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Abstract

Purpose – The main objective of this study is to investigate the impact of the leadership styles followed by deans, vice-deans and chairmen of scientific department councils to on levels of job satisfaction among academics.

Design/methodology/approach – For the purposes of the study, only three leadership styles are examined (transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles) to test their impact on job satisfaction among 311 academic staff member from 7 of private universities in Egypt during the 1st semester of the academic year of 2022/2023. Both the Pearson correlations and the multiple linear regressions are used to achieve the research objectives.

Findings – The results approved that the job satisfaction of academic staff members in the higher educational institutions under study is influenced positively by transformational leadership style (Sig= 0.000) and negatively by the both of transactional leadership (Sig= 0.191) and laissez-faire leadership style (Sig= 0.453).

Research limitations/implications – The findings were related to only 7 private higher educational institutions in Egypt and belongs the impact of only 3 leadership styles (transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles).
Originality/value – The assessment of job satisfaction levels aren’t easy because of their intangible nature. Therefore, this research offering useful findings those help in supporting academic institutions in raising satisfaction levels of their academic staff members through improving the transformational leadership style and reducing the application of the transformational and the laissez-faire leadership styles.

Keywords Leadership styles, higher education institutions, job satisfaction, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, laissez-faire leadership.
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1. Introduction

Academic institutions are considered as one of the most prominent sources of development in contemporary societies as they bear the responsibility of producing the vital human resources necessary for economic and social growth. They are also responsible for providing the society with the intellectual capital that necessary for growth and development. Accordingly, higher education institutions are seen as a center for the production and spreading of knowledge and skills and adapting them to suit the needs of society. The institutional success in universities, especially in times of change, depends on the effectiveness of the leadership style used in and the associated cases of satisfaction or dissatisfaction among subordinates (Assefa, 2013).

Employees' perception of the value of their direct leaders is one aspect of the work environment in higher education institutions. Employees feel that they are more motivated to perform when they feel that there are opportunities for personal and professional growth as a result of their participation in decision-making activities. These motivational needs are dealt with through the interaction of employees with their leaders, which contributes to job satisfaction and leads to the success of the educational institution (Mulugeta, 2010).

This study helps to identify the extent of the impact of the leadership methods used in Egyptian private universities on the job satisfaction of academic staff members that provides an integrated vision of the current situation and limits the migration of academic competencies in a way that preserves the intellectual capital which represents the nucleus of achieving comprehensive development.
2. Research Problem

Many successive changes have taken place in the global higher education environment that has led to an increase in the importance of studying satisfaction rates among employees in the institutions that operate according to these changes. Satisfaction is affected by many factors, which may include the nature and conditions of work, the personality and behavior of leaders and their ability to achieve justice with regard to promotions, supervision, granting benefits, incentives, rewards and the distribution of workloads (Jossanov-Vrgovic and Pavlovic 2014). Leadership style and levels of job satisfaction are among the most important factors that contribute to raising the efficiency and effectiveness of organizations (Zeleke and Bekele, 2020). The process of achieving goals in higher education institutions depends on the ability of their leaders to motivate subordinates. The current pressures on higher education institutions represented by internationalization, globalization and the growing role of knowledge in the economy require conscious and active intervention from the leadership (Mulugeta, 2010). Because of the diversity of leadership patterns used in institutions, there is an urgent need to identify the relationship of each of these patterns with job satisfaction among subordinates as job satisfaction rates for subordinates differ accordingly (Bushra et al., 2011). It is assumed that educational institutions that increase job satisfaction rates among their faculty members will be more efficient and productive compared to other institutions that have a low level of satisfaction among their faculty members (Shibru and Darshan, 2011). Academics who are satisfied with their work will be more interested in devoting more energy and time to accomplish the tasks required of them. Therefore, understanding the factors affecting academics' job satisfaction is the cornerstone of supporting the university education system. Since the behavior of academic leaders represents one of the most important factors directly related to job satisfaction, the study of this matter comes at the top of scientific research priorities (Abeje and Latchanna, 2018).
Many studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction (Herman and Chiu, 2014; Zeleke and Yeshitila, 2014; Asghar and Oino, 2018). The results indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction in higher education institutions. Most of these studies focused on developed countries, which led to a relative scarcity of this type of studies in developing countries such as Egypt. Hence, this study attempts to bridge this research gap. Institutions of higher education in developing countries, including Egypt, must contribute to addressing multiple societal problems. Because of the increasing interest in studying the impact of leadership styles on the job satisfaction of academics, as it plays a vital role in achieving the objectives of higher education institutions, an urgent need has emerged to study and examine this relationship (Abeje and Latchanna, 2018). Accordingly, the problem of the study can be formulated by asking the following research questions:

- Is there a statistically significant impact of the leadership styles under study in the higher education institutions under study on the job satisfaction of the academic staff members in the same institutions?
- Is there a specific leadership style among the leadership styles under study that has a greater impact on the job satisfaction in the higher education institutions under study compared to other leadership styles?

3. Research Objectives

The literature has shown the need to verify the relationship between the leadership style adopted in higher education institutions and the levels of job satisfaction of subordinates (Mulugeta, 2010). Therefore, this study aims to determine the most leadership styles that adopted in 7 of private higher education institutions in Egypt and the impact of those styles to the levels of satisfaction among faculty members in those institutions. This study focuses on examining the leadership styles used by the deans, vice deans and heads of
the councils of scientific departments in the higher education institutions under study to find out the extent of the impact of these styles on the levels of job satisfaction of their faculty members.

The main objective of this study is to investigate the impact of the leadership styles followed by deans, vice-deans and chairmen of scientific department councils to on levels of job satisfaction among academics. It is the goal from which a group of other sub-goals emanate, which can be summarized as follows:

- Examining the impact, if any, of perceived leadership styles on levels of job satisfaction among academic staff members in the higher education institutions under study.
- Identifying the most efficient leadership style that has a greater impact on the job satisfaction in the higher education institutions under study.

4. Literature Review

4.1. Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is considered as one of the most complicated areas of contemporary research (Lumley et al, 2011). Job satisfaction expresses the extent to which a person is satisfied with the job he occupies (Thompson and Phua, 2012). It is viewed as a pleasant emotional state resulting from a person's evaluation of his job. It depends on an emotional response to the individual's tasks under a set of physical and social conditions within the workplace (Garr and Kaushik, 2013). This emotional state is based on the ability of that job to achieve his aspirations (Yucel and Bektas, 2012).

Despite the multiplicity of approaches that define the job satisfaction, it generally refers to how the individual feels about his work (Latif et al., 2013). This means that positive attitudes towards a job indicate job satisfaction while negative attitudes indicate job dissatisfaction (Bakotic, 2016).
Accordingly, job satisfaction rate is the extent of employees' positive or negative feelings about their job (Abeje and Latchanna, 2018).

In the case of high job satisfaction rates among workers, it is likely that absenteeism and labor turnover rates will decrease while quality, productivity and organizational commitment rates will increase (Zeleke and Obang, 2021). Thus, increasing employee satisfaction rates plays a decisive role in the success of institutions (Singh and Jain, 2013). It represents a strong incentive for employees to perform their work as it leads to raising the morale of workers and increasing loyalty rates among them towards the organization (Rajasekar and Bhuvaneswari, 2014). Job satisfaction creates positive attitudes among employees, enhances their morals, improves their performance and creates good relationships with co-workers. Employees who are satisfied with their jobs tend to be more creative, innovative and able to bring about positive changes in their organizations (Mwesigwa et al., 2020).

Achieving job satisfaction among employees is one of the most important challenges facing contemporary business organizations as organizational commitment is essential to the success of organizations, increase their ability to achieve their goals and to indicate organizational citizenship behaviors among their employees (Obedgiu et al., 2017). Studies of job satisfaction supported that employees with high levels of emotional commitment are less absent from work, higher performers, more productive and more able to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors such as helping other colleagues and defending the organization (Mwesigwa et al., 2020).

