



University of Sharjah Journal

Refereed Scientific Periodical

of

**Humanities
& Social
Sciences**



Vol. 5, No. 2
Jumada Al Aula 1429 H. / June 2008 AD.

ISSN : 1996 - 2339

The Relationship between Leadership Styles of Hashemite University Department Chairs and Job Satisfaction as Reported by Department Faculty Members

الأنماط القيادية لرؤساء الأقسام الأكاديمية وعلاقتها بالرضا الوظيفي لأعضاء هيئة التدريس في الجامعة الهاشمية

د. أيمن أحمد إبراهيم العمري Dr. Aieman A. Al-Omari

The Hashemite University

Zarqa, Jordan

الجامعة الهاشمية

الزرقاء، الأردن

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between leadership styles of Hashemite University Department Chairs and job satisfaction as perceived by department faculty members. The results of the study indicate that there is a relationship between leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction. The strongest relationship is between extrinsic job satisfaction and the consideration dimension of the LBDQ, and the least effect on job satisfaction is between the initiating structure of the LBDQ and intrinsic satisfaction. Overall, both dimensions of leadership behaviors had a positive correlation overall to the self-reported faculty job satisfaction. The gender and experience of faculty members in higher education indicate no statistical significance in relationship to overall job satisfaction.

Key words: Leadership styles, job Satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction, Department Chairs, faculty members, consideration, initiating structure, and higher education.

الخلاصة

هدفت هذه الدراسة والتي تكونت عينتها من (١٠١) عضو هيئة تدريس في الجامعة الهاشمية إلى التعرف على العلاقة بين الأنماط القيادية لرؤساء الأقسام الأكاديمية والرضا الوظيفي كما يراها أعضاء هيئة التدريس. بشكل عام وجدت علاقة إيجابية بين بعدي الأنماط القيادية والرضا الوظيفي. وقد أشارت نتائج الدراسة إلى أن أقوى علاقة كانت بين النمط القيادي المهتم بالناس والرضا الوظيفي الخارجي، وأدنى علاقة

كانت بين النمط القيادي المهتم بالعمل والرضا الوظيفي الداخلي. لم تظهر نتائج الدراسة لوجود أثر للجنس والخبرة في التعليم العالي لأعضاء هيئة التدريس والرضا الوظيفي.
الكلمات المفتاحية: الأنماط القيادية، الرضا الوظيفي، الرضا الوظيفي الخارجي، الرضا الوظيفي الداخلي، رؤساء الأقسام الأكاديمية، الاهتمام بالناس، الاهتمام بالعمل، والتعليم العالي.

INTRODUCTION

Despite the multitude of ways in which leadership has been conceptualized, the following definition of leadership can be proposed: leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 1997). The main challenges for leaders are to build a long-term vision, to increase commitment, and to build teams and coalitions in order to create required organizational changes. In order to reach their goals, they should focus on motivating, inspiring, empowering and satisfying their employees.

The importance of job satisfaction in all types of organization has been consistently supported through research (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992). The results of different studies indicate that job satisfaction is linked to the employee's performance (Wanous, 1974), organizational climate (Muchinsky, 1977; Pritchard & Karasick, 1973), possibility of stress and burnout (Um & Harrison, 1998), and the propensity to leave a job (Rahim & Afza, 2001).

Traditional measures of leadership indicate that leadership in higher education is in serious trouble as well (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Tucker, Bass, & Daniel, 1992). Leaders in higher education have been greatly criticized for their failure to apply the literature on leadership and management to maintain and advance their institutions in today's increasingly complex internal and external environments (Tucker, et al., 1992).

Despite much research on leadership behaviors, no clear-cut conclusions have been rendered as to what specific leader behaviors

consistently contribute to productivity within an institution (Al-Omari, 2007; Ehrle & Bennett, 1988). However elusive the concept, leadership has long been recognized as the strength of any organization. The need for effective leadership is still emphasized.

The research conducted in this study attempts to identify the relationship between leadership styles of Hashemite University Department Chairs and job satisfaction as perceived by department faculty members. To complete the study, two instruments were used, including The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Al-Ashker, 1994), and The Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale (MCMJSS) (McKee, 1990; Proffit, 1990; & Hardman, 1996).

