Effects of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles on Job Satisfaction: The Case of Cape Coast Technical University

Emmanuel Baffour-Awuah
Department of Mechanical Engineering,
Cape Coast Technical University,
PO Box AD 50, Cape Coast, Ghana.
emmanuelbaffourawuah37@yahoo.com

Samuel Kwaku Agyei
Department of Finance, School of Business,
University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana.
sagyei@ucc.edu.gh

Abstract
Management of newly transformed Technical Universities (TUs) in Ghana, including Cape Coast Technical University, needs to achieve their mission in an environment full of competition from traditional, private, and foreign universities. This study was conducted to assess the relationship between job satisfaction on one hand, and transformational and transactional leadership styles on the other. Data was collected using Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire to exhume information on leadership styles of Heads of Department and job satisfaction of faculty members respectively. The results from correlation and regression analyses show that leadership is by no means a contributory factor in determining the satisfaction of faculty-members. Thus academic heads of departments' adaptation to transformational and transactional leadership techniques could be motivating to faculty-members to give off their best through enhancement of satisfaction and contentment to increase institutional productivity. The results of the study are limited to the study organization.

Keywords: Educational institutions; Employee job satisfaction;Laissez-faire leadership style; Transactional leadership; Transformational leadership,

Introduction
Sustainability of organizations in this global competitive environment has placed a lot of emphasis on the consequences of leadership such as employee engagement, employee performance and employee job satisfaction (Brenyah & Damoah, 2016; Malik et al., 2016; Yenikewaty, 2015). According to Hukpati(2009), leadership that drives the required dynamism in organizations can enhance organizational success. The driving momentum of employee satisfaction and consequential employee and institutional outcomes hence rest on the performance of the leader. Organizations' continuous survival is therefore inextricably linked with effective leadership (Yunikewaty, 2015; Conger & Kanungo, 1990)

Hanjunkar et al. (2014) revealed that among the various leadership styles exhibited by organizational leaders, transformational leadership is recognized as one with the highest competitive edge as a result of its ability to motivate and entice employees to adapt to the required business environmental needs that the organization demands. Studies have shown that transformational leadership attributes exhibit the most effective leadership style and the cardinal participant for the achievements of the goals of these institutions (Hukpati, 2009; Roueche et al., 1989). Bush (2003) supported this observation by asserting that the

transformational leadership model is the official model suitable for higher institution (education) leadership.

According to Bass (1985), transformational leadership inspires and stimulates followers to perform more than they would normally do through which individual capabilities are totally developed and harnessed. The transformational leader adaptively reacts to the necessities of followers by empowering and conforming the objectives and goals of followers, him/her and that of the organization. This she/he does with the aim of constructing a collective and shared vision of the trio. By so doing,followers' satisfaction is enhanced. It has been severally proven that transformational leadership attributes, when practiced in earnest, positively influence greater organizational performance and commitment and enhanced employee job satisfaction (Amofa et al., 2016; Brenya&Damoah, 2016; Girma, 2016; Malik et al., 2016;Pourbarkhordari et al.,2016; Durrani et al., 2015; Yunikewaty, 2015;Surji, 2015). For these reasons educational institutions require transformational leaders to stimulate, inspire and empower teachers to enhance teacher job satisfaction and achieve higher levels of students learning (Hukpati, 2009; Silins&Mulford, 2002; Podsakoff et al., 1996).

It has been documented that in learning institutions where leaders exhibit transformational leadership characteristics, the level of teacher job satisfaction is high (Hukpati, 2009; Alam et al., 2005; Silins&Mulford, 2002). The fair share of the consequence of disatisfied teachers has been occurring in Ghanaian universities, particularly public institutions (Hukpati (2009). Hukpati (2009) documents that industrial actions and teacher agitations have been common in public universities over decades of years and technical universities(previously known as polytechnics until 2015) are no exception. Consequently, the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction in public universities in Ghana should be of great concern if public universities are to remain competitive and viable both academically and financially. Unfortunately, however, Kest (2007) observed that in spite of the relevance of transformational leadership to job satisfaction, research within universities in Ghana is limited. Hukpati (2009) agrees with Kest (2007) that available studies did concentrate on basic and secondary schools and restricted to the western world. Hukpati further agrees with Zame and Hope (2008) that, as far as Ghana is concerned, few public documented studies on leadership are available in this regard.