The most important factors affecting job satisfaction are summarized in working conditions, wages, promotion opportunities, quality of supervision, the relationship between co-workers and the work environment (Sattar et al., 2012; Chahal et al., 2013). Sowmya and Panhanatham (2011) agreed with these previous factors and added the supervisory and leadership behavior to factors affecting the job satisfaction. They also confirmed that job satisfaction levels differ according to different demographic factors such as
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gender, age, level of education, income and experience. In the study conducted by Ghafoor (2012), the results indicated that male employees are more satisfied with work compared to females. He found also that job satisfaction increases with the increase in job grade, level of education and income. Each of Rajasekar and Bhuvaneswari (2014) and Sageer et al., (2012) also refers to a set of personal determinants of job satisfaction that includes personal expectations, age, level of education, gender, perceptions and attitudes of the employee and the degree of ability to learn.

Zeleke and Obang (2021) referred to nine factors involved in determining the level of employee satisfaction. These factors are summarized in wages, promotion, supervision, additional benefits, bonuses, operating conditions, work colleagues, nature of work and communication. They added that leadership style also affects levels of job satisfaction.

4.2. Leadership Styles

Since the 1950s, leadership styles have become one of the most studied and analyzed fields among researchers from around the world (Megheirkouni, 2017). It is generally defined as the process of influencing others in order to obtain a set of desired results. It plays a prominent role in the success or failure of organizations (Ojokuku et al., 2012). Generally, the leadership style is viewed as a combination of the traits, skills and behaviors that leaders use during their interactions with their subordinates (Northouse, 2016). It plays a decisive role in enhancing organizational commitment (Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016).

Effective leadership in higher education institutions is the leadership that is able to deal with the diverse challenges, cultures and stakeholders involved in higher education (Ruben et al., 2017). The effective leadership style is related to continuous improvement that supports the quality of any organization (Gremyr et al., 2021). In higher education institutions, Matongolo et al. (2018) pointed out that the used leadership style affects the enhancement of
the work environment. When leaders follow leadership methods that respect the skills and capabilities of subordinates, this enhances the organizational commitment of subordinates (Chuang, 2013).

Different organizations require different leadership styles. It means that leadership style may differ from one organization to another and even within one organization. Likewise, a single leader does not use a consistent leadership style throughout his life. He must change his leadership style according to the situations and contexts, which is why the concept of situational leadership became popular in the contemporary business world. Leaders have different styles that enable them to lead their subordinates. Some of them are authoritarian, some are democratic and some are achievement-oriented (Ruben et al., 2017). Despite the extensive studies focused on leadership styles, there is no agreement on the leadership style that leads directly to achieving the highest levels of productivity in organizations. The reason could be that the actual application of the various leadership styles showed that the effectiveness of the leadership style depends on the conditions of the institution that differ from one institution to another (Mulugeta, 2010). According to literatures, the most leadership styles can be concluded in the followings 3 styles:

4.2.1. Transformational Leadership Style

Transformational leadership is one of the most important means of enhancing organizational effectiveness, especially in times of change (Mulugeta, 2010). The term transformational leadership refers to the practices leaders undertake to motivate their followers to do more than they originally intended and even more than they thought possible (Jacobsen, 2013). It is the process that leaders undertake to support their subordinates to reach their fullest potentials (Northouse, 2016). It crystallizes in the leader's attempt to influence followers positively, as the transformational leader motivates his followers towards better performance at all levels by influencing their beliefs, attitudes and values rather than simply obeying orders and instructions (Arzi and
Farahbod, 2014). Thus, transformational leadership becomes an organized process aimed at empowering followers and encouraging them to accept and take responsibility (Marn, 2013). It can be considered as an extension of transactional leadership. Instead of the leader and subordinates exchanging roles, transformational leaders give subordinates greater opportunities to work in order to enhance the leadership ability of followers (Zeleke and Obang, 2021). It refers to the extent to which leaders are able to motivate their followers to achieve performance rates that exceed what is planned or expected by transforming the attitudes, beliefs and values of subordinates rather than subjecting them to orders and instructions. According to Mwesigwa et al. (2020), transformational leadership involves four dimensions:

- **Idealistic Influence**: It is the leader's ability to present himself to the work group as a model. It is also called charisma that represents the emotional component of leadership. This component is related to the behavior of the leader who acts as a role model, where the followers unite with their leaders and want to imitate them. Here, leaders are seen as people with high moral standards and ideal ethical behavior to the extent that being trusted and respected by his followers (Nanjundeswaraswam and Swamy, 2014). These leaders have the ability to inspire their subordinates depending on how followers view the leader's behavior (Shibru and Darshan, 2011).

- **Inspiring Motivation**: It is the ability of leaders to motivate the work group towards the tasks entrusted to them that develops a sense of loyalty and commitment. It includes activating followers by formulating a convincing vision that moves subordinates to go beyond direct self-interests and reach the general interests of the organization. It is an essential quality for leaders who are able to convey high expectations to their followers and encourage them by developing their motivation to become committed to the shared vision of the organization where the leader motivates his followers by stimulating team spirit, supporting positive ideas and using symbols.
and emotional appeals that focus on adding challenge, enthusiasm and optimism to the work environment (Northouse, 2016).

- Intellectual Stimulation: It is the leader's ability to provide opportunities for the work group to rethink in traditional procedure and replace it by innovative one. Leaders seek to raise the level of awareness and interest of followers in problems and enhance their ability to solve them. This encourages them to be creative and innovative to the extent that they can challenge the usual ways of doing things (Zeleke and Obang, 2021).

- Individual Consideration: It is the leader's treatment of each member as a distinct and unique individual. Leaders use individual considerations to achieve the goals of the organization in a way that does not conflict with the needs of individuals. The personal needs of individuals receive great attention by the leader to integrate them with the general needs of the organization. The leader provides opportunities for the followers to learn everything new in order to achieve individual growth and meet their personal needs (Northouse, 2016).

In line with the above, the second hypothesis of the research was formulated as follows:

**H1:** Transformational leadership style positively impacts job satisfaction.

4.2.2. Transactional Leadership Style

Transactional leadership ensures that the followers are rewarded by the leader in the case that their performance reaches the expected level. It requires explaining how to implement the work and informing everyone that there is a reward in the case of achievement. The amount of such a reward should be clearly defined in advance (Hamidifar, 2010). Transactional leadership theory is based on the idea that the leader-follower relationship is depending on negotiation and contractual dimensions. Transactional leadership also involves punishing followers who fail to meet required standards. Thus
transactional leadership becomes a conditional use of rewards and punishments as such leadership style relies on leaders supporting followers to achieve their goals by offering rewards when they worth and imposing penalties when necessary. It is a style that emphasizes sharing costs and benefits (Jacobsen, 2013). This leadership style occurs in the event that the leader communicates with the followers for the purpose of exchanging things of value. It means that both parties have purposes to achieve, as the relationship does not exceed the exchange of benefits (Mwesigwa et al., 2020). It balances the needs of employees with the expectations of the organization as transactional leaders use rewards and punishments to get followers to comply (Odumeru & Ifeanyi, 2013).

Literatures referred to three dimensions of transactional leadership which are:

- Contingent Rewards: It includes the leader obtaining the approval of the followers on what must be done with the pledge to provide specific rewards in return for carrying out the task in an acceptable manner (Arzi and Farahbod, 2014).

- Active Management by Exception: Active management by exception is seen as a corrective transaction. Leaders are supposed to monitor workflow to try to anticipate deviations from standards before they occur to head them out before they occur or at least in their early stages (Northouse, 2016).