LEADERSHIP STYLES

The most influential research in leadership behavior was pioneered in the 1950's and 1960's at the Ohio State University (Bensimon et al., 1989; Yukl, 1989). The Personnel Research Board of the Ohio State University, as one of the Ohio State Leadership Project studies, developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) at a time when little research that dealing with the leadership theory existed (Halpin, 1957; Stodgill, 1963, 1970, Yukl, 1989). Since the development of the LBDQ, most of the research on leadership behavior has adopted the pattern developed by the pioneering research at the institution (Yukl, 1989).

Al-Omari's (2007) study was one of the studies that adopted LBDQ to investigate the leadership styles of the Hashemite University Department Chairs as perceived by Department Chairs (35 Department Chairs) and faculty members (413 faculty members), measured by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The results indicate that there are no differences in perceptions of Department Chairs and faculty members regarding the two dimensions of leadership style among Department Chairs. Based on the ANOVA analysis, t-Test, Means and Standard Deviation differences in leadership styles were not found among Department Chairs as perceived by gender and length of service of faculty members.

The LBDQ was established as a method whereby group members would be able to describe the leadership behavior of designated leaders in formal organizations (Halpin, 1957; Stodgill, 1963). The instrument contained items describing the manner in which a leader might behave, along with the respondent rating of the way in which the leader is perceived to engage in each type of behavior (Halpin, 1957).

Two broadly defined dimensions of behaviors were established as encompassing a wide variety of leadership characteristics. Those dimensions were, Initiating Structure and Consideration (Charters, 1963; Gorton & Snowden, 1993; Halpin, 1957; Hemphill, 1955; Stodgill, 1963, 1970; Yukl, 1989).

Initiating Structure refers to the leader's perceived ability to clearly define the leader's role and to let followers know what is expected (Gorton & Snowden, 1993; Hemphill, 1955; Stodgill, 1963, 1970). The Initiating Structure dimension of leadership involves attempting to set well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job completed (Halpin, 1957; Hemphill, 1955). Initiating Structure behaviors describe leaders who are task-oriented and stress the global activities of directing, planning, coordinating, and problem solving (Bensimon et al., 1989; Gorton & Snowden, 1993; Hemphill, 1955).

The consideration dimension of leadership behavior refers to behavior indicating friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the interactions between the leader and members of the group (Halpin, 1957; Hemphill, 1955; Stodgill, 1963). This dimension of leadership behavior is more relationship-oriented (Bensimon et al, 1989; Yukl, 1989).

JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction is generally defined as an employee's affective reaction to a job, based on comparing actual outcomes with desired outcomes. It is generally recognized as a multifaceted construct that includes employee feelings about a variety of both intrinsic and extrinsic

job elements. Employees expect their job to provide an accumulation of features (e.g., pay, promotion, autonomy) for which the employee has certain preferential values. The range and importance of these values vary across individuals, but when the accumulation of unmet expectations becomes sufficiently manifest, job satisfaction is lower, and there is a greater probability of withdrawal behavior (Pearson, 1991).

Workers at every level form impressions regarding whether they are valued and respected from important cues that emanate from their environment, especially those that come from the leaders directly above them (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; Fryer & Lovas, 1991). These impressions are translated into feelings, either positive or negative, that become the principal component of a worker's morale. Morale is a key factor in determining an employee's commitment to work and the degree of job satisfaction to which he or she professes (Fryer & Lovas, 1991).

In higher education, faculty morale, based on Fryer and Lovas' (1991) contentions, results from perceptions faculty members hold regarding their value to the Dean/Department Chair. Faculty members will be motivated (a) when given a chance to feel intellectually and emotionally challenged by their work, (b) when perceiving opportunities for personal and professional growth, (c) when afforded the opportunity to participate in decisions affecting their own development, (d) when encouraged to feel they are part of an important ongoing enterprise, and (e) to know that they make a difference and are given recognition and visibility (Lucas, 1994). These motivational needs of faculty, addressed through the interactions with their Department Chair, are believed to contribute to faculty member's personal growth and development, job satisfaction and willingness to change (Kearney & Hays, 1994).

Leadership and leadership styles that emphasize work related characteristics are: challenging work, fair and adequate rewards for work performance, a safe and clean work environment with supportive superiors, and an atmosphere where peers and subordinates can have an impact on the job satisfaction of subordinates. Schneider et al. (1992) indicate that challenging work does correlate with positive job satisfaction. Bruce and

Blackburn (1992) report that fair and equitable pay, promotions, and financial rewards for workers performance are linked to positive job satisfaction. Bruce and Blackburn also report that a clean and safe work place with supportive colleagues can influence job satisfaction.