With the exception of a study by Hukpati (2009) on transformational leadership and job satisfaction which focused on the influence of the former on the latter in one private and one public university, no other study exists in the area. The non-existence of technical universities (TUs) at the time of Hukpati's study and the unique circumstances of TUs make the danger of applying results of similarstudies real. The aim of this study was, therefore, to examine the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction in Ghanaian technical universities with particular reference to Cape Coast Technical University. Theoretically, the study aims at bridging the gap of the inadequate leadership studies among Ghanaian universities in general and the lack of it among Ghanaian technical universities that have been given the daunting task of managing transformed polytechnics. Within the framework of educational institution leadership it will contribute to the limited studies in both Africa and the developing world. With reference to the above, the following research questions guided the study:

1. To what extent do the factors of transformational leadership (idealized influence; inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; individualized consideration) relate with intrinsic job satisfaction?
2. How do the factors of transformational leadership (idealized influence; inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; individualized consideration) relate with extrinsic job satisfaction?

3. To what degree does transformational leadership contribute to transactional leadership in influencing overall job satisfaction?

The study relied on the theories of Burns (1978), Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1994) to establish the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction.

Transformational Leadership Theoryand Concepts

The theory of transformational leadership is rooted in the path goal theory developed originally by House (1971) with the aim of explaining leadership at the work place. The path goal theory attempts to account for the behavior of leaders towards motivation and performance of subordinates. In this regard, House (1971) stated leadership style or behavior that facilitates achievements of organizational goals through the creation of conducive work environment towards employees. Within the context of the path goal theory, leadership behaviors such as leader consideration, leader initiative, hierarchical influence, motivation, coaching, guidance, support and rewards are pertinent in complementing subordinates' behavior and abilities to induce employee contentment as well as individual and effective team-work performance (House 1996; House, 1971). As psychological as it may be though, these leadership behavior are enshrined in the leadership behavior of transformation leadership (Breevaart et al., 2014).

The concept of transformational leadership, distinguished from transactional leadership, was first expatiated by Downton (1973) in an attempt to distinguish between ordinary, rebellious, reform-oriented and revolutionary leadership behavior. Subsequent studies by Burns (1978) on leadership in relation to the influence of political leaders on later developments identified transformational and transactional leadership as the two styles of leadership. Applying qualitative analysis to documentary biographies of political leaders, Burns (1978)regarded leadership styles as a continuum with reference to leader's success, power, efficacy, enthusiasm and energy. On the continuum, transformational leadership was positioned at the top, transactional leadership at the middle and laissez-faire or avoidant leadership at the button. Thus transformational leadership was considered the best form of leadership style than transactional,and reactive or avoidant leadership when it comes to higher employee performance through subordinate motivation. Based on these precepts the transformational and transactional leadership theory was born.

The theory of transformational leadership as propounded by Bass (1985) was, however, different conceptually, dwelling on the two factor principle. Bass (1985) argues that transformational and transactional leadership styles are independent of one another andare two different dimensions of leadership. It is also argued by Bass & Avolio, 1993 that transformational leadership hinges on the bedrock of transactional leadership, each constituting a part of leadership. Thus, if one considers leadership as a whole object exhibited by a leader, part of the style exhibited would be transformational and part transactionalbut both complementing each other (Girma, 2016; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Waldman et al., 1990; Avolio & Bass, 1988).

In spite of its appeal, the Bass (1985) leadership theory has undergone several modifications. One of the most popular revised modelsconsists of eight sub-dimensions of leadership, comprising three major dimensions. The major dimensions are transformational, transactional and avoidant leadership. Transformational leadership is composed or four sub dimensions as idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulations and individualized consideration. Transactional leadership dimensions include contingent rewards, active and passive management by exception. Arguably, this model regarded the most extensively explored and incalculably utilized for more than three decades (Zhu et al., 2013; Takahashi et al., 2012; Rafferty & Griffin, 2012),continues to be the most influential leadership model employed by researchers to yield anticipated and desired results (Bass 1978; Tyssen et al., 2014). Noticeably, the model combines Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) leadership theories.