- Passive Management by Exception: It involves waiting for errors to intervene. This means that the leader does not intervene unless there are obvious errors. In that case, subordinates are punished for their actions. It is usually appropriate to use when the leader is responsible for supervising a large number of subordinates (Hamidifar, 2010).

It has been observed that the transactional leadership style is more effective in the case of organizations with stable conditions. The success of this method depends on the characteristics of the leader and his ability to define his goals (Nanjundeswaraswam and Swamy (2014).
In line with the above, the first hypothesis of the research was formulated as follows:

\[ H_2: \text{Transactional leadership style positively impacts job satisfaction.} \]

4.2.3. Laissez-faire Leadership Style

The actual practices of the administrative process showed that there are leaders who withdraw from their leadership role and do not provide any guidance or support to their subordinates. These leaders are known as laissez-faire leaders. They are usually ignoring the needs of their followers and have no desire or intention to be responsible for anything. They also avoid making any decisions (Mulugeta, 2010). It is a type of passive leadership where there is no interaction between leader and follower. Some describe this style of leadership as an absence of the leader as full responsibility is left to the followers where managers avoid giving notes and instructions (Hamidifar, 2010; Long and Thean, 2011; Northouse, 2016).

In line with the above, the second hypothesis of the research was formulated as follows:

\[ H_3: \text{Laissez-faire leadership style negatively impacts job satisfaction.} \]

4.3. The Relation between Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction

Leadership styles play a major role in influencing employee satisfaction. In addition to salary, job nature and work environment and conditions, leadership style is one of the most important factors affecting the job satisfaction of employees (Abeje and Latchanna, 2018). There is a close relationship between job satisfaction and the leadership style used in the organization. The behavior of leaders directly affects the employees and controls their levels of job satisfaction that reflects in the overall performance of the organization (Mulugeta, 2010). The dissatisfaction of workers resulting from the inappropriate leadership style used in the organization leads to a
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lack of organizational commitment among workers. It means that the leader's actions are considered crucial in influencing the attitudes and behaviors of the organization's employees (Mwesigwa et al., 2020).

As leadership is seen as an important and central indicator in guiding employee job satisfaction (Kiplangat, 2017), several studies have been conducted to evaluate the relationship of leadership styles to levels of job satisfaction in various organizations. Most of the results indicated an increase in job satisfaction rates among subordinates who belong to institutions whose leaders adopt the transformational leadership style (Mulugeta, 2010).

With the beginning of the 1960s, many studies focused on examining the relationship between job satisfaction and leadership style in educational organizations. The results of many of these studies revealed a positive relationship between job satisfaction and leadership style, while the results of many other studies showed that the behavior of managers leads to supporting the performance of educational institutions through its positive impact on the job satisfaction of teachers (Kusum and Billingsley, 1996). According to Timoty and Ronald (2004), the positive relationship between leadership style and employee satisfaction in educational institutions leads to the development of the institution's performance, the support of relationships among colleagues and the encouragement of collective performance. Accordingly, leadership becomes the primary responsible for strengthening teamwork opportunities, imposing a positive climate within the work environment and achieving cooperation between workers within the boundaries of the educational institution.

In universities, encouraging leaders to subordinates, giving them important responsibilities, delegating authorities to them, preparing them to be leaders and involving them in the decision-making process lead to an increase in job satisfaction rates that related to higher levels of organizational commitment (Tourinawi, 2011). On the other hand, the arbitrariness of leaders in universities, the poor system of selection and recruitment of people,
promotions that are not based on skills and competencies, weak performance incentives and poor working conditions lead to low rates of job satisfaction that related to low levels of organizational commitment (Amutuhaire, 2010). The results of the study conducted by File and Shibesh (2012) also revealed that there is a negative correlation between the task-oriented leadership style of and the satisfaction of teachers in educational institutions. It means that the manager who pays more attention to tasks will have an inability to communicate with workers. This will lead to less development of human resources and less support for democratic relations that lead to lower rates of satisfaction among workers. The study conducted by Bushra et al. (2011) on the effects of transformational leadership on employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the banking sector in Lahore, Pakistan revealed a positive relationship between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction. In the study conducted by Musinguzi et al. (2018) on workers in the health sector in Uganda, they found that workers prefer transformational leaders compared to transactional leaders or laissez-faire leaders. The results also indicated that transformational leadership and transactional leadership are positively related to job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction helps academics to maximize their educational potential by influencing their morale, motivation and general willingness to work, which increases their ability to teach and complete the educational process to the fullest (Northouse, 2016). Job satisfaction is a critical factor in influencing the effectiveness of performance in all educational institutions (Abeje and Latchanna, 2018).