The study of leadership styles and job satisfaction can provide educational administrators with information to make informed judgments that improve job satisfaction and reduce dissatisfaction, and encourage department chairpersons to modify their leadership styles to increase job satisfactions among faculty members.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Research into what contributes to faculty job satisfaction is important. Leaders who enable faculty members and employees to participate more in decision making and who encourage a two-way communication process tend to generate a favorable climate among their faculty team, characterized by less interpersonal conflict and a higher level of job satisfaction (Stordeur et al., 2001). Studies indicated that overall job satisfaction by university faculty members has declined and fewer faculty members would choose the same profession again (Milosheff, 1990). Due to these findings, job satisfaction needs to be addressed to assist department chairpersons in providing leadership that will maintain the desire of faculty members in teaching and belonging to the institution.

This research examined The relationship between leadership styles of Hashemite University Department Chairs and job satisfaction as perceived by departmental faculty members. More specifically, this study answers the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between the Department Chair's leadership style (Consideration and Initiating Structure) and faculty members' overall job satisfaction, faculty members' extrinsic job satisfaction, and faculty members' intrinsic job satisfaction?

2. What is the relationship between gender, number of years in higher education for faculty members and the overall extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction of faculty members?

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Leadership Style: The manifestation of the leader's needs structure and personality, which motives his or her behavior in various leadership situations, as measured by the LBDQ questionnaire used in this study.

Initiating Structure Style: A leadership style, the principal manifestation of which is the leaders involvement in attempting to set well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job completed, as measured by the LBDQ questionnaire used in this study.

Consideration Style: A leadership style which refers to behavior indicating friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the interactions between the leader and members of the group, as measured by the LBDQ questionnaire used in this study.

Job satisfaction: An employee's affective reaction to a job, based on comparing actual outcomes with desired outcomes, as measured by the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale (MCMJSS) used in this study.

Intrinsic Job satisfaction: The intrinsic factors on the MCMJSS related to self-esteem/self-respect, personal growth and development, achievement, and expectations, as measured by the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale (MCMJSS) used in this study.

Extrinsic Job satisfaction: The factors on the MCMJSS indicating the extrinsic job satisfaction characteristics of respect and fair treatment, being informed, the amount of supervision by the immediate supervisor, and opportunity to participate in the methods, procedures and goals of the organization, as measured by the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale (MCMJSS) used in this study.

METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

The population of concern was all faculty members (322) at the Hashemite University in Jordan, 256 male and 57 female faculty members for the first academic term 2005-2006. The sample from the population was taken randomly. A total of 200 survey packages were distributed and 101 responses were received, 84 male and 17 female faculty members. Regarding the number of years in higher education, there were 41 faculty members with (1-3) years, 39 faculty members with (4-6) years, and 21 faculty members with (7 years and over).

Instrumentation

The two instruments used in the collection of data for this research were the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (requiring an employee rating of the immediate supervisor), and the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale (MCMJSS).

The LBDQ instrument contained 30 items that described specific ways in which leaders behave, 15 for each of the two dimensions (Halpin, 1957). The respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which each type of behavior was exhibited by the leader, in this case the Department Chair. The score for consideration and initiating structure, as designed by Halpin (1957) was determined by calculating the sum of the 15 items in each dimension. The range of scores was 0 to 60 (Halpin, 1957). Reliability for the LBDQ was determined by the split-half method. The estimated reliability, using this method, was .83 for initiating structure scores and .92 for consideration scores (Halpin, 1957).

In this study the researcher employed the Arabic version of the LBDQ that was used by Al-Ashker (1994). Al-Ashker (1994) presented the reliability for the LBDQ by redistributing the questionnaire to a sample of 24 members, two weeks after the first time with an initiating structure score of 0.81; and consideration score of 0.83. The validity of the questionnaire

was assessed by 10 people specialists in the field of educational administration at Yarmouk University and the Ministry of Education.

The researcher in this study tested the reliability of the LBDQ with a sample of 24 faculty members at Hashemite University, outside that of the study but drawn from the same population (Hashemite University faculty members). Cronbach's alpha for the two dimensions was calculated to be as follows: initiating sStructure (.78), and consideration (.85). These reliability estimates seemed consistent with previous research (Al-Ashker, 1994). The validity of the questionnaire was assessed by 12 people specialists in the field of educational administration at Hashemite University.

