaction, transformational leadership accounts for 15.9% variability on extrinsic job satisfaction (R^2 = 0.138 and 0.159, respectively). This implies the relevance of the transformational leadership style in improving employees' extrinsic job satisfaction in the university than the other two leadership styles. Laissez-faire leadership is a passive kind of leadership style. There is no relationship exchange between the leader and the followers. It represents a non-transactional kind of leadership style in which necessary decisions are not made, actions are delayed, leadership responsibilities are ignored, and authority is unused. A leader displaying this form of non-leadership is perceived as not caring at all about others' issues (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Table 8. Linear Regression Analysis between Leadership Styles and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95% CI for B	
	B	SE	Beta	t	P	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	3.417	0.196		17.39	0.000	3.031	3.804
Transactional	0.097	0.052	0.098	1.87	0.062	-0.005	0.198
Transformational	0.198	0.054	0.246	3.66	0.000	0.091	0.304
Laissez-faire	-0.094	0.023	-0.272	-4.05	0.000	-0.140	-0.048

In Table 8, stepwise regression analysis was calculated using each component of leadership style as a predictor and total job satisfaction as the dependent variable. Accordingly, from data in Table 7, it can be seen that the domain of transformational leadership style emerged as the strongest predictor (β= 0.25, p < 0.01) followed by the transactional leadership style as the second predictor of total job satisfaction. This means that the transformational leadership style has an effect on the job satisfaction of academic staff at Jimma University. Transformational leaders do more with followers and colleagues than transactional leaders (Avolio et al., 1991). Instead of a simple exchange and agreement, transformational leaders provide a vision and a sense of mission, inspire pride, and gain respect and trust through charisma (Bass, 1990).

CONCLUSION
The results of this study disclosed that each leadership style factor relates to employees' job satisfaction factors differently. All the results from the study, except for the supervision dimension of job satisfaction, indicate that a transformational leadership style has positively influenced all the job satisfaction factors. On the other hand, the laissez-faire leadership style significantly and negatively influenced all the job satisfaction variables, except the contingent reward and fringe benefits dimensions of job satisfaction. In the context of higher education institutions, which is the focus of this study, laisse-fair leadership style is to some extent exercised by leaders since employees are highly qualified, experienced, and don't require much supervision on their jobs. Similarly, there was a statistically significant and negative relationship between transactional leadership style and supervision dimension of job satisfaction. All these findings undercut the traditional form of leadership style and call for an advanced leadership style that pays special attention to employees' job motivator dimensions such as pay, promotion, contingent reward, fringe benefits, operating conditions, coworker, and nature of the

work and communication dimensions of subordinates' job satisfaction to improve job satisfaction among the University's academic staff.

As proved by the findings, there is a statistically significant correlation between transformational leadership style and instructors' job satisfaction. This indicates that the transformational leadership style is better related to the academic staff's job satisfaction than the other two leadership styles. Hence, there is a need to develop a project in terms of leadership training and development to advance transformational leaders. Effective training in transformational leadership needs to be based on a substantive theory of transformational leadership and specific action plans, to achieve the required transformational leadership behaviors. This type of training would result in the development of specific action plans for enhancing individual transformational leadership behaviors, thus emphasizing the issue of personal feedback and goal setting.

Continuous feedback on leadership behaviors, performance evaluation, and reward strategy should be encouraged to include transformational leadership behaviors displayed by university leaders. The focus should be on incremental behavioral changes and the implementation of those changes should be sustained over time. The academic leadership of Jimma University should also enhance knowledge of their leadership styles through lifelong learning. This would help them understand how their leading styles influence their employees. To ensure higher employee performance, academic leaders should act as ethical leaders and role models for their staff. In this regards, the highest scores observed in transformational and transactional leadership style at Jimma University may indicate that the university's leadership style inclined towards the two leadership styles that positively correlate with academic staff's job satisfaction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Avolio, B.J., Waldman, D.A., & Yammarino, F.J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: the four I's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *15*(4), 9-16.

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

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

Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (3rd ed.). The Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1997). *Transformational leadership*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

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

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(1), 9-32.

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

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks. SAGE Publications Inc.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Leader Form, Rater Form, and Scoring. California. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers

Bassett, G. (1994). The Case against Job Satisfaction. *Business Horizons*, *37*(3), 67-73.

Bogler, R. (2002). Two Profiles of schoolteachers: A discriminate analysis of job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*(6), 665–673.

Bolden, R. (2004). What is leadership? Research Report 1, Leadership South West, Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter.

Bryman, A. (1999). *Leadership in Organizations*, In Clegg, S. R, Hardy, C & Nord,
   W.R. (eds.), Managing Organizations. Sage. PP. 26-42.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. Harper & Row.

Cantu, C. (1997). *Virtual Teams. CSWT Papers*, *Center for the Study of Work Teams*. University of
   North Texas.

Chen, J., & Silverthorne, C. (2005). Leadership Effectiveness, Leadership Style and Employee
   Readiness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *26*(4), 280-288.

Choi, S. (2007). The lessons of exemplary models for democratic governance. *International Journal
   of Leadership Studies, 2*(3), 243-262.

Clark, A. E. (1996). Job Satisfaction in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 34*(2), 189-217.

Davis, F. A., Judge, T. A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A
   Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755-768.

Coates, H., Dobson, I. R., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, L. (2010). Across the Great Divide:
   What Do Australian Academics Think of University Leadership? Advice from the CAP Survey.
   Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 32(4), 379-387.