In regard to examining styles of leadership and their relations to job satisfaction in higher education institutions, Hanaysha et al. (2012) examined the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. The results showed a strong positive relationship between job satisfaction and the all various components of transformational leadership, with the exception of inspiring motivation. Such results are fully consistent with what was reached by Marn (2012). In a similar study conducted at a university of Kuala
Lumpur, Ahmad et al. (2013) found that there is a strong relationship between the various variables affecting leadership style and job satisfaction factors. While the study detected a strong positive relationship between job satisfaction and both transformational and transactional leadership styles, the correlation was negative with regard to laissez-faire leadership style.

In the study conducted by Nebiat and Asresash (2013) at Jima University specialized hospital, with the aim of investigating the relationship of nursing managers' leadership styles with nurses' job satisfaction, the results showed that job satisfaction was more related to transformational leadership than transactional leadership style. While another study conducted by Long et al. (2014) on the same university revealed that the various variables constituting transformational leadership styles were positively associated with all factors of job satisfaction, the result indicated a negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction. Other studies conducted by Belias and Koustelios (2014) and Metwally and El-bishbishy (2014) on the impact of transformational leadership on job satisfaction and perceived performance in Jordan, Greece and Egypt showed positive significant relationships between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction.

Mahnegar and Far (2015) examined the relationship between the leadership style used at the Iranian Payam Noor University and the level of job satisfaction among both employees and faculty members during the academic year 2014-2015. The results showed that there is a direct significant relationship between the participatory and consultative leadership styles and the job satisfaction level of individuals. This means that the style and the quality of leadership affect the satisfaction levels among workers in the academic field. In the same context, Odubuker (2016) also found a moderate correlation between both participative and directive leadership and job satisfaction among Ugandan Management Institute employees. By focusing on the relationship of job satisfaction of faculty members with the leadership styles used by the heads of the scientific departments councils in the college of Education at the University of Addis Ababa, the study conducted by
Mulugeta (2020) showed that there was a statistically significant relationship between transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles and job satisfaction for faculty members.

By examining the relation of the leadership style to job satisfaction, Mwesigwa et al. (2020) found that transformational leader enhances job satisfaction due to his ability to convey a sense of mission and intellectual stimulation as these leaders tend to encourage their followers to have more independence and take more responsibilities that develop the sense of achievement and increases job satisfaction among them. They also found that both transformational leadership and transactional leadership are associated with job satisfaction. They also referred that according to the leadership-member exchange theory, the leader's relationship with his subordinates affects the performance. It confirmed that the leader's provision of support to his followers in critical situations and appreciation of their efforts during the completion of tasks necessarily leads to their job satisfaction.

5. Research Variables

Depending on research hypotheses, the variables of the research can be classified into:

- Independent variables: Transactional leadership style, transformational leadership style and laissez-faire leadership style.
- Dependent variables: Job satisfaction.