The MCMJSS, used for measuring job satisfaction, was designed to measure eight facets of perceived job satisfaction. Four items measured intrinsic job satisfaction and four items measured extrinsic job satisfaction. The response format consisted of a 6-point Likert-type scale with 1 being the lowest score for job satisfaction and 6 being the highest score. The intrinsic factors were related to self-esteem/self-respect, personal growth and development, achievement, and expectations. The factors on the MCMJSS indicating extrinsic job satisfaction characteristics were respect and fair treatment, being informed, the amount of supervision by the immediate supervisor, and the opportunity to participate in the methods, procedures and goals of the organization (McKee, 1990).

In a study of organizational development in public schools, Mohrman, Cooke, Mohrman, Duncan, and Zaltman (1978) established reliability coefficients for the MCMJSS of .87 and .82. In another study conducted by Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) related to participation in decision making, the reliability coefficient for intrinsic satisfaction was established at .86 and the reliability coefficient for extrinsic satisfaction was established at .71. The MCMJSS has been widely used in job satisfaction research including studies by McKee (1990), Proffit (1990) and Hardman (1996).

Instrument Translation Process

To ensure the equivalence of meaning among the items and constructs between the Arabic and English versions of the MCMJSS, a rigorous translation process was used that included forward and backward translation, subjective evaluations of the translated items, and pilot testing. The goal of the translation process was to produce an Arabic version of the MCMJSS with items that were equivalent in meaning to the original English version.

One translator (faculty member) bilingual in English and Arabic translated the English version of the MCMJSS into Arabic (forward translation). This translator was instructed to retain both the form (language) and the meaning of the items as close to the original as possible but to give priority to meaning equivalence. When the Arabic translation was finalized, the instrument was then back-translated (from Arabic to English) by another faculty member, bilingual in English and Arabic.

The back-translated items were then evaluated by a group of three faculties to ensure that the item meanings were equivalent in both the original English versions and the back-translated version. If differences in meaning were found between items, those items were put through the forward and back-translation process again until the faculties were satisfied that there was substantial meaning equivalence. The Arabic version of the MCMJSS was then pilot tested with a group of 12 faculties to collect feedback about instrument content and usage. The feedback from the faculties emphasized that the instrument had both face and content validity.

Instrument Standardization

The Arabic version of the MCMJSS was tested with a sample of 20 faculty members outside that of the study but drawn from the same population (the Hashemite University faculty). Reliability coefficients for the MCMJSS were established for the two dimensions as follows: intrinsic job satisfaction (.85), and extrinsic job satisfaction (.83). These reliability estimates seemed consistent with previous research

(Mohrman, Cooke, Mohrman, Duncan, and Zaltman, 1978)). Based on the translation process and the reliability estimates, the Arabic-translated version of the MCMJSS seemed to be a valid and reliable measure for use with a Jordanian population.

Demographic information of variables related to faculty in the Hashemite University was also included. Participants were asked to respond to the demographic information in order to determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction and the following:

1. Gender of faculty member and;
2. Number of years in higher education.

Data Analysis

Frequency distribution and descriptive analyses were completed on the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), as well as the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale (MCMJSS) and the demographic variables. On the MCMJSS, individual surveys were examined to determine the intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction scores as well as an overall job satisfaction score for all participants in the study. An overall mean and standard deviation were determined for each score. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficient was used to analyze the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction. Both measures were included in the Statistical Analysis System (SPSS). A significance of .05 was set for analysis of the data collected for this study. Demographic data were analyzed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

FINDINGS

Question One: What is the relationship between the Department Chair's leadership style dimensions (Consideration and Initiating Structure) and faculty members' overall job satisfaction, faculty members' extrinsic job satisfaction, and faculty members' intrinsic job satisfaction?