Cohen, M.D., & March, J. G. (1974). *Leadership and Ambiguity.* McGraw Hill.

Cohen, L. Morrison, L., & Monion, K. (2005). *Research Methods in Education* (7th ed.). Rutledge.

Fang, Y. W. (2006). *Leadership Styles and Foreign English Teachers Job Satisfaction in Adult English
   Cram Schools of Taipei and Kaohsiung Cities in Taiwan* (PhD Thesis). University of the Incarnate
   Word.

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

Fincham, R., & Rhodes, P.S. (1999). *Principles of Organizational Behavior* (3rd ed.). Oxford
   Press.

Flood, P.C., Hannan, E., Smith, K. G., Turner, T., West, M., & Dowsons, J. (2000). Chief Executive
   Leadership Style, Consensus Decision Making, and Top Management Team Effectiveness.
   European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19 (3), 401-420.

Griffin, R.W., & Bateman, T. S. (1986). *Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment*.
   International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. John Wiley.

Hamidifar, F. (2009). The Relationship between Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction at Islamic Azad
   University Branches in Tehran. PhD Thesis, Islamic Azad University Branches in Tehran.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of
   control and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance.
   Journal of Applied Psychology, *78*(6), 891-902.

Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1999). *Organizational Behavior and Management* (5th ed.).
   Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Jones, G. R., & George, J.M. (2004). *Essentials of Contemporary Management*. McGraw Hill
   Companies, Inc.

Kanter, R. M. (1993). Men and women of the corporation (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Landrum, N. E., Howell, J. P., & Paris, L. D. (2000). Leadership for strategic change. *Leadership &
   Organization Development Journal, 21*(3), 150-156.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs,
   Prentice-Hall.

Lok, P., & John, J. (2004). The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction
   and organizational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*,
   23(4), 321-338.

Luond, D. B. (2003). *Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction*. *J. Bus. Ind. Market*, *18*, 219-236.

McCall, M., & Lombardo, M. (1983). *Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed*.
   Greensboro, NC: Centre for Creative Leadership.

McKenna, E. (2000). *Business Psychology and Organizational Behavior: A Student's Handbook* (3rd
   Ed.). East Sussex Psychology Press.

Medley, F., & Larochelle, D. R. (1995). Transformational leadership and job satisfaction. *Nursing
   Management*, *26*(9), 64-75.

Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

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

O'Malley, M. (2000). *Creating Commitment: How to Attract and Retain Talented Employees by Building Relationships that Last?* John Wiley.

Pachura, P., Man, M., Modrak, V., & Dima, I. (2011). A Theoretical Approach to the Job Satisfaction**.** *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, *4*(3), 7-15.

Pawar, P.S., & Eastman, K. (1997). The Nature and Implications of Contextual Influences on Transformational Leadership: A Conceptual Examination. *Academy of Management Review*, *22*(1), 80-109.

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

Rezaiean, R., Givi, M. E., Givi, H. E., & Nasrabadi, M. B. (2010). The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment, Satisfaction and Trust**.** *Research Journal of Business Management*, *4*(2), 112-120.

Rice, R.W., Phillips, S. M. & McFarlin, D. B. (1990). Multiple Discrepancies and Pay Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(1), 385-399.

Robbins, S. P., Decenzo, D. A., & Coulter, M. (2010). *Fundamentals of Management: Essential Concepts and Applications*. Seventh ed. Prentice-Hall.

Rosmiller, R. A. (1992). The Secondary School Principal and Teachers Quality of Work Life**.** *Educational Management Administration, 20*(3), 132-146.

Schermerhon, J., & Taylor-Bianco, A. (2006). Self-regulation, strategic leadership and paradox in organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *19*(4), 457-470.

Schneider, B., Gunnarson, G. K., & Wheeler, J. K. (1992). *The role of opportunity in the conceptualization and measurement of job satisfaction*. In: C. J. Cranny, P.C. Smith, & E. F. Stone (Eds.). Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance. pp. 165-194). New York.

Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2002). Schools as learning organizations: The case for system, teacher and student learning. *Journal of Educational Administration, 40*(5), 425-446.

Singer, M.S., & Singer, A. (1990). Situational Constraints on Transformational versus Transactional Leadership Behavior, Subordinates' Leadership Preference, and Satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 130*(3), 385-396.

Smith, H.L. (1994). Supervisors Concern for Staff: Opportunity and Outcomes**.** *Health Care Supervisor, 12*(3), 58-74.

Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: application, assessment, cause and consequences.* Thousand Oaks, Sage Publishers.

Staples, D.S., & Higgens, C.A. (1998). The Study of the Impact of Factor Importance Weightings in Job Satisfaction Measures. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 13*(2), 211–232.

Stogdill, R. (1974). *Handbook of Leadership (*1st ed.). Free Press.

Sung, S. Y., & Choi, J. N. (2012). Effects of team knowledge management on the creativity and financial performance of organizational teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 118*(1), 4-13.

Tappen, R. M. (2001). *Nursing Leadership Management: Concepts and Practices* (4th ed.)*.* F. A. Davis Co.

Yousef, D.A. (2000). Organizational Commitment: A Mediator of the Relationships of Leadership Behavior with Job Satisfaction and Performance in A Non-Western Country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *15*(1), 6-24.

Yukl, G. A. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle Rivers. Prentice-Hall.