According to the relation between these 2 types of variables, the research conceptual framework can be illustrated by figure (I).
Figure I. The Research Conceptual Framework

6. Research Methodology

For the purposes of the study, only three leadership styles are examined. These styles are the transactional leadership, the transformational leadership and the laissez-faire leadership. The research depends only on such 3 leadership styles as most previous studies, e.g. Hunt (2010), Ahmad et al. (2013), Nebiat and Asresash (2013), Yukl (2013), Long et al. (2014), Metwally and El-bishbishy (2014), Mahnegar and Far (2015), Northouse (2016), Odubuker (2016), Abeje and Latchanna (2018), Mulugeta (2020) and Mwesigwa et al. (2020) referred that these styles are the most applied in the higher educational institutions. To collect the research data, a Likert scale questionnaire was designed and distributed to the research sample. As shown in table (1), the results of calculating Cronbach's Alpha showed that the overall scale is valid (0.895) and reliable (0.946). While 483 questionnaires were distributed to a sample of academic staff members from 7 of private universities in Egypt during the 1st semester of the academic year of 2022/2023 to examine their perception of the prevailing leadership styles among their leaders who represented in deans, vice-deans and chairmen of the councils of scientific departments, only 344 questionnaires were returned. By checking the returned questionnaires, 35 questionnaires were excluded because of incomplete data. Thus, the research sample consisted only of 311 valid questionnaires as shown in Table (2). Depending on version 18 of PASW statistics, the collected data was analyzed by using the statistical
methods of descriptive statistics, Pearson correlations and the multiple linear regressions to achieve the research objectives.

Table I. Validity and Reliability of the Research Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire Leadership</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall scale</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. The Research Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributed Questionnaires</th>
<th>Returned Questionnaires</th>
<th>Excluded Questionnaires</th>
<th>Valid Questionnaires (The Sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71.22%</td>
<td>7.24%</td>
<td>64.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Results and Discussion

As shown in table III, the most of respondents are male (57.23%). While the majority of them are from 55 to less than 65 years (46.94%), only 3.85% of them are less than 35 years. Regarding the job experience in the current position, the majority of respondents are less than 5 years experience (40.51%). The highest percentage of them is married (70.41%) and more than half of them are teachers (55.62%).
Table III. Characteristics of the research sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>42.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>57.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to less than 45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to less than 55</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to less than 65</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>46.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Experience in the Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 Year</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>40.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to less than 10 Years</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to less than 15 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years and more</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>70.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>55.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1. Job Satisfaction Correlations to Leadership Styles

By measuring the strength of the correlation between the constructs, depending on Pearson correlation analysis, the inter-factor correlations between transformational and transactional leadership styles refereed a moderate positive correlation, where \( r= 0.346 \) and \( p= 0.000 \). The same moderate positive correlation are noticed between transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles as \( r= 0.346 \) and \( p= 0.000 \) and between transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles (\( r=0.201 \) and \( p= 0.000 \)). These positive moderate correlations can be illustrated by the data of table IV.
Depending on the data illustrated in the same table, a moderate positive correlation was observed between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction (r= 0.306 and p= 0.000). This means that increasing the practices of transformational leadership in the higher educational institutions of under study leads to an increase in job satisfaction levels among academic staff members.

The analyses also indicated a strong negative correlation between transactional leadership and job satisfaction (r= -0.93; p= 0.000). This means that increasing the practices of transactional leadership in the higher educational institutions of under study leads to a decrease in job satisfaction levels among academic staff members and vice versa.

The data of table IV also indicated a weak negative correlation between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction (r= -0.26; p= 0.000), which refereed that decreasing of practices of laissez-faire leadership style leads to increasing the job satisfaction levels among academic staff members.

Table IV. Job Satisfaction Correlations to Leadership Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Laissez-faire Leadership</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.346**</td>
<td>0.346**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.346**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.201**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.346**</td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.306**</td>
<td>-0.93**</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at p<0.05

7.2. Test of Research Hypotheses
To test the research hypotheses, the linear regressions analysis was used to set the predictive relationships between the three leadership styles under the study and job satisfaction. As there are three independent variables, there are three models of regression. In the 1st regression model, while transformational leadership is the independent variable, job satisfaction is the dependent variable. In the 2nd regression model, the transactional leadership style is the independent variable and job satisfaction is the dependent variable. In the last regression model, while laissez-faire leadership style is the independent variable, job satisfaction is the dependent variable. These three regression models are illustrated in table V.