Table 1: Pearson Correlational analysis between leadership styles (Consideration, Initiating Structure), and overall Job Satisfaction, Extrinsic Job Satisfaction, and Intrinsic Job Satisfaction

Variable	Variable	r- value/ Job Satisfaction
Overall Job Satisfaction	Consideration	0.62*
	Initiating Structure	0.49*
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	Consideration	0.70*
	Initiating Structure	0.53*
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	Consideration	0.33*
	Initiating Structure	0.29*

*Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Table 1 clarifies the Pearson Correlational analysis between leadership styles (consideration and initiating structure), and overall job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, and intrinsic job satisfaction. The data analyzed relative to the LBDQ and the MCMJSS indicated a strong relationship between overall job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction and both dimensions of leadership style. The results of the correlational analysis between consideration leadership style scores and the overall job satisfaction were ($r = .62$); and between initiating structure leadership style scores and the overall job satisfaction ($r = .49$). The results of the correlational analysis between consideration leadership style scores and extrinsic job satisfaction were ($r = .70$); and between initiating structure leadership style scores and extrinsic job satisfaction ($r = .53$). This indicates that the more prominent the characteristics of the consideration or the initiating structure dimension of leadership styles, the more the degree of self-reported job satisfaction. A greater degree of extrinsic job satisfaction was reported when the leadership behavior fell within the consideration dimension.

Table 1 indicates that the correlation between leadership style and intrinsic job satisfaction was statistically significant, but not as strongly correlated. The results of the correlational analysis between consideration leadership style scores and intrinsic job satisfaction were ($r = .33$); and between initiating structure leadership style scores and intrinsic job satisfaction ($r = .29$).

Question Two: What is the relationship between gender, number of years in higher education for faculty members and overall, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction of faculty members?

Gender and number of years in higher education for faculty members indicated no statistical significance in relationship to overall job satisfaction.

Gender and Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members:

Table 2: Means, standard deviation for faculty members' perceptions concerning overall, Intrinsic, Extrinsic Job Satisfaction-Gender of faculty members

Dimensions	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Overall Job Satisfaction			
Male	84	24.89	1.89
Female	17	24.36	2.26
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction			
Male	84	8.50	1.56
Female	17	8.35	1.49
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction			
Male	84	15.57	1.41
Female	17	16.0	1.62

Table 2 presented means and the standard deviation for male and female faculty members concerning overall intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction. The mean score for male faculty members concerning overall job satisfaction was 24.98 (SD, 1.89). The mean score for female faculty members concerning overall job satisfaction was 24.36 (SD, 2.26). The mean score for male faculty members concerning intrinsic job satisfaction was 8.50 (SD, 1.56), and for extrinsic job satisfaction 15.57 (SD, 1.41). The mean score for female faculty members concerning intrinsic job satisfaction was 8.35 (SD, 1.49), and for extrinsic job satisfaction 16.0 (SD, 1.62).

To test any significant findings among male and female faculty members and overall intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, a One-Way Analysis of Variance was used in Table 3.

Table 3: Analysis of variance for the perceptions of faculty members concerning overall, Intrinsic, and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction - Gender of faculty members

Over all Job Satisfaction	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Over all Job Satisfaction					
Between Groups	1.120	1	1.120	.291	.591
Within Groups	381.454	99	3.853		
Total	382.574	100			
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction					
Between Groups	.306	1	.306	.127	.723
Within Groups	238.882	99	2.413		
Total	239.188	100			
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction					
Between Groups	2.597	1	2.597	1.233	.270
Within Groups	208.571	99	2.107		
Total	211.168	100			

Table 3 presents the ANOVA Summary; there is insufficient evidence to show that a significant difference exists between gender of faculty members and overall job satisfaction. Also, Table 3 indicates that there were no statistically significant findings relating any of male and female faculty members to the intrinsic and extrinsic scale of the MCMJSS.

Number of years in higher education and Job Satisfaction of faculty members:

Table 4: Means, standard deviation for faculty members' perceptions concerning overall Job Satisfaction- Number of years in higher education for faculty members

Number of years in higher education	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
-------------------------------------	-------	------	--------------------

Number of years in higher education	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Overall Job Satisfaction			
1-3	41	24.17	2.10
4-6	39	24.02	1.66
7 and over	21	24.19	2.22
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction			
1-3	41	8.73	1.170
4-6	39	8.43	1.50
7 and over	21	8.04	1.24
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction			
1-3	41	15.43	1.41
4-6	39	15.58	1.27
7 and over	21	16.14	1.76

Table 4 presents the means and standard deviation for faculty members' perceptions concerning overall intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction and number of years in higher education for faculty members. Forty-one of the respondents had served three years and under. The mean for this group on overall job satisfaction was 24.17 (SD, 2.10), and the mean for the group that served (4 – 6) years was 24.02 (SD, 1.66), while the mean of the third group that served over 7 years was 24.19 (SD, 2.22).