The Bass (1985) model, however, takes a center stage in this revised edition particular when its augmentation effect component is taken into consideration. The augmentation effect states that transformational leadership adds to the effect of transactional leadership in the transformational and transactional leadership theory. It is the extent to which transformational leadership styles builds on the foundation of transactional leadership as an added effort to enhance follower performance (Burns, 1978). It has been established that, using diverse performance criteria, transactional leadership significantly adds to predict employee performance by way of augmenting transformational leadership attributes (Ngumi et al., 2006). In addition to this, transactional leadership has been found to statistically account for the unique variance in employee performance ratings higher than that accounted for by transformational leadership (Bass 1985; Bass &Avolio, 1990; Bass et al., 2003). Thus transformational leaders also exhibit transactional leadership behavior (Bass, 1999; Howell & Avolio, 1993). Transactional leadership is sometimes referred as bartering since it deals with the principle of exchange between employee services in exchange of tangible rewards that is controlled by the leader. Transactional leadership dwells on the fact that human beings wish to be led instead of being responsible for their own inactions and decisions.

On the contrary, transformational leadership motivates, and tasks employees to be creative in dealing with challenges, builds followers confidence, empowers followers, recognizes individual's unique interests and inspires followers to commit to assigned organizational goals and vision (Leithwood, 1999; Sergiovanni, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1990). It is upon this background that the multifactor leadership questionnaire was developed to evaluate the eight-dimensional leadership behavior of leaders.In today's global economy where technology, culture and economics are perpetually changing by day, there is the need for transformational leaders to provide satisfying organizational politics, culture, enhanced subordinate engagements, motivation, morale and performance and healthy work environment towards successful organizational performance (Choi, 2007; Sherman & Pross, 2010). Among the three most recently developed theories including charismatic leadership, visionary leadership and transformational leadership, which have some commonalities, the latter is the most influential, attractive and researched (Takahashi et al., 2012; Tyssen et al, 2014; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004).

Transformational leaders are needed in every organization to transform organizational performance through the transformation of subordinates. The Bass transformational-transactional leadership model identified four major dimensions under transformational leadership with sub attributes under each dimensions. This is explicitly exhibited in the structure of the consequential questionnaire (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio 1994) designed by Bass (1985).

Idealized influence also referred as charisma places the interest of the team above individual interests, benefits and attention (Tims et al., 2011). The charismatic leader achieves success using ethical means, norms and values, organizational culture and group dynamics to arrive at the vision of the organization. According to Grant (2012) when organizational goals and vision are achieved through ethical principles, transformational leaders gain respect, trust and pride not for the leader alone but the group as well. Birasnav (2014) observes that the behavior of charismatic leaders supports subordinates to perform better even under unexpected working conditions and environments. Besides idealized influence is concerned with pertinent organizational values, beliefs and norms, stressing on the interest and concerns of the team and communicating always what is the important information to the group.

Inspirational motivation, another component of charisma (Antonakis et al., 2013) is a behavioral feature that use symbolic articulates to direct followers' performance. Such moves should be compelling, attractive and enticing to achieve organizational goals and vision (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Breevaart et al., 2014; Shuck & Reio, 2014; Tims et al., 2011; Tyssen et al.,

2014). Inspirational motivational behavior inspires leader to cultivate extra-goal oriented exuberance by charting visionary course through the setting of strategic agenda different from the organizational agenda with the aim of enhancing performance of followers and organization (Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999; Zhu et al., 2013).

A transformational leader should be able to stimulate the intellect of followers, particularly when followers are observed to lack the requisite intellectual capacity for the job at hand (Rafferty and Griffin, 2004). The rationale behind intellectual stimulation is that followers are challenged to solve problems by looking from different dimensions and standpoints and thinking with distinguished independence (Grant, 2012; Kelloway et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2011). It is the responsibility of transformational leaders to make followers, not only think actively, but proactively in job engagement (Tims et al., 2011). The intent is to encourage workers to think differently in solving work-related challenges, tackle problems from psychological point of view, and be more confident in advancing their skills, talents and know-how (Kelloway et al., 2012). Besides, conventional means of dealing with work related challenges are dissuaded (Birasnav, 2014) by invigorating inventiveness, creativity and ingenuity, both individually and as a team (Hoon Song et al., 2012).