Table V. Test of the Research Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>4.880</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>23.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>-1.312</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire Leadership</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.315</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H1:** Transformational leadership style positively impacts job satisfaction.

By checking the value of β, the coefficient for the transformational leadership style is 0.445. This means that any increase in practices of transformational leadership style by one unit would lead to an increase in job satisfaction by 44% unit. The impact is statistically significant (P-Value= 0.000). This impact referred a positive contribution of transformational leadership style as a predictor of job satisfaction. The adjusted $R^2 = 0.103$ that indicates approximately 10% of the variance in job satisfaction is returned to practices of transformational leadership style. Therefore, the 1st hypothesis of the research was accepted as transformational leadership style positively impacts job satisfaction. These results are consistent with the findings of Mulugeta, (2010), Bushra et al. (2011), Hanaysha et al. (2012), Marn (2012), Ahmad et al. (2013), Nebiat and Asresash (2013), Long et al. (2014), Metwally and El-bishbishy (2014), Musinguzi et al. (2018), Mulugeta (2020) and Mwesigwa et
al. (2020) who found that positive impact of transformational leadership style on job satisfaction. By the comparison of values of beta, it is noticed that transformational leadership style gained the highest beta value ($\beta = 0.445$). This means that the transformational leadership style have the highest impact on the job satisfaction levels.

**H2: Transactional leadership style positively impacts job satisfaction.**

As the coefficient for the transactional leadership style is -0.093, a negative impact is observed. Thus, any increase in practices of transactional leadership style by one unit would lead to a decrease in job satisfaction by less than 1% unit. The impact is statistically insignificant (P-Value= 0.191). The adjusted $R^2 = 0.004$ that indicates that the impact of transactional leadership practices leads almost no variance in job satisfaction. Thus the 2nd hypothesis of the research was rejected as transactional leadership style isn’t positively impacts job satisfaction. These results are consistent with the findings of Nebiat and Asresash (2013), Long et al. (2014) and Musinguzi et al. (2018) who found negative impact of transactional leadership style on job satisfaction. These results contradict what was reached by Ahmad et al. (2013) and Mwesigwa et al. (2020) who found a positive impact of transactional leadership style on job satisfaction.

**H3: Laissez-faire leadership style negatively impacts job satisfaction.**

According to the coefficient for the laissez-faire leadership style, the value of $\beta = -0.022$. It means that there is negligible and negative impact of laissez-faire leadership style on job satisfaction. This impact is statistically insignificant (P-Value= 0.753). The adjusted $R^2 = 0.005$ that indicates that the impact of laissez-faire leadership practices leads almost no variance in job satisfaction. Therefore, the 3rd hypothesis of the research was accepted as there is negative impact of laissez-faire leadership style on job satisfaction. This result is in agreement with the findings of Ahmad et al. (2013), Long et
al. (2014), Musinguzi et al. (2018) and Mulugeta (2020) who found a negative impact of laissez-faire leadership style on job satisfaction.

8. Conclusion and Recommendations

This research tries to investigate the impact of the leadership styles followed by deans, vice-deans and chairmen of scientific department councils to on levels of job satisfaction among academics. The results approved that the job satisfaction of academic staff members in the higher educational institutions under study is influenced positively by transformational leadership style and negatively by the both of transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership style. According to such findings, some recommendations could be introduced as follows:

- As the results indicated the role of transformational leadership practices in improving job satisfaction among academic staff members, there is a need for more encouragement of deans, vice-deans and chairmen of scientific department councils to apply the practices of transformational leadership.
- As the research focused only on 3 leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles), more research efforts are needed to focus on other leadership styles.
- The research findings are related to a sample of academic staff members from only 7 of private universities in Egypt. Therefore, it is recommended to reapply the study on other private and public educational institutions in Egypt to reach more generalizable results.
- Because of the small size of research sample (311 academic staff member), a similar study should be conducted in wider context.
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