The mean score for faculty members who served three years and under concerning intrinsic job satisfaction was 8.73 (SD, 0.170), for the group that served (4 – 6) years 8.43 (SD, 1.50), and for the group that served (7 and over) years 8.04 (SD, 1.24). The mean score for faculty members who served three years and under concerning extrinsic job satisfaction was 15.43 (SD, 1.41), for the group that served (4 – 6) years

15.58 (SD, 1.27), and for the group that served (7 and over) years 16.14 (SD, 1.76).

To test any significant findings among faculty members concerning overall intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and number of years in higher education, a One-Way Analysis Variance was used (Table 5).

Table 5: Analysis of variance for the perceptions of faculty members concerning overall intrinsic and extrinsic job Satisfaction and number of years in higher education for faculty members

Dimensions	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall Job Satisfaction					
Between Groups	.557	2	.278	.071	.931
Within Groups	382.017	98	3.898		
Total	382.574	100			
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction					
Between Groups	6.579	2	3.299	1.390	.254
Within Groups	232.591	98	2.373		
Total	239.188	100			
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction					
Between Groups	7.063	2	3.532	1.696	.189
Within Groups	204.105	98	2.083		
Total	211.168	100			

Table 5 indicates that there is insufficient evidence to show that a significant relationship exists between the overall job satisfaction and number of years in higher education for faculty members. In addition, there were no statistically significant findings that related to number of

years in higher education for faculty members and the intrinsic and extrinsic scale of the MCMJSS.

DISCUSSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study indicate that the correlation between leadership styles of the Department Chairs demonstrates a significant relationship to the self-reported job satisfaction of faculty members. This correlation is most evident in the relationship of extrinsic job satisfaction to the consideration dimension of the LBDQ. The greater the degree of perceived "consideration" behaviors in the Department Chair, the higher the degree of extrinsic job satisfaction reported by faculty members, which appears to affect the employee's performance (Wanous, 1974) and the propensity to stay or leave a job (Rahim & Afza, 2001).

Both dimensions of leadership behavior had a significant positive correlation to increased overall self-reported faculty job satisfaction scores. Generally, overall job satisfaction scores increased as one or the other dimensions of leadership behaviors were attributed to Department Chairs. The correlation of the study, which indicated the least effect on job satisfaction, was between the initiating structure of the LBDQ and intrinsic job satisfaction. The consideration dimension of the LBDQ was also weakly correlated with reported intrinsic job satisfaction scores. Generally, neither dimension of leadership behavior contributed to an increase in intrinsic job satisfaction.

Halpin (1957) described the consideration dimension as behavior that is indicative of friendship, warmth in a relationship, mutual trust, and respect. There is a logical connection between the behaviors identified as consideration behaviors in supervisors and a higher degree of reported job satisfaction in subordinates. These behaviors correlate with Maslow's (1965) hierarchy of needs and the data are consistent with the work of Cohen (1990), Ford and Gillette (1969), and Fryer and Lovas (1991), which states that the individual's basic needs must be met prior to expectations of higher order contributions.

The lower correlations between both leadership dimensions and intrinsic job satisfaction in this study were reasonable and logical. Intrinsic job satisfaction indicates that the degree to which a respondent feels satisfied is determined by internally motivated factors. Internal factors come from within the individual. External behaviors from a leader or supervisor appear, based on the results of the current study, to have less effect on intrinsic satisfaction than on extrinsic job satisfaction.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The findings of this study have several practical recommendations. The study showed a significant relationship between job satisfaction and leadership style. This means that educational administration programs can be improved by improving specific individual leadership characteristics identified in the LBDQ. This in turn could result in more satisfied employees.

The data from the current study could be very useful to practicing administrators, especially those results pertaining to the two dimensions of leadership as measured by the LBDQ. By allowing employees to complete a leadership instrument such as the LBDQ, administrators could analyze their own leadership style and incorporate components of those leadership dimensions that increase faculty job satisfaction. Behaviors that relate to decreased job satisfaction could be identified and the leader could work on modifying such behaviors. Such action by the leader should improve job satisfaction of faculty members.

Also, the academic leadership styles of department chairpersons need to be examined to identify any obstacles that may hinder chairpersons from modifying their leadership styles to increase job satisfaction levels of faculty members.

The current study did not allow for the determination of generalizability of the results across all Jordanian institutions of higher education, because the data were collected from only one university. The

results did indicate that the respondents were not extremely satisfied or extremely dissatisfied. The scores for job satisfaction ranged from a low of 3.0 to a high score of 5.7.

CONCLUSIONS:

Job Satisfaction has been shown in the literature to be an important pedagogical consideration, and studies such like this one can show the importance of it in relation to leadership styles. As was identified in the introduction of this study, there are no studies on examining the relationship between the leadership styles of department chairpersons and the job satisfaction of faculty members at the Hashemite University. Therefore, it is recommended that this study be replicated to increase the generalizability of these findings.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Ashker, W. M. (1994). Styles of leadership in Yarmouk and Jordanian University of Science and Technology Universities as viewed by staff members. Unpublished Thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid.
2. Al-Omari, A. (2007). Leadership styles of department chairs at the Hashemite University. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 8(3), 7-24.
3. Bensimon, E.A., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). Making sense of administrative leadership: The "I" word in higher education. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.
4. Bruce, W., & Blackburn, J. (1992). Balancing job satisfaction and performance. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
5. Charters, W.W. (1963). The social background of teaching. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 715 - 813). Chicago: Rand McNally.
6. Cohen, W. (1990). *The art of the leader*. New York: Prentice Hall.
7. Ehrle, E.B., & Bennett, J.B. (1988). *Managing the academic enterprise*. New York: Macmillan.
8. Ford, R.N., & Gillette, M.B. (1969). A new approach to job motivation: Improving the work itself. In R.N. Ford (Ed.), *Motivation through the work itself*. American Management Association.

9. Fryer, T.W., & Lovas, J.C. (1991). Leadership in governance: Creating conditions for successful decision making in the community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
10. Gmelch, W.H., & Miskin, V.D. (1993). Leadership skills for department chairs. MA: Anker.
11. Goodchild, L.F., & Weschler, H.S. (1989). Ed Ashe reader on the history of higher education. MA: Ginn.
12. Gorton, R.A., & Snowden, P.E. (1993). School leadership and administration. WI: Brown & Benchmark.
13. Green, M.S. (1994). Not for cowards or wimps: Leadership in the post-heroic age. Educational Record, 61(3), 55-60.
14. Halpin, A.W. (1957). Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.
15. Hardman, T.M. (1996). A study of job satisfaction of female public school administrators in West Virginia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Morgantown, WV.
16. Hemphill, J.K. (1955). Leadership behavior associated with the administrative reputation of college departments. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 48(7), 385-401.
17. Kearney, R.C., & Hays, S.W. (1994). Labor-management relations and participative decision making: Toward a new paradigm. Public Administration Review, 54(1), 44-50.
18. Lucas, A. (1994). Strengthening departmental leadership: A team-building guide for chairs in colleges and universities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
19. Maslow, A.H. (1965). Eupsychian management. IL: Richard D. Irwin and The Dorsey Press.
20. McKee, J.G. (1990). Relationship between community college presidents' leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater Beach, FL.
21. Milosheff, E. (1990). Factors contributing to job satisfaction at the community college. Community College Review, 18(1), 12-23.
22. Mohrman, A.M., Cooke, R.A., & Mohrman, S.A. (1978). Participation in decision making: A multidimensional perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14(1), 13-29.
23. Mohrman, A.M., Cooke, R.A., Mohrman, S.A., Duncan, R.B., & Zaltman, G. (1978). An assessment of a structural task approach to organizational development in a school system. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