The bedrock of individualized consideration, as a characteristic of transformational leaders, is the ability of the leader to deal with individual needs of workers. Leaders thus treat workers uniquely and individually in terms of attention, specific needs and demands (Tim et al., 2011; Tyssen et al., 2014). The motive behind is to support, coach, understand employee needs and invigorate their development (Avolio and Bass, 1994; Grant 2012; Tims et al., 2011). Birasnav (2014) supports this idea that leaders of this attribute influence and affect emotionally by mentoring, coaching and supporting followers individually through the provision of comparable opportunities. Two-way communication becomes essential in this regard (Hoon Song el al., 2012). Using effective communication in this vein, a fully developed support mechanism in relation to follower needs is employed to deal with personal challenges and work-related assignments (Bass 1999; Strom et al., 2014; Kelloway et al., 2012). Application of these attributes motivates workers to contribute to the extensive organizational vision rather than pressing self-interests and being self-centered (Grant, 2012). Individual consideration is the foundation for leader-follower relationship (Kelloway et al., 2012).

Job Satisfaction

Lok and Crawford (2004) described job satisfaction as a positive sensual or emotional feeling of an employee in recognition of self-worth and contentment towards his or her work. The inter-relationship between a person's job expectation and real achievement determines the job satisfaction or dissatisfaction level of the individual. Armstrong (1973) enumerates demographic profile, goal-setting, rewards, job design, individual difference and leadership as determinants of job satisfaction. It has also been found that a well-cared for workforce is a satisfied team and yields long-term productivity (Yi-Fend & Islam, 2012). A workforce that is motivated and committed is also a satisfied one, and contributes significantly to, as well as determines the survival of the organization (Hina, 2015). With the current domestic,international and global competition among organizations, the need for satisfied workers has now become more important than ever. There is now fierce competition among organizations. This situation invites improved productivity and performance, higher customer demands and a satisfied workforce. The leader, being a supervisor, manager or headman becomes indispensably relevant in this regard as a supporter, developer, mentor, coach or otherwise, to ensure the well-being and satisfaction of subordinates. The leader is also expected to give regular and continual feedback and ensure individual and group interest (Hina, 2015; Iiacqua et al., 1995). According to Hackman and Oldman (1974) a satisfied employee reacts

totally positive to work task and considers work itself an important tool in yielding efficient work performance.

Job satisfaction may be either intrinsic or extrinsic. While intrinsic factors are considered "satisfiers", extrinsic factors are viewed as "dissatisfiers". (Hersberg et al.,1959). Gharibvand et al. (2013) found that leadership and particularly participative leadership, an attribute of transformational leadership, positively and strongly relates to job satisfaction. Other studies concerning leadership and job satisfaction further show that transformational leadership impacts positively on employee job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2003, Avolio & Bass, 1993; Durrani et al., 2015; Girma, 2016; Malik et al, 2016; Shahzad et al., 2008;). A study by Hussain, Haider and Riaz (2010) indicates that job satisfaction highly depends on transformational and transactional leadership styles. From the foregoing, it can be supported that transformational and transactional leadership could positively and strongly impact on job satisfaction of employees and result in higher productivity and organizational performance.

Method

The study was quantitative, drawing samples from Cape Coast Technical University, among the academic staff but excluding heads of departments. Out of the 102 teaching staff 90 was target while 54 were sampled from nine departments. The questionnaire had three sections. Section A requested for staff demographic profile including age; gender; period of service and years held in position. The rest were academic qualification, rank and marital status. Section B contained the features of the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) with 21 questions. Respondents were tasked to respond to the leadership attributes of heads of department (HOD's) as a measure of leadership styles of the heads of department. Section C contained questions entailed in the Minnesota satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) consisting 20 items meant to assess job satisfaction levels of respondents. While section A was made of open-ended questions, section C and D were close-ended.

Multi-step sampling technique was used to sample respondents. Out of the three schools in the institution three departments were sampled from each, employing simple random sampling (Lottery method). Thus, a total of nine departments were involved. Six members of academic staff were then sampled from each of the nine departments except Marketing Department (7) and Secretaryship and Management Studies Department (5) making a total of 54 respondents. Questionnaire was self-administered in the month of July 2015 when the university was on vacation. A period of 14 working days was spent in collecting all the questionnaires from respondents. Forty-five questionnaires were analyzed after rejecting those with missing cases and outliers and those not returned. The response rate was therefore 83.3%. Applying the Yamene (1967) formula the number of respondents was adequate for analysis since the calculated N value was 44.5% at ±10% precision level.

Data employed in the study were both primary and secondary. Primary data were basically collected from the teaching staff while secondary data were from academic journals and the World Wide Web. Closed-ended questions,i.e. for both section C and D, were rated by respondents byLikert scale from 1, representing minimum agreement to 5, indicating maximum. In the case of the MLQ, 1 represented "not-at-all" and 5 "fairly often". For the MSQ, 1 indicated "not satisfied" while 5 represented "extremely satisfied." Data was organized and analyzed using SPSS version 21. Descriptive statistical elements including mean and standard deviation were employed. Besides, Pearson's correlation coefficient and regression analysis were employed to access the association and relationship among variables. Suitability of data were tested by means of tolerance, variance inflation factor (VIF) and Cronbach alpha.

Results

Out of the sampled 45 faculty members, 44 (97.8%) were male. The mean age was 39 years and 7 months. The range wasbetween 28 and 56 years. The minimum of the multimodal age was 34 years. The standard deviation was 6.7 years. Mean working age was 9 years and 8 months, within the range of 5 and 24 years.The modal working agewas 9 years. Ninety-one percent were master degree holders. Ranks in employment were lecturers (77.8 percent), senior lecturers (6.7 percent) and assistant lecturers (13.3 percent). Nine departments in three faculties were considered: School of Engineering, School of Business Studies and School of Science and Applied Arts. The proportions of respondents include 11.0 percent from Marketing Department and 11.0 percent from Secretaryship and Management Studies Department. The rest were Accountancy, 11 percent; Building Technology, 11.0 percent;Electrical Engineering, 8.9 percent, Liberal Studies, 11.0 percent, Mechanical Engineering Department, 13.1 percent; and Statistics Department, 8.9 percent and Tourism Departments constituting 11.1 percent each. In terms of faculties, 33.3 percent of respondents from each school participated. About 71.1 percent of respondents were married, 2.2 percent single and 4.4 divorced. The remaining 22.2 percent were in a relationship. Qualifications include Bachelor degree, 13.3 percent; Master degree, 84.5 percent; and Doctorate degree, 2.2. Duration of position held ranged between less than 6 years, 17.8percent; 6-10 years, 42.2percent; 11-15years, 31.1percent; 16-20years, 6.7percent; and more than 20years, 2.2percent.

Before the data was analyzed instrument reliability was tested using the Cronbach's alpha test. Cronbach alpha coefficient for the MLQ was 0.922 and 0.90 for MSQ. Since mean scores for individual dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership styles were also analyzed, Cronbach's alpha values were additionally determined and obtained as 0.896 and 0.790 respectively. The Nunally (1978) criteria for reliability was referred which recommends Cronbach's alpha values above 0.7 as acceptable. Validity relates study design principles including overall sampling and data-collection concepts and establishes whether the results obtained meet the requirements of scientific research techniques. Measures including appropriate care, scientific structuring methods and diligence were therefore shown in the allocation of controls indicating validity.The data obtained were therefore valid and reliable, and acceptable and hence used for the analysis.

To answer research question 1, Pearson's correlation coefficient were utilized. Table 1 show that the relationship between all the dimensions of transformational leadership and extrinsic job satisfaction were positive and significant and ranged from medium to large in strength. Correlations between idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration were 0.538, 0.44, 0.487 and 0.425 respectively (and extrinsic job satisfaction). This implies that high levels of perceived transformational leadership dimensions associated with higher levels of perceived extrinsic job satisfaction. There was a strong, positive correlation between idealized influence and extrinsic job satisfaction (r=0.538, n= 45, p<0.0005), with high levels perceived idealized influence associated with higher levels of job satisfaction. The relationship between inspirational motivation (r=0.44, n=45, p<0.0005), intellectual stimulation (r=0.457, n=45, p=0.002) and individual consideration (r=0.425, n=45, p=0.004) and job extrinsic satisfaction were however medium in strength.

Table 1: Correlation results between transformational leadership dimensions and job satisfaction

Dimensions of transformational leadership		Extrinsic job satisfaction	Intrinsic job satisfaction	Overall job satisfaction

Idealize influence	Pearson correlation	0.538	0.546	0.558
	Sig (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	45	45	45
Inspirational motivation	Pearson correlation	0.440	0.484	0.480
	Sig (2-tailed)	0.003	0.001	0.001
	N	45	45	45
Intellectual stimulation	Pearson correlation	0.457	0.503	0.503
	Sig (2-tailed)	0.002	0.000	0.000
	N	45	45	45
Individual consideration	Pearson correlation	0.425	0.535	0.509
	Sig (2-tailed)	0.004	0.000	0.000
	N	45	45	45

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). (Source: Computed from study data, 2015)

To answer research question 2 Pearson correlation test was further employed. The association between the dimensions of transformational leadership and intrinsic job satisfaction were found to be positive and significant (refer table 1). Whiles the association between intrinsic job satisfaction and idealized influence ($r=0.546$, $n=45$, $p<0.0005$); intellectual stimulations ($r=0.503$, $n=45$, $p<0.0005$); and individualized consideration ($r=0.535$, $n=45$, $p<0.0005$) were strong; that between inspirational motivation and intrinsic job satisfaction ($r=0.484$, $n=45$, $p=0.001$) was medium in strength. Thus high levels of idealized influence associated with higher with higher levels of intrinsic job satisfaction. Additionally, high levels of inspirational motivation associated with higher levels of intrinsic job satisfaction. Besides high levels of intellectual stimulation associated with high levels of intrinsic job satisfaction and finally, high levels of individualized consideration associated with intrinsic job satisfaction.

The study went further to establish the association between the dimensions of transformational leadership and overall job satisfaction (conjoined extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction). Results obtained affirmed the results obtained by correlating transformational leadership dimensions with extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction separately. A cursory look at table 1 shows that transformational leadership dimensions correlates positively and significantly with overall job satisfaction. The association between job satisfaction and idealized influence ($r=0.558$, $n=45$, $p<0.0005$); intellectual stimulation ($r=0.503$, $n=45$, $p<0.0005$); and individualized consideration ($r=0.509$, $n=45$, $p=0.0005$) were strong while inspirational motivation ($r=0.48$, $n=45$, $p=0.0005$) was medium in strength. In summary, Table 1 shows that the association between intrinsic job satisfaction and transformational leadership dimensions are generally stronger than with extrinsic job satisfaction. Thus intrinsic job satisfaction of respondents overrides extrinsic job satisfaction in determining overall job satisfaction of faculty members. Besides, the study also reveals that high levels of perceived transformational leadership associated with higher levels of perceived overall job satisfaction.

The relationship between transformational leadership and overall satisfaction was further assessed using regression analysis. Since the number of respondents was less than 60 (Stevens, 1996, p. 72), the relationship between transformational leadership and overall job satisfaction was directly assessed instead of assessing the relationship through the transformational leadership dimensions. Pearson correlation coefficient between

transformational-transactional leadership and job satisfaction was found to be strong, positive and significant (r=0.628; n=45, p<0.0005). This affirms the earlier results when the dimensions of the transformational leadership were correlated with extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction separately. Thus high levels of perceived transformational leadership associated with high levels of overall job satisfaction (refer Table 2). The table also reveals that perceived transformational leadership helps explain nearly 40 per cent of the variance in respondents' scores on perceived job satisfaction scale.

Table 2: Regression results between transformational leadership and overall job satisfaction.

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig	Part correlations	Collinearity statistics	
	B	std Error	Beta				Tolerance	VIF
1 (constant)	1.006	0.338		2.972	0.005			
Leadership	0.572	0.108	0.628	5.288	0.000	0.628	1.000	1.000

Dependent variable: overall job satisfaction. (Source: Computed from study data, 2015)

Research question 3 was answered by first examining the relationship between individual transactional leadership dimensions and overall and overall job satisfaction.The two major dimensions contingent reward and management-by-exception were considered. Pearson's correlation test yielded strong, positive and significant association between transactional leadership and overall job satisfaction (Table 3). Thus high levels of perceived contingent reward (r=0.551, n=45, ρ<0.0005) associated with higher levels of perceived overall job satisfaction. High levels of perceived management-by-exception (0.495, n=45, ρ <0.005) also associated with higher levels of overall job satisfaction (table 3). Table 3 also reveals that perceived contingent rewards and management-by-exception help explain 33.5% of the variance in respondents' scores on overall job satisfaction scale. However, the regression analysis showed that the contribution of management-by-exception to the model was insignificant (ρ = 0.167) (Table 3).

Table 3: Regression results between transactional leadership dimensions and overall job satisfaction.

Model	Unstandardized coefficients	Standardized coefficients	t