The Relationship between Leadership Styles and Employees' Job Satisfaction at Gambella Teachers' Education and Health Science College

Befekadu Zeleke [1] and Peter Obang [2]

Abstract: This study explored the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction of the academic staff at Gambella Teachers' Education and Health Science College. The study employed a correlational research design and included all the 79 academic staff members and 17 leaders. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and Job Satisfaction Survey were used to collect data. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviations and inferential statistics such as one-way ANOVA, Pearson correlation coefficient, and regression analysis. The results unveiled a positive and significant relationship between the transformational leadership style with all the nine facets of job satisfaction while the transactional leadership style had a positive but non-significant relationship. The regression analysis further revea[3]led that transformational and laissez-faire leaderships were better predictors of job satisfaction than transactional leadership. It was concluded that leaders who frequently employ transformational leadership motivate the academic staff better than the other two leadership styles. Policy implications are also forwarded in the study.

Background of the Study

Leadership style encompasses a wider range of terms. As some authors claim, leadership style is a combination of traits, skills, and behaviors that leaders use while they interact with subordinates (Lussier &Achua, 2010). Leadership styles exclusively focus on what leaders do and how

---

[1] Associate Professor, Department of Educational Planning and Management, College of Education and Behavioral Studies, Addis Ababa University

[2] Lecturer, Gambella Teachers Education and Health Science College

they behave (Northouse, 2011). Leadership style in an organization is one of the factors that play a significant role in enhancing or retarding the interest and commitment of the individuals in an organization (Ojokuku, Adebayo, and Sajuyigbe,2012).

Like leadership styles, job satisfaction is of paramount importance to an organization. One importance of job satisfaction is that it brings motivation among employees. Job satisfaction leads to high morale and goal achievement. Although the term job satisfaction has various definitions, in this study it refers to *the attitude and feelings people have about their work. Positive and favorable attitudes toward the job indicate job satisfaction. Negative and unfavorable attitudes towards the job indicate job dissatisfaction* (Armstrong, 2006, p. 264). It is an emotional response to one's tasks as well as to the physical and social conditions of the workplace. Absenteeism is likely to decrease when employees are satisfied. Satisfied employees also stay longer in the organization and an organization benefits by getting the return on investment. It is argued that organizational performance is largely based on job satisfaction (Bakotic,2016). That means employees' satisfaction plays a great role in the success of an organization. Satisfied employees are indeed more likely to be productive. So, in an organization where employees are satisfied, there is high productivity. Job satisfaction also leads to high-quality performances in organizations (Rajasekar & Bhuvaneswari, 2014; Garrg & Kaushik, 2013; Latif, et al 2013; Singh & Jain, 2013; Naseem, Ejaz& Malik, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

Many factors contribute to the effectiveness of an organization. Among the various factors, the leadership style employed by the leader and the job satisfaction of the employees could be mentioned (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Josanov-vrgovic & Pavlovic, 2014). Many leadership styles can be used by leaders. Yet, some of the styles may lead to satisfaction while others do not. (Bushra, Usman, and Naveed, 2011).

In today's fast-changing environment, satisfaction becomes much important as satisfied staff work harder and stay long in an organization. Job satisfaction is very important because satisfied employees perform better since they are likely to be absent less, show less job stress, stay at work longer, and so on. Job satisfaction, in turn, is also affected by different factors. According to Jossanov-Vrgovic and Pavlovic (2014), factors that affect job satisfaction include the nature of work, working conditions, personality and teacher behavior, demographic factors, interaction with students, teacher autonomy, culture, and climate of school and others. In addition to these pays, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, coworker and communication could be mentioned (Lamond and Spector, 1999). Therefore, educational institutions with satisfied teachers are more efficient and more productive than institutions with less satisfied or dissatisfied teaching staff. Various studies have been carried out to investigate the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction (See also Ali, Sidow, and Guleid, 2013; Asghar and Oino,2018, Herman and Chiu, 2014). The literature indicates a positive and significant relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction. Most of these studies focus on the advanced nations and there is a dearth of studies conducted in developing countries like ours. Hence, this study tries to fill in this research gap.

There are few studies conducted to examine the relationship between leadership styles and employees' job satisfaction in Ethiopia. One of these studies was conducted in leather companies by Bekele and Darshan in 2011 to see the effect of the transformational leadership style on job satisfaction. The findings of this study indicated that only two transformational leadership dimensions (idealized influence and individualized consideration) have significant effects on the job satisfaction of employees. This means other dimensions did not show a significant relationship with job satisfaction (Bekele and Darshan, 2011).

The second research was conducted at the College of Education of Addis Ababa University in 2010 by Fikadu. The researcher's focus was on the academic staff's job satisfaction and leadership styles of head

departments. The results of the study showed that there was a significant relationship between transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles and job satisfaction of academic staff. The study also indicated that there was a strong relationship between transactional and laissez-faire leadership style and intrinsic staff job satisfaction. However, there was no observed relationship between transformational leadership and intrinsic job satisfaction (Fikadu, 2010).

Another study was conducted by Nebiat and Asresash at Jima University specialized hospital in 2013. The study aimed at investigating nurse managers' leadership styles and nurses' job satisfaction. The findings show that job satisfaction was more related to transformational leadership than to transactional leadership style (Nebiat and Asresash, 2013). Still, other studies by Befekadu and Million (2020) on the perceived relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment in the Poly Technique Colleges of Addis Ababa City Administration and Befekadu and Feleke (2014) on the perceived relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment at Defense University were conducted in the capital, Addis Ababa and different in research settings from the current study. Although some attempts were made to examine if there were relationships between leadership style and job satisfaction by these researchers, they were limited to urban settings, and the peripheral areas such as Gambella regional state with different environmental and working conditions that affect employees' job satisfaction were ignored. The main purpose of this study is, therefore, to explore the relationship between the leadership style of leaders and employees' job satisfaction at Gambella Teachers' Education and Health Science College. As one of the researchers was from this region and a staff member of the college understudy, it was very easy to overcome these challenges and conduct the study. Hence, this study tries to fill this research gap. Therefore, this study was guided by the following basic questions.

- What is the dominant leadership style used by leaders as rated by the academic staff of the college using MLQ?
- What is the extent of the academic staff's job satisfaction as measured by JSS at Gambella College?
- How statistically significant are the relationships between the three leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) and each of the nine-job satisfaction sub-variables at Gambella College?

Review of the Literature

Leadership Style

Leadership is one of the widely defined and studied constructs in the literature and yet lacks a common definition or agreement among authorities so far. However, the significance of leadership for organizational effectiveness is well acknowledged. On top of this, different research efforts have such as (Nanjundeswaraswam and Swamy, 2014; Bogler 2001; Hunt 2010) been carried out to identify what makes some leaders more effective than others, and leadership style is one of the areas that received the attention of leadership researchers since 1950s. Since then, however, different styles of leadership were identified and developed at different times. However, the most recent styles of leadership: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire styles have received the attention of leadership researchers as they are highly relevant to bringing organizational change during this era of change (Yukl, 2013; Northouse, 2016).

Leadership style can be classified into a transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style (Arzi and Farahbod, 2014). The classification of leadership into transformational and transactional is based on component behaviors used to influence subordinates and the effects of the leader on the subordinates. Other leadership styles that are not treated here include distributed leadership, servant leadership,

authentic leadership, leader-member exchange theory, and many other styles.

Transformational Leadership Style

Transformational leadership can be defined as the process by which leaders transform and motivate followers by raising the awareness of the followers about the values of the organization (Jacobsen, 2013). Transformational leaders motivate others to do more than they originally intended and often even more than they thought possible (Bass &Riggio, 2006). Northouse (2013) described the term transformational leadership as the process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the followers. Transformational leaders pay attention to the needs of their followers and support them so that the subordinates reach their maximum potential.

According to Bass and Riggio (2006), transformational leadership can be taken as an expansion of transactional leadership. Instead of a simple exchange that may take place between the leader and followers, transformational leaders inspire followers to commit themselves to the common vision and goals of the agency, giving them challenging work, enhancing followers' leadership capacity. These types of leaders raise leadership to the next level. Such leaders encourage their subordinates to go beyond their self-interest for the common or organizational benefit (Jacobsen and House, 2001).).

For Arzi and Farahbod (2014), transformational leadership involves an attempt by the leader to influence the followers in a positive direction. A transformational leader motivates the followers so that they perform better than the intended level. The leader tries to influence the beliefs, attitudes, and values of the followers instead of just complying with existing ways of doing things. Transformational leadership is a process of inspiring change and empowering followers to enhance themselves

and their organization. This type of leadership encourages followers to accept their responsibilities and be accountable (Koehler &Pankowski in Marn, 2013). Bass and Riggio (2006) indicated that transformational leadership has much in common with charismatic leadership, but charisma is only part of transformational leadership. Critics of both charisma and transformational leadership have identified the bad side of charisma.

According to Bass and Riggio (2006), transformational leaders use one or more of the following core components of transformational leadership to achieve the maximum results possible. The four components are Idealized Influence (II), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individualized consideration (IC). Each of these four components is discussed in more detail below.

Idealized Influence (II): The first dimension of the transformational leadership style is idealized influence. It is also called charisma and is the emotional component of leadership (Northouse, 2013). This component tells us the behavior of a leader who acts as a role model for their followers. In this case, followers identify with their leaders and want to emulate them. Leaders are taken as people who have very high moral standards and ethical conduct. The leader is trusted and respected by the followers. The followers are regarded as having exceptional capabilities, persistence, and determination. Such leaders provide vision and a sense of mission, instill pride, gain respect and trust in people. Such leaders excite, arouse, and inspire their subordinates. Leaders of this kind emphasize trust, take stands on difficult issues, present their most important values, and stress the importance of purpose (Bass &Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2013; Bekele & Darshan, 2011; Hamidifar, 2010). According to Bass and Riggio (2006), there are two aspects of idealized influence. These are the leader's behaviors and the elements that are attributed to the leader by their followers. The behavioral component is based on how followers see the behavior of the leader. The attributional component relates to attribution made by the followers

about their leader based on their perceptions about him/her (Bass &Riggio, 2006; and Northouse, 20013)

Inspirational Motivation (IM): The second component of the transformational leadership style is inspirational motivation. According to Northouse (2013:185), inspirational motivation is *descriptive of leaders who communicate high expectations to followers, inspiring them through motivations to become committed to and a part of shared vision in the organization.* The leader motivates and inspires the followers by giving them challenges and meaning to their works. This dimension involves arousing team spirit. There are eagerness and positive thoughts. Leaders use symbols and emotional appeals so that their followers focus and commit themselves to achieve more than their self-interest. Leaders show enthusiasm and optimism. It involves *creating attractive future states* (Bass &Riggio, 2006; and Northouse, 2013)

Intellectual Stimulation (IS): The third component of the transformational leadership style is intellectual stimulation. Bass and Regio, (2006:7) defined intellectual stimulation as *increasing awareness and interest of employees of issues and advancing their capability to solve them.* The leader encourages followers to be creative and innovative by challenging the usual ways of doing things and reframing problems. In this case, much emphasis is given to creativity. There is *no public criticism of followers' mistakes.* There is no disapproval of followers' ideas as they are different from those of leaders. The leaders encourage their followers to tap opportunities to learn and find remedies to challenging problematic conditions. Followers' understanding of their problems and identification of their values and ethical standards are stimulated (Bass &Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2013)

Individualized Consideration (IC): The fourth and last dimension of transformational leadership is individualized consideration. Yammarino and Bass (1990) identified that leaders who use individualized consideration contribute to individual follower's achieving his/her fullest potential. This involves connecting the need of an individual follower to

the need of the organization he/she works for. The leader acts as a coach and mentor for their followers. The leader also encourages followers to do more. The followers' needs are given much attention so that they grow to their fullest potential possible. The leader is supportive of the individual and provides a supportive climate. According to Bass and Regio (2006:7), *the leaders may delegate to help followers grow through personal challenges.* New learning opportunities are created in individualized consideration. There is a recognition that an individual follower has distinct and separate needs that must be fulfilled. *Two-way communication is encouraged and 'Management by Walking Around' is practiced* (Bass and Regio, 2006:7). The leader also listens carefully to what their followers say. Though there is the monitoring of tasks delegated, the followers do not feel that they are being monitored. The monitoring is more systematic and more positive (Bass &Riggio, 2006; and Northouse, 2013)

Transactional Leadership Style

According to Bass and Riggio (2006), transactional leadership involves rewarding the followers by the leader, when the performance of the followers is to the expected level. Transactional leadership entails explaining how works are performed and that there will be a reward when the task is done well. A leader can interact with his/her subordinates by explaining how works are done and telling them that there are associated rewards (Avolio et al, 2003 cited in Hamidifar, 2010).

According to Bass (1997), transactional leadership theory was founded upon the idea that leader-follower relations were based on negotiation exchange and contractual dimensions (Bass and Regio (2006)). Transactional leadership also involves punishing employees who fail to meet the required standards. This idea coincides with the definition given by Jacobsen. According to Jacobsen (2013), transactional leadership is the *use of contingent rewards and sanctions intended to initiate that employees have a self-interest in achieving organizational goals*. This means that followers are rewarded when they act according to the

interest of the leader and punished when they do not act accordingly. Followers are supposed to obtain some kind of valued outcomes when they act in a way that is of interest to the leader. In this regard, Burns describes the style as a cost-benefit exchange process.

Transactional leadership also involves a balance between the needs of the people as well as the expectation or needs of the organization. Transactional leaders use rewards and punishments to gain compliance from followers, they accept goals, structure, and the culture of existing organizations (Odumeru & Ifeanyi, 2013). Transactional leaders call for an integration of the need of workers or followers with the expectation or needs of the organization or leaders. Jacobsen (2013) described that transactional leadership involves making sure that organizations are managed according to the plans and rules and regulations are obeyed.

Transactional leaders explain clearly the performance criteria to be met by the followers and when they are required in return. According to Long and Thean (2010), transactional leaders are expected to frequently communicate with their subordinates and clearly explain and guide the work of the followers to get work done. Researchers have identified three dimensions of transactional leadership. These are contingent rewards, management by exception (active), and management by exception (passive) (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Arzi and Farahbod, 2014; Northouse, 2013). According to Bass and Riggio (2006), contingent reward (CR) involves the leader assigning or obtaining follower agreement on what needs to be done with promised or actual rewards offered in exchange for satisfactorily carrying out the assignment. It is an exchange of a reward system that takes place between the leader and the followers. When the followers perform above the expected level they are going to get rewards. A contingent reward is an exchange process that occurs between leader and followers where the effort of the followers is exchanged for a determined reward. An agreement of the followers is required by the leader regarding what must be accomplished and what benefits the people will get as a result of the accomplishment of the expected task. A contingent reward is taken as a constructive

transaction. It is described as a continuous and positive exchange with followers. This dimension has been effective in motivating followers to accomplish higher-order development and performance. However, it is indicated that contingent reward is not effective like transformational components (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Avolio, Bass and Jung, 1999; Bass, 1997).

The second dimension of transactional leadership is Management by Exception. This dimension is categorized into two as Management by Exception Active (MBE-A) and Management by Exception Passive (MBE-P) (Northouse, 2013). Some authorities consider this as one whereas others into two different dimensions. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), Management by Exception is called a corrective transaction. When it is compared to the contingent reward or the components of transformational leadership, it tends to be ineffective. In MBE-A the leaders are supposed to monitor deviances from errors, mistakes, and standards and then take corrective action when it happens. Under certain conditions, MBE-A may be effective. (Bass &Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2013; Arzi and Farahbod, 2014)

Management-by-Exception Passive (MBE-P) involves waiting for mistakes errors and deviances. That means there is no intervention until there are clear mistakes. When discrepancies occur the subordinates are punishment for their actions. It is usually appropriate to use passive Management-by-Exception (MBE-P) when a leader is responsible for supervising a great number of subordinates (Northouse, 2013; Bass&Riggio, 2006; Hamidifar, 2010; Bass, 1997).

Laissez-faire Leadership Style

According to Hamidifar (2010), the laissez-faire leadership style is an inactive kind of leadership where the exchange between the leader and the follower is absent. In this kind of leadership style, the necessary decisions are avoided. Others describe such a leadership style as an absence of leadership. In this kind of leadership style, the responsibility

is left to the followers. Managers avoid giving feedback. The satisfaction of the followers is given less attention. Researches show that this leadership style is the most ineffective and inactive kind of leadership style (Bass &Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2013, Long &Thean, 2011).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one of the areas that has been widely researched and yet one of the complex ones (Lumley et al, 2011). Different writers have identified factors that are conducive to job satisfaction. Luthans (2005) and Robbins (1998) (cited in Sattar, Narwaz & Khan, 2012) identified such factors as work, pay, promotion, supervision, coworkers, and environment. Such factors determine the job satisfaction of employees in an organization Chahal, et al. (2013) on their part identified factors related to workspaces as influencing job satisfaction. Such factors include building design, air quality and temperature, noise and lighting, and others. Other factors mentioned by the researchers are the nature of the job, working promotional methods, performance appraisal, and relationship with other employees and management, grievance handling, and so on.

Sowmya and Panhanatham (2011) also identified factors such as supervision behavior, coworker behavior, pay and promotion, job and working condition, and organizational aspect. The study further unveiled factors such as sex, age, education, salary, and experience that are found to influence the job satisfaction of employees. In a study conducted by Ghafoor (2012), male staffs are more satisfied as compared to females. Moreover, an increase in rank, qualification and salary resulted in increased job satisfaction. The findings of the researcher also showed that permanent staff is more satisfied than those who are not. In addition to this, staff with Ph.D. degrees were found to be more satisfied than the staff with lower degrees.

According to Sageer, Rafat, and Agarwal (2012), variables that determine employee satisfaction were categorized into two: personal and organizational variables. Personal variables include personality, expectation, age, education, and gender differences. Perception, attitudes, and learning of an employee have much impact on the job satisfaction of the individual employee. Another personal factor mentioned by the writers is the expectation of the employee. For instance, employees that receive more than she/he expected is highly satisfied. Age also determines the satisfaction of employees. Hence, younger employees are more satisfied than older ones as the former has a high energy level. The researchers also identified that women are more likely to be satisfied than males in the same job. Different studies, (for instance, Sageer, Rafat & Agarwal, 2012, Rajasekar & Bhuvaneswari, 2014), came up with the findings that leadership style affects job satisfaction.

Spector (1994) identified nine facets of job satisfaction that determine employees 'satisfaction. The nine factors are pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. Spector's model is more appropriate than other models to explore elements of employees' job satisfaction and is used in this study.

Pay: This facet of job satisfaction relates to the pay or pay raise of an employee. Although money has some credit for humans, having enough may not necessarily mean that the individual is satisfied. However, the results of many studies show that pay can significantly affect the overall job satisfaction of employees (Lumley et al, 2011). Although many people do take pay as a motivator, some researchers still recognize that unfair pay leads to unhappiness and a low pace of performance. For instance, salary and wage are being mentioned to be one-factor affecting job satisfaction (Rajasekar & Bhuvaneswari, 2014). But not all people need pay to work. What employees need related to pay is the feeling of fairness (Kumari, 2011). When employees feel that their pay is equitable and fair, they tend to be more satisfied (Singh & Jain, 2013).

Promotion: Here promotion refers to the chances for advancements that are made available for subordinates within an organization. Literature indicates that promotion gives a chance for personal growth, more responsibilities, and increased social status (Lumley et al, 2011). According to Singh and Jain (2013), the opportunity for promotion determines the degree of satisfaction of employees. This indicates the great importance of promotion for the satisfaction of the employee.

Supervision: This relates to the idea that when the immediate supervisor if friendly, praise subordinates, listen to employees' opinion, and are more interested in their subordinates, job satisfaction if more likely to increase (Lumley et al, 2011). According to Rajasekar and Bhuvaneswari (2014), how supervisors treat their subordinates highly affects the satisfaction of those subordinates.

*Fringe Benefits***:** Fringe benefit here refers to both monitory and non-monitory benefits that an organization is ready to offer to its employees. Fringe benefits can be intrinsic or extrinsic. Organizations can increase the commitment and performance of staff by making available fringe benefits that are regarded as important by the staff (Lumley et al. 2011).

Contingent Rewards: This stands for appreciation, recognition, and rewards for appropriate work done by the subordinates. When employees feel that they are not rewarded according to their contributions, they are more likely to be dissatisfied leading to low commitment thereby low productivity (Lumley et al, 2011).

Working Conditions: The working condition has been used interchangeably with an operating condition in the literature. The term refers to the policies and procedures used in an organization. Some procedures may be too tight that flexibility is impossible when needed. This may lead to dissatisfaction among the employees (Lumley et al, 2011). Employees become more satisfied when wanted or respected (Kumari, 2011). The working condition also refers to the environment in

which employees are working. It gives employees a feeling of safety, comfort, and motivation (Singh and Jain, 2013).

Coworker: Coworker relates to having coworkers who are friendly and supportive of each other. Having such coworkers brings satisfaction among the subordinates. The reverse will be true if there are no such kinds of coworkers (Lumley et al, 2011).

Nature of Work: The nature of work refers to the type of work done. When employees are mentally challenged by their work, provided with a variety of tasks and freedom, and the opportunity to develop their skills and abilities and feedback, they are more likely to be satisfied with their job (Lumley et al, 2011).

Communication: Here communication includes both formal and informal communication within the organization. Effectiveness within an organization brings motivation and commitment thereby resulting in increased job satisfaction (Lumley et al, 2011). Communication is related to satisfaction both at the personal and at an organizational level. Lack of effective communication prevents an organization from achieving its goal (Kumari, 2011).

Relationship between Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction

Various studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction. One of these studies was conducted by Razi and his associates in 2013 at Islamic Azad University among physical education organization employees. The findings of this study revealed that there was a strong relationship between leadership style sub-variables and factors of job satisfaction. While job satisfaction was positively related to transformational and transactional leadership styles, it was negatively related to laissez-faire leadership styles (Rizi et al, 2013). A study by Hamidifar (2010) conducted in the same university revealed that the sub-variables of transformational leadership styles

were positively related to all the job satisfaction factors while the laissez-faire leadership style had a negative relationship with job satisfaction.

A study from Malaysia conducted by Ahmad et al. (2013) indicated that the transformational leadership style was related to employees' job satisfaction. However, another study conducted in the same country by Long et al, (2014) showed that the relationship between most transformational leadership factors and job satisfaction was insignificant except individualized consideration that had a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction.

Hanaysha and his associates researched the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. The results showed that intellectual stimulation was positively related to job satisfaction while individualized consideration was negatively related to job satisfaction. On top of this, this study indicated that inspirational motivation had no relationship with job satisfaction (Hanaysha, et al, 2012). The results of a study conducted by Marn (2012) in Kuala Lumpur came up with similar same findings to the above studies.

A similar study on the effects of transformational leadership on employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the banking sector of Lahore (Pakistan) revealed a positive relationship between transformational leadership style and employees' job satisfaction (Bushra, Usman, and Naveed, 2011). Other studies conducted on the impact of transformational leadership on job satisfaction and self-perceived performance of employees in Jordan, Greece, and Egypt showed significant relationships between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction (Belias & Koustelios, 2014; Metwally, 2014). From the above discussions, it could be generalized that the relationship between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction was positive, strong, and significant while the relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction was strong, significant but negative. Yet, most of the findings on the

transactional leadership style indicated a positive but non-significant relationship with job satisfaction.

Conceptual Framework of the Study

This conceptual framework is mainly developed based on Bass and Riggio's (2006) and others' writings that leadership style influences job satisfaction. The model shows that three leadership styles of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire are related to job satisfaction. There are five dimensions of transformational leadership style namely idealized influence (behavior), idealized influence (attributed), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. It is assumed that each of these styles relates to job satisfaction in a certain way. There are also three dimensions of transactional leadership style: contingent rewards, management by exception (active), and management by exception (passive) that relate to job satisfaction. Besides, the laissez-faire leadership style is also assumed related to job satisfaction of the academic staff as measured by pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, recognition, operating procedure, co-worker, nature of work, and communication. In this model, the leadership styles are regarded as independent variables and facets of job satisfaction are taken as dependent variables.

Independent variable   **Dependent variable**

Transformational Leadership style
- Idealized Influence (behavior)
- Idealized Influence (attributed)
- Intellectual Stimulation
- Inspirational Motivation
- Individualized Consideration

Transactional Leadership style
- Contingent Reward
- Management by Exception (Active)
- Management by Exception (Passive)

Laissez-faire leadership style

- Pay
- Promotion
- Supervision
- Fringe Benefits
- Contingent rewards
- Working Conditions
- Co-worker
- Nature of the Work
- Communication

Figure 1: The Conceptual Framework

Operational Definition

Leadership Style: in this study it refers to a pattern of behavior that leaders display at Gambella Teachers' Education and Health Science College and measured by computing the mean ratings of respondents using a Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio's (1995)

Job Satisfaction: in this study, it refers to the attitude and feelings employees at Gambella Teachers' Education and Health Science College have on their work and is measured by computing the mean

ratings of respondents using the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) developed by Paul Spector.

Research Methodology

The Research Setting

Gambella People's National State is one of the regions in Ethiopia. Gambella is located to the west of the country. The region covers 34,063 km^2. There is one college that prepares primary school teachers and health workers (clinical nurses, laboratory technicians, and health workers). The college was established as a Teachers' Training Institution (TTI) in 1990/91 with 382 students. In 1997, the college started a two-year training in the evening program and in 1998 it started the regular program. In the 2014/15 academic year, the total number of students admitted was 833. In the same academic year, the college has graduated 1052 students in three programs: regular, evening, and summer (Action Plan of Adaptive to Climate Change, 2011; GTEHSC strategic plan, 2011).

Research Design

The research design used was correlational design since the study aimed at examining the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction.

Sampling Techniques

The study used a census where all the leaders at different levels used purposive sampling and all members of the academic staff who were on duty during the 2014/2015 academic year were included in the study using availability sampling. Since the total number of staff, both leaders and other staff members were too small to manage and collect data all of them were included in the study. The list of all the academic staff members was taken from the core process owner of the College.

Data Gathering Tools

To gather data from leaders and academic staff members, two standardized questionnaires were used. The first questionnaire known as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was used to gather primary data from both the leaders and the academic staff. MLQ was developed by Bass and Avolio in 1995. In this study, the revised MLQ 5X-short consisting of 36 items designed based on the Full Range Leadership Model was used to assess leadership behaviors of leaders as suggested by the developers. 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 represent transformational leadership behavior. Three of the factors 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 a 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 is reported that the reliability of MLQ was above 0.80 (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Besides, the validity of the tool was also tested revealing that it is valid. Other studies revealed that the reliability of MLQ is Cronbach's alpha of >.90 (Avolio and Bass cited in Hamidifar, 2009; Antonakis, 2001). Moreover, the current reliability of the

instrument was computed and range from .71 to .89. This shows that the level of reliability of the questionnaire was acceptable.

The second questionnaire used was the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) developed by Paul Spector, a professor of psychology at the University of South Florida. According to Spector (2011), JSS is used to assess the feelings of the employees towards nine facets of job satisfaction about their job related to pay, 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. So, 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 0.69 for reward and 0.90 for co-workers and nature of work sections showing the reliability of the questionnaire used for the study. The items in both instruments were translated into Amharic and contextualized to the local setting by rephrasing some of the items where necessary.

Data Analysis

To analyze the quantitative data, Statistical Packages for Social Science (SPSS) version 20.0 was employed. Mean and the standard deviation was computed to explore the dominant leadership style and the status of academic staff job satisfaction. To investigate the relationship or association between leadership styles and facets of job satisfaction, a correlational analysis was used. In this study, simple linear regression was used to examine how much job satisfaction was predicted by leadership style. Thus, a two-tailed Pearson correlation coefficient was used to identify the existence, strength, and direction of the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction sub-variables (facets). According to Dunn (2001), a correlation coefficient (r) between 0.00 and 0.19 is very weak. If the correlation coefficient ranges from 0.20 to 0.39 it is weak. A correlation coefficient between .40 and .59 shows a moderate relationship. If the correlation coefficient is 0.60 to 0.79 it is strong. Very strong is a correlation coefficient between 0.80 and 1.00. On top of this, Spector (2011) suggested that the six scales in Job Satisfaction Survey ranging from 1 to 6 could be recoded into three average scores where an average score ranging from 1 to 3 analyzed as dissatisfied, an average score ranging from 3 to 4 as ambivalent (neutral) and 4 to 6 as satisfied (Bateh and Heyliger, 2014). Accordingly, the interpretation of data on employees' satisfaction was based on this category to analyze the data collected through JSS.

Results and Discussions

Leadership Style of Leaders as Rated by Respondents

Table 1: **Mean Scores on the dimensions of Leadership Style**

Dimension	Code	N	Min.	Max.	M	SD
Transformational Leadership	**TF**	**93**	**1.10**	**3.85**	**1.70**	**.65**
Idealized influence (Attributed)	IA	93	0.75	4.00	1.71	0.68
Idealized influence (Behavior)	IB	93	1.00	4.00	1.73	0.65
Inspirational motivation	IM	93	0.75	3.75	1.68	0.70
Intellectual stimulation	IS	93	0.50	4.00	1.66	0.76
Individualized consideration	IC	93	0.75	3.75	1.73	0.65
Transactional Leadership	**TA**	**93**	**1.50**	**2.83**	**2.02**	**0.27**
Contingent rewards	CRL	93	1.00	2.50	1.41	0.39
Management by Exception(Active)	MBEA	93	1.00	3.50	2.55	0.57
Management by Exception (Passive)	MBEP	93	1.25	3.00	2.10	0.37
Laissez-faire Leadership	**LZ**	**93**	**0.00**	**3.50**	**2.32**	**0.76**

From the data in the above table, the highest mean score was that of Management by Exception-active (M= 2.55, SD= 0.57) followed by laissez-faire leadership (M= 2.32, SD= 0.76). The third highest mean score was that of Management by Exception-passive (M= 2.10, SD= 0.37). Based on the recommendation of the developers (a mean rating for transformational leadership is 3.00, while for transactional leadership 2.50 and laissez-faire around 1.00). From the above mean ratings, therefore, the dominant leadership style is nearer to the transactional leadership style than the other two styles. Among all the dimensions of transformational leadership styles, individualized consideration had the highest mean score (1.73, SD= 0.65) followed by idealized influence (attributed) (1.72, SD= 0.68). The mean score of individualized consideration was 1.73 while that of idealized influence was 1.72. This shows that the transactional leadership style seems the dominant style over the other two styles.

The above table also portrays the mean scores for leadership styles along with their corresponding standard deviations. The minimum scale for the transformational leadership style was 1.10 whereas the maximum

scale was 3.85. The mean score for the transformational leadership style was 1.70 (SD= .65). The mean score of transformational leadership style dimensions ranges from 1.66 to 1.73 with intellectual stimulation with the lowest mean score (M= 1.66, SD= 0.76) while individualized consideration and idealized influence had the highest mean score (M= 1.73, SD= 0.65) each. However, Bass and Avolio (1997) suggested that the ideal mean score required for good leadership is greater than 3 for all the dimensions of transformational leadership style. From this one can say that the leadership style of leaders at the Gambella Teachers Education and Health Science College was very far from being transformational. Having transformational leaders in an organization is particularly essential in today's fast-changing environment. Transformational leaders are necessary because they motivate others to work beyond what they think is possible. Transformational leadership is about motivating and raising the morals of both the leader and the followers. Such leaders pay great attention to the need and interests of those whom they lead. They strive to support their followers to reach their fullest potential (Bass, 1997; Northouse, 2013; Bass and Riggio, 2006).

Data in Table 1 further showed that the minimum scale for transactional leadership style was 1.50 while the maximum scale was 2.83 while the average mean score was 2.02 (SD= 0.27), a little bit greater than the ideal mean of 2.00. This indicates that the transactional leadership style was the dominant leadership style in the college. From the dimensions of transactional leadership style contingent reward had the lowest mean score (M= 1.41, SD= .39), and Management by Exception (Active) had the highest mean score (M= 2.55, SD= 0.57). The results of this study were contrary to what was suggested by Bass and Avolio for effective leadership. These writers suggested that the mean score for contingent reward should be greater than 2. The suggested mean score for Management by Exception (Active) was less than 1.5 and for Management by Exception (Passive) was less than 1. In line with this, the styles can also be arranged based on effectiveness. The arrangement according to effectiveness is transformational, contingent

rewards, Active Management by Exception, Passive Management by Exception, and Laissez-faire leadership. That means all the dimensions of transformational leadership are equally important for effectiveness (Bass, 1997). In the literature, it is indicated that contingent reward is transformational when the reward can be psychological such as praise (Bass and Riggio, 2006). That means, when leaders frequently use psychological rewards, the subordinates become motivated and do more. But the findings of this research showed that contingent reward was not usually used in the college. Instead, leaders used Management by Exception most frequently. Leaders that use Management by Exception give negative feedback, corrective criticism, and negative reinforcement (Northouse, 2013). This leads to say that leaders in the college were not effective.

The above table also showed that laissez-faire leadership had a minimum scale of 0.0 and a maximum scale of 3.50. The mean score for laissez-faire leadership in this study was 2.32 (SD= 0.76) while the mean score suggested by Bass and Avolio (1999) for laissez-faire leadership must be less than 1 to be effective. As a result, it is found that leaders at GTEHSC were not effective in their leadership style since the mean score for a laissez-faire leadership style was much greater than 1. In general, the above data disclosed that leaders at Gambella Teachers' Education and Health Science College emphasized Management by Exception dimension (both active and passive) and laissez-faire leadership style. So, they were more transactional leaders and tend to leave subordinates to work by themselves. Although there are some conditions under which laissez-faire style is needed, such as having many people who report to one, it should not be emphasized under conditions in the college where different initiatives are being undertaken to embark on change and transformation.

Level of Academic Staff's Job Satisfaction at the College as rated by Respondents

As indicated in the data of Table 2, nine facets of job satisfaction were rated by respondents. They were pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, working conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. A critical examination of the data in the table showed that the lowest scale for job satisfaction sub-variables was 1.25 and the maximum scale was 5.25. The mean score for coworkers was 3.52 (SD= 0.83) and it was the highest mean score among all the other facets of job satisfaction. The next highest mean score from the sub-variables was that of the nature of work with a mean score of 3.46 (SD= 0.74). The third highest mean score was that of pay (M= 3.31, SD= 0.85) while the fourth highest mean score belonged to promotion (M= 3.11, SD= 0.77) with the lowest mean score for that of communication (M= 1.82, SD= 0.21). The remaining job satisfaction facets had mean scores between 2 and 3. According to the above-average mean scores, four of the job satisfaction sub-variables such as coworkers, nature of work, pay, and promotion fell within the ambivalent category. This means the academic staff members were hesitant to decide whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied with these job satisfaction sub-variables. All the other sub-variables had a mean score between 1 and 3 which showed that the academic staff members were dissatisfied with supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, and communication. The mean scores for the overall job satisfaction fell within the range of 1 to 3 implying that the academic staff feels dissatisfied with their current work. Another way of approaching the data is based on Herzberg's job satisfaction theory. Based on this theory, the satisfaction of academic staff with the nature of work was moderate (M= 3.46, SD= 0.74) but it was low for contingent rewards (M= 2.15, SD= 0.37). Regarding their dissatisfaction with hygiene factor, it showed they were dissatisfied with working condition (M= 2.33, SD= 0.57), communication (M= 1.82, SD= 0.21), supervision (M= 2.53, SD= 0.50).

Table 2: Extent of Academic Staff's Job Satisfaction

Dimension	Code	Valid (N)	Min.	Max.	M	SD
Overall Job Satisfaction	**JS**	**77**	**2.17**	**3.83**	**2.77**	**.51**
Coworker	CW	77	2.00	5.25	3.52	.83
Nature of work	NW	77	2.25	5.00	3.46	.74
Pay	PA	77	2.00	5.25	3.31	.86
Promotion	PR	77	1.75	5.00	3.11	.77
Fringe benefits	FB	77	1.75	4.50	2.68	.74
Supervision	SU	77	1.75	3.50	2.53	.50
Working conditions	WC/OC	77	1.50	5.00	2.33	.57
Contingent reward	CRJ	77	1.50	3.25	2.15	.37
Communication	CM	77	1.25	2.00	1.82	.21

Relationship between Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction

As indicated in Table 3, the relationship between transformational leadership style and the nine facets of job satisfaction indicated moderate, positive, and significant relationships for six of the facets: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, working condition, and communication with (r= .586, .529,.594,.573, .440 and .399 p<.01) respectively as perceived by respondents. However, the transformational leadership style had high, positive, and significant relationships with the remaining three facets of job satisfaction: contingent reward, coworkers, and nature of work with (r=.612, .709, .608, p<.01) respectively as perceived by respondents. The finding is consistent with the finding by Hamidifar (2010) that stated transformational leadership style has a significant relationship with recognition or contingent reward.

According to data presented in Table 3 the relationship between transactional leadership style and the nine facets of job satisfaction indicated significant and positive relationships with three of the facets: contingent reward, communication, and nature of work where the first two had moderate relationships while the latter had slightly weak relationships with (r=.503,.298, .294,p< 0.01). But the relationship was non-significant for the remaining six facets of job satisfaction with very

weak and weak strengths of relationships. These facets were: pay, promotion and supervision with (r= .223,.202, .204, p> 0.01) respectively and weak relationships while fringe benefits, coworker and working conditions with (r= .184,.181, .190, p> 0.01) respectively and very weak relationship. These findings contradict the findings of Hamidifar (2010) that came up with a non-significant relationship between transactional leadership style and job facets.

Data in table 3 below further indicated the relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and the nine facets of job satisfaction. Accordingly, the relationships indicated negative, moderate, and significant relationships with four of the job satisfaction facets of pay, promotion, supervision, and communication with (r = -.427,-.435,-.408, -.414 p<.01) respectively, while negative, weak, and significant relationships with four of the job satisfaction facets of fringe benefits, contingent reward, coworkers and nature of work with (r= -.383,-.369,-.249,-.324,p<.05) respectively and finally weak, negative and non-significant relationship with working conditions. In general, the relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and the job satisfaction facets was negative for all the nine facets meaning the style was inversely related to employees' job satisfaction as perceived by respondents of the study.

As indicated in Table 3, the relationship between the overall leadership style and the nine facets of job satisfaction was positive, weak but significant (r = .329, p<.01). This result is consistent with the findings of researches that came up with a positive and significant relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction (Rizi et al, 2013; Fikadu, 2010).

Table 3: Relationship between Leadership Styles and Facets of Job Satisfaction

		TF	TA	LZ	PA	PR	SU	FB	CRJ	WC	CW	NW	CM
TF	PC	1.000											
	Sig. (2tailed)												
	N	93											
TA	PC	.150	1.000										
	Sig.(2tailed)	.151											
	N	93	93										
LZ	PC	-.914	.091	1.000									
	Sig.(2tailed)	.000	.387										
	N	93	93	93									
PA	PC	.586**	.223	-.427**	1.000								
	Sig.(2tailed)	.000	.051	.000									
	N	77	77	77	77								
PR	PC	.529**	.202	-.435**	.810**	1.000							
	Sig.(2tailed)	.000	.078	.000	.000								
	N	77	77	77	77	77							
SU	PC	.594**	.204	-.408**	.780**	.772**	1.000						
	Sig.(2tailed)	.000	.076	.000	.000	.000							
	N	77	77	77	77	77	77						
FB	PC	.573**	.184	-.383**	.749**	.741**	.805**	1.000					
	Sig.(2tailed)	.000	.108	.001	.000	.000	.000						
	N	77	77	77	77	77	77	77					
CRJ	PC	.709**	.503**	-.369**	.443**	.406**	.406**	.470**	1.000				
	Sig.(2tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000					
	N	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77				
WC	PC	.440**	.190	-.209	.642**	.677**	.697**	.781**	.284**	1.000			
	Sig.(2tailed)	.000	.098	.068	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000				
	N	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77			
CW	PC	.612**	.181	-.249*	.771**	.697**	.809**	.781**	.425**	.747**	1.000		
	Sig.(2tailed)	.000	.114	.029	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000			
	N	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77		
NW	PC	.608**	.294**	-.324**	.684**	.631**	.716**	.768**	.494**	.727**	.845**	1.000	
	Sig.(2tailed)	.000	.009	.004	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		
	N	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	
CM	P.C.	.399**	.298**	-.414**	.482**	.517**	.447**	.419**	.294**	.370**	.453**	.402**	1.000
	Sig.(2tailed)	.000	.008	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77

** p< 0.01, * p< 0.05   Note: PC = Pearson Correlation

Table 4: Correlation between overall Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction

		Leadership Style	Overall Job Satisfaction
Overall Leadership Style	PC	1	.329**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.003
	N	93	77
Overall Job Satisfaction	PC	.329**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	
	N	77	77

** p< 0.01

Table 5: Linear Regression Analysis of the three Leadership Styles

No.	Leadership Style	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Sig	Beta	F
1	TF	.674**	.454	.446	.000	.674**	62.30
2	TA	.266*	.071	..058	.019	.266*	5.71
3	LZ	.418**	.175	.164	.000	-.418**	15.89

    a.   Predictor Variable: leadership style (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire)
    b.   Dependent Variable: Overall Job Satisfaction

** p< 0.01, * p< 0.05

As data in the above table indicated,45% of the change in job satisfaction was due to transformational leadership while the remaining 55% was due to other variables not included in the model. The results showed that there was a moderate and statistically significant relationship between the two variables (Beta= .674, F (1, 75) = 62.30, p<.01). This finding is consistent with the result of a study by Bushra, Usman, and Naneed (2011), which revealed that 42% of the change in overall job satisfaction was due to transformational leadership. A study carried out by Stumpf in

2003 also showed that transformational leadership was a good predictor of job satisfaction (Stumpf, 2003). However, a study carried out by Ali and Dahie (2015) in Somalia revealed that transformational leadership styles are responsible only for a 14% change in job satisfaction.

The regression analysis of transactional leadership and overall job satisfaction, on the other hand, showed that only 7% of the change in the overall job satisfaction was due to transactional leadership while 93% change was due to other variables. The results showed that there was a weak but statistically significant relationship between the variables (Beta= .266, F (1, 75) = 5.71, p<.05). This result is also consistent with some other findings that transactional leadership is not a good predictor of overall job satisfaction (Stumpf, 2003).

According to data on the regression analysis of laissez-faire leadership and the overall job satisfaction, 18% of the change in the overall job satisfaction results from laissez-faire leadership while the remaining 82% was due to unexplained variables. The results indicated that the relationship between the two variables was moderate and statistically significant (Beta= -.418, F (1, 75) = 15.89, p<.01). The result of this study is against the findings of a study conducted in Somalia by Ali and Dahie (2015). Their result showed that a 47.3% change in job satisfaction was due to the laissez-faire leadership style (Ali and Dahie, 2015).

Table 6: Model Summary of Multiple Regressions

Model	R	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.709	.502	.482	.37825

a. Predictors: (constant), transformational, transactional, laissez-faire

Multiple regression was conducted to examine the best combination of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles for

predicting job satisfaction. The table showed that the combination of the three leadership styles significantly predicted job satisfaction, $F(3, 73) = 24.55$, $p<0.01$. Of the three leadership styles, transformational leadership ($p<0.01$) and laissez-faire leadership ($p< 0.05$) significantly contributed to the prediction. But transactional leadership did not contribute much to prediction ($p > 0.05$). The R squared value for a combination of the three styles was found to be 0.502. This denotes that 50.2% of the change in job satisfaction was predicted by a combination of the three leadership styles.

Table 7: ANOVA Table of Multiple Regression

ANOVA					
Model	Sum of squares	df.	Mean squared	F	sig.
Regression	10.54	3	3.51	24.55	.000
Residual	10.45	73	.14		
Total	20.98	76			

    a.   Dependent variable: Job Satisfaction
    b.   Predictors: (constant), transformational, transactional, laissez-faire

Table 8: Correlation Coefficient of Leadership Styles and the overall Job Satisfaction Facets

		B	Std. error	Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(constant)	1.95	0.82		2.38	0.020
	Transformational	1.51	0.23	0.59	6.55	0.000
	Transactional	0.08	0.18	0.04	.45	0.653
	Laissez-faire	-0.58	0.22	-0.22	-2.56	0.012

    a.   Dependent variable: Overall Job Satisfaction

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Findings

The finding showed that the transactional leadership style was the dominant style because one of its dimensions, Management by Exception (Active), had the highest mean followed by laissez-faire leadership. The results of this study further signposted that the academic staff members were not satisfied with fringe benefits, working conditions, supervision, contingent rewards, and communication but neutral on a coworker, nature of work, pay, and promotion.

The findings on the relationship between the leadership styles and facets of job satisfaction revealed a statistically significant and positive relationship between transformational leadership style and all the nine facets of job satisfaction. This means that frequent use of the transformational leadership style leads to employees' satisfaction with all the facets of job satisfaction. However, there was a negative and statistically significant relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and almost all facets of job satisfaction (except working conditions). The only working condition did not show a significant relationship with a laissez-faire leadership style. From this, it can be concluded that frequent use of laissez-faire leadership style leads to low satisfaction with eight facets of job satisfaction. There was a positive but non-significant relationship between transactional leadership style and job satisfaction (except contingent rewards, nature of work, and communication). Contingent reward, nature of work, and communication showed a significant relationship with transactional leadership. This showed that the use of transactional leadership does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction as most facets did not have a significant relationship with it.

The findings on the overall leadership style and job satisfaction designated a positive and statistically significant relationship. The results of simple regression divulged that transformational leadership predicts a

45% change in job satisfaction, laissez-faire leadership style predicted an 18% change in job satisfaction but transactional leadership was not found to be a good predictor of job satisfaction, though it seemed statistically significant. The results of multiple regression further unveiled that the combination of the three leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) significantly predicted job satisfaction where a 50% change in job satisfaction was explained by the three leadership styles.

Conclusions

Today's fast-changing environment needs leaders who are creative, visionaries, and capable of dealing with turbulent change rather than those who just engage in a material exchange between leaders and followers. It calls for leaders who empower followers, set challenging expectations, and achieve higher performance. Leaders who are likely to succeed in such an environment are those who pay attention to the needs of the individual and personal development of employees and encourage followers to be creative and innovative. From the findings of this study, it can be concluded that if leaders of GTEHSC frequently use a transformational leadership style they will enhance the satisfaction of academic staff in the college since the academic staff preferred it. However, the college leaders did not use the leadership styles that the academic staff members prefer. This means the focus of leaders was mostly on the task elements instead of balancing between tasks and the human element.

In addition to this, the satisfaction of the academic staff seems to be endangered. They feel that college leaders did not pay attention to their needs. In general, the performance and productivity of academic staff could be lowered when the leadership styles dominantly used by leaders in the college were not preferred by the academic staff which may lead to job dissatisfaction.

Policy Implications

Since transformational leadership was not frequently used by the leaders of the college, the REB ought to design leadership development programs for college leaders through short term pieces of training, meetings, and workshops to enhance their capacity by focusing on the acquisition of knowledge and skills which will lead to increased competence

The result showed that the academic staff members were not satisfied with communication within the college. Therefore, deans of the college need to pay attention to communication, both formal and informal, by keeping the academic staff up-to-date with the available information through frequent meetings and by disseminating information through notices, letters, and posters. The results of decisions need to be disseminated to the subordinates. Moreover, deans and department heads in the college ought to listen attentively whenever speaking to the subordinates.

Since the academic staff members prefer a transformational leadership style, the leaders of the college ought to act as role models by being the first to do what needs to be done. They need to motivate the subordinates and act as a coach for the development of future leaders by delegating duties and engaging them in decision-making.

Other researchers who are interested to conduct a study in the same area are advised to focus on other factors such as demographic factors, to assess their impact on the leadership styles as well as job satisfaction. The influence of various factors on each other needs to be investigated to know what impacts more on the leadership styles and job satisfaction in the college as well as in schools in the region.

References

Ahmad, A., Adi, M., Noor, H., Rahman, A &Yushuang, T. (2013). The Influence of Leadership Style on Job Satisfaction among Nurses. *Asian Social Science*, Vol. 9, No. 9. pp.172-178.

Ali, A. and Dahie, A. (2015). Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction: Empirical Survey from Secondary Schools in Somalia. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences.* Vol. 5, No. 8. pp.84-96.

Ali, A. Y. S., Sidow, M. A. & Guleid, H. S. (2013) Leadership Styles And Job Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence From Mogadishu Universities. *European Journal of Management Sciences and Economics*, 1(1), 1-10.

Armstrong, M. (2006). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice.* 10th edition. London: Kogan Page Publishing.

Arzi, S. &and Farahbod, L. (2014). Relationship of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Style with Job Satisfaction. *Institute of Interdisciplinary Business Research*, Vol. 6., No. 3. pp 187-204.

Asghar, S., & Oino, I. (2018). Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction, *Market Forces*, 13(1), 1-13.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-Examining the Components Of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal Of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 72(4), 441-462.

Awamleh, R. (2004). The Impact of Transformational Leadership on Job Satisfaction and Self-Perceived Performance of Banking Employees: The Case of Jordan. *International Business and Economics Research Journal.* Vol. 3, No. 11. pp. 29-42.

Aziri, B. (2011). Job Satisfaction. A Literature Review.*Management Research and Practice*, Vol. 3, Issue 8, pp. 77-86.

Bakotic, D. (2016). Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Performance*. Journal of Economic Research.* Vol. 29, issue 1. pp. 118-130.

Bass, B. and Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational Leadership. (2nded.)* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Inc.

Bass, B. (1997). Does The Transactional-Transformational Leadership Paradigm Transcend Organizational And National Boundaries? *The American Psychological Association*, Vol. 52, No. 2, pp.130-139.

Bateh, J. and Heyliger, W. (2014). Academic Administrator Leadership Styles and the Impact on Faculty Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Leadership Education*, Vol. 3 No. 3 pp. 34-49.

Befekadu Zeleke and Million Bekele (2020). Perceived Relationship between Leadership Style and Organizational Commitment in the Poly Technique Colleges of Addis Ababa City Administration. *The Ethiopian Journal of Education.* Vol. XXXX No. 1, pp.187-222.

Befekadu Zeleke and Feleke Yeshitila (2014). Perceived Relationship Between Leadership Style and Organizational Commitment At Defense University. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences.*Vol.10, No. 2. pp.1-26.

Bekele Shibru and Darshan, G. (2011). Effects of Transformational Leadership on Subordinates Job Satisfaction In Leather Companies In Ethiopia. *International Journal of Business Management and Economics Research*. Vol. 2 No. 5. pp. 334-344.

Belias, D. & Koustelios, A. (2014). Transformational Leadership and Job Satisfaction in the Banking Sector: A Review. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 187-200.

Boateng, C. (2012). Leadership Styles and Effectiveness of Principals of Vocational-Technical Institutions in Ghana. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, Vol. 2, No. 3. pp 128-134.

Bogler R. (2001). The Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher Job Satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662–683.

Bushra, F., Usman, A. &Neveed, A. (20110. Effects of Transformational Leadership on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment In Banking Sector of Lahore (Pakistan). *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol.2 No. 18. pp 261-267.

Chahal, A., Chahal, S., Chowdhary, B. & Chahal, J. (2013). Job Satisfaction Among Bank Employees: An Analysis of The Contributing Variables Towards Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research,* Vol. 2, Issue 8. pp. 11-20.

Fikadu Mulugeta (2010). The Relationship Between Leadership Style and Staff Job Satisfaction at The College of Education, Addis Ababa University. *Ethiopian Journal of Education*, Volume 30, Number 1. pp 1-22.

Garr, A. & Kaushik, B. (2013). A Study of Job Satisfaction and Factors That Influence It: An Analysis of Branded Ready Made Apparel Industry. *International Journal of Organizational Behavior & Management Perspective,* Volume 2, Number 2. pp. 256-268.

Ghafoor, M. (2012). Role of Demographic Characteristics on Job Satisfaction. *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business,* Vol. 6, No. 1. pp. 30-45.

Hamidifar, F. (2010). A Study of The Relationship Between Leadership Style and Employee Job Satisfaction of Islamic Azad University In Tehran, Iran, *AU-GSBE e-Journal.*Vol.3, No.1.pp:45-57.

Hanaysha.J. Khalid,K., NikMat, N. Sarassina, F. Abraham. Bin Zakaria, A. (2012). Transformational Leadership and Job satisfaction. *American Journal of Economics, Scientific and Academic Publishing. Special Issue. pp. 145-148.*

Herman, H., & Chiu, W. C. (2014). Transformational Leadership And Job Performance: A Social Identity Perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(1), 2827-2835.

Hoyle, J. (2012). Leadership Styles. *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hui, H. (2013). Principal's Leadership Style And Teacher Job Satisfaction: A Case Study In China. Interdisciplinary *Journal of Contemporary Research in Business* 5, No 4. pp.175-184.

Hunt, J. (2010) Leadership Style Orientations of Senior Executives in Australia. *Journal of the American Academy of Business Cambridge,* 16(1), pp. 207-217.

Jacobsen, C. (2013). Leadership and Motivation in Danish High School, EFMD EQUIS Accredited, AARHUS, University.

Jacobsen,C. and R.J.House (2001). Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership: A Process Theory, Simulation Model, and Tests. *The Leadership Quarterly.* 12(1):75-112.

Josanov-Vrgovic, I., and Pavlovic, N. (2014). Relationship Between The School Principal Leadership Style and Teachers'job Satisfaction In Serbia. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics, 10* (1), 43

Kotur, B. andAnbazhagan, S. (2014). The Influence of Age and Gender on the Leadership Styles. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM),* Vol. 16, Issue 1.

Kumari, N. (2011). Job Satisfaction of Employees At The Workplace. *European Journal of Business and Management.* 3, No, 4. pp 11-30.

Lamond, D. & Spector, P. (1999).Taking Stock of the Job Satisfaction Survey: Its Validity and Reliability in a Different time and place. Macquarie University. (Unpublished).

Latif, M., Ahmad, M., Qasim, M., Mushtaq, M., Ferdoos, A. & Naeem, H. (2013). Impact of Employee's Job Satisfaction on Organizational Performance. *European Journal of Business and Management.*Vol.5, No.5.pp.166-171.

Long, C. and Thean, L. (2011). Relationship Between Leadership Style, Job Satisfaction And Employees Turnover Intention: A Literature Review, *Malaysia. Research Journal of Business Management,* Vol. 5 No.3.pp.91-99.

Long, C., Yusof, W., Kowng, T. & Heng, L. (2014). The Impact of Transformational Leadership Style on Job Satisfaction. *Malaysia: IDOSI Publications, World Applied. Science*, Vol.29 No.1 pp. 117-124.

Lumley, E.J., Coetzee, M., Tladinyane, R. & Ferreira, N. (2011). Exploring The Job Satisfaction And Organizational Commitment Of Employees In The Information Technology Environment. *South African Business Review*, Volume 15, Number 1, pp.100-116.

Lussier, R., & Achua, C. (2009). *Leadership: Theory, Application and Skill Development*. Mason: South-Western Publications.

Marn, J. (2012). The Importance of Transformational Leadership Practices on Job Satisfaction of PHEI Lecturers. *Journal for the Advancement of Science and Arts*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp.26-38.

Metwally,D. and El-bishbishy,N. (2014). The impact of transformational leadership style on employee satisfaction. *The Business & Management Review*, Volume 5 (3), pp.32-42.

Nanjundeswaraswamy T. S. and D. R. Swamy (2014). Leadership Styles. *Advances in Management*. Vol. 7(2), pp. 1-7.

Naseem, A., Ejaz, S. and Malik, K. (2011). Impact of Employee Satisfaction on Success of Organization: Relation Between Customer Experience and Employee Satisfaction. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Science and Engineering*, Vol. 2, No. 5.pp-41-46.

Nebiat N. and Asresash D. (2013). Relationship Between Leadership Styles of Nurse Managers and Nurses' Job Satisfaction in Jimma University Specialized Hospital. *Ethiopian Journal of Health Science* Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 49-58.

Northouse, P. (2011). *Introduction to Leadership: Concept and Practice.* Thousand Oaks: Sage

Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Northouse, P. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and Practice.* (5th ed). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Odumeru, J.A. and Ifeanyi, G.O. (2013). Transformational Vs. Transactional Leadership Theories: Evidence in Literature. *International Review of Management and Business Research.* 2(2). 355-361.

Ojokuku R. M. Odetayo T. A. and Sajuyigbe A. S (2012). Impact of Leadership Style on Organizational Performance: A Case Study of Nigerian Banks. *American Journal of Business and Management.* 1, No. 4, pp.202-207.

Josanov-Vrgovic, I. and Palovic, N. (2014). Relationship between the School Principal Leadership Style and Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Serbia. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics.* Vol. 10 (1).pp. 43-57.

Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, pp.441–462.

Rajasekar, D.and Bhuvaneswari, K. (2014). An Empirical Evaluation on Job Satisfaction of Employees Towards Chennai Logistics Sector. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*. Volume 4, Issue 2. pp. 5-7.

Rasheed, M.I., Aslam, H.D. & Sawar Shakeel. (2010). Motivation Issues for Teachers in Higher Education: A Critical Case of IUB. *Journal of Management Research*, Vol. 2, No. 2. pp.1-23.

Rizi, R.M., Azadi, A., Farani, M.E. &Aroufzad, S. (2013). Relationship Between Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction Among Physical Education Organizations Employees. *European Journal of Sports and Exercise Science,* Vol.2, No.1. pp. 7-11.

Sageer, A., Rafat, S. &Agarwal, P. (2012). Identification of Variables Affecting Employee Satisfaction and Their Impact on the Organization. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM),* Vol. 5, Issue 1, pp. 395-407.

Satar, A., Nawaz, A. & Khan, S. (2012). The Contextual Impacts on Job Satisfaction of Employees in the Developing States like Pakistan. *Universal Journal of Education and General Studies*.Vol. 1No.5.pp.136-145.

Singh, J. & Jain, M. (2013).A Study of Employees' Job Satisfaction and Its Impact of their Performance. *Journal of Indian Research*, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 105-111.

Sowmya, K. & Panchanatham, N. (2011).Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction of Banking Sector Employees in Chennai, India. *Journal of Law and Conflict Resolution,* Vol. 3 No.5.pp.76-79.

Spector, P. (1994). *Job Satisfaction Survey*. Florida: University of South Florida.

Stumpf, M. (2003).The Relationship of Perceived Leadership Styles of North Carolina County Extension Directors' to Job Satisfaction of County Extension Professionals. (Unpublished Dissertation.) North Carolina State University.

Suresh, A.& J, Rajini (2013). Transformational Leadership Approach in Organizations: Its Strengths and Weaknesses. *International Journal of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Research,* Vol. 2No.3.pp.155-160.

Voon, M., Lo, M., Ngui, K. &Ayob, N. (2011).The Influence of Leadership Styles on Employees' Job Satisfaction in Public Sector Organizations in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business, Management, and Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.24-36.

Warrick, D.D. (1981). Leadership Styles and their Consequences, *Journal of Experiential Learning and Simulation, 3-4*, 155-172.

Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Multifactor Officer Questionnaire: MLQ Forms HR and IS. Binghamton, New York: Center for Leadership Studies, State University of New York.

Yukl, G. (2010*). Leadership in Organizations.* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Yukl, G.A. (2013). Leadership in Organizations, **(**8th ed**.).** New York**:** Pearson.