24. Muchinsky, P.M. (1977). Organizational communication: Relationships to organizational climate and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20(4), 592-607.
25. Northouse PG (1997). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. USA:SAGE Publications.
26. Pearson CA (1991). An assessment of extrinsic feedback on participation, role perceptions, motivation, and job satisfaction in a self-managed system for monitoring group achievement. *Human Relations* 44(5): 517-537.
27. Pritchard, R.D., & Karasick, B.W. (1973) The effects of organizational climate on managerial job performance and job satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 9, 126-146.
28. Proffit, A.C. (1990). The relationship between locus of control and job satisfaction of Appalachian principals [CD ROM]. Abstract from: ProQuest File: Dissertation Abstracts Item: 9029346.
29. Rahim, M.A., & Afza, M. (2001). Leader power, commitment, satisfaction, compliance, and propensity to leave a job among U.S. accountants. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 133(5), 611-625.
30. Schneider, B. Gunnarson, S., & Wheeler, J. (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*, (pp. 53-68). New York: Lexington Books.
31. Stodgill, R.M. (1963). *Manual for the leadership behavior description questionnaire-form xii: An experimental approach*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University. College of Commerce and Administration.
32. Stodgill, R.M. (1970). *A review of research on the leadership behavior description questionnaire-xii*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press. College of Administrative Science.
33. Stordeur, S., D'hoore, W., & Vandenberghe, C. (2001). Leadership, organizational stress, and emotional exhaustion among nursing hospital staff. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 35(4), 533-542.
34. Tucker, M.L., Bass, B.M., & Daniel, L.G. (1992). Transformational leadership's impact on higher education satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort. In K. Clark (Ed.), *Impact on leadership*, (pp. 170-175). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
35. Um, M., & Harrison,, D.F. (1998). Role stressors, burnout, mediators, and job satisfaction: A stress-strain-outcome model and an empirical test. *Social Work Research*, 22(2), 100-116.
36. Wanous, J.P. (1974). A causal-correlational analysis of the job satisfaction and performance relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(2), 139-144.

*The Relationship between Leadership Styles of Hashemite
University Department Chairs and Job Satisfaction as
Reported by Department Faculty Members*

الأنماط القيادية لرؤساء الأقسام الأكاديمية وعلاقتها بالرضا الوظيفي
لأعضاء هيئة التدريس في الجامعة الهاشمية

37. Yukl, G.A. (1989). Leadership in organizations. NJ: Prentice-Hall.

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – Other

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor, as you think he should act. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe what an ideal leader ought to do in supervising his group.

Note: The term, “group,” as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which is supervised by the leader.

DIRECTIONS:

- a. READ each item carefully.
- b. THINK about how frequently the leader SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.
- c. DECIDE whether he (A) Always (B) Often, (C) Occasionally, (D) Seldom or (E) Never act as described by the item.
- d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you selected.

A = Always, B = Often, C = Occasionally, D = Seldom, E = Never

1	Do personal favors for group members	A	B	C	D	E
2	Make his attitudes clear to the group	A	B	C	D	E
3	Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group	A	B	C	D	E
4	Tryout his new ideas with the group	A	B	C	D	E
5	Slow to accept new ideas	A	B	C	D	E
6	Be easy to understand	A	B	C	D	E
7	Rule with an iron hand	A	B	C	D	E
8	Find time to listen to group members	A	B	C	D	E
9	Criticize poor work	A	B	C	D	E
10	Works without a plan	A	B	C	D	E
11	Speak in a manner not to be questioned	A	B	C	D	E
12	Keep to himself	A	B	C	D	E
13	Look out for the personal welfare of individual group members	A	B	C	D	E
14	Assign group members to particular tasks	A	B	C	D	E
16	Schedule the work to be done	A	B	C	D	E
17	Maintain definite standards of performance	A	B	C	D	E
18	Refuse to explain his action	A	B	C	D	E
20	Act without consulting the group	A	B	C	D	E
23	Treat all group members as his equals	A	B	C	D	E

24	Encourage the use of uniform procedures	A	B	C	D	E
26	Be willing to make changes	A	B	C	D	E
27	Make sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members	A	B	C	D	E
28	Be friendly and approachable	A	B	C	D	E
29	Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations	A	B	C	D	E
31	Make group members feel at ease when talking with them	A	B	C	D	E
32	Let group members know what is expected of them	A	B	C	D	E
34	Put suggestions made by the group into operation	A	B	C	D	E
35	See to it that group members are working up to capacity	A	B	C	D	E
38	Get group approval in important matters before going ahead	A	B	C	D	E
39	See to it that the work of group members is coordinated	A	B	C	D	E

MOHRMAN-COOKE-MOHRMAN JOB SATISFACTION SCALE

Indicate your level of satisfaction with various facets of your job by circling a number on the six-point scale after each of the statements.

	Items	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	The feeling of self-esteem or self-respect you get from being in your job						
2	The opportunity for personal growth and development in your job						
3	The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in your job						
4	Your present job when you consider the expectations you had when you took the job						
5	The amount of respect and fair treatment you receive from your superiors						
6	The feeling of being informed in your job						
7	The amount of supervision you receive						
8	The opportunity for participation in the determination of methods, procedures, and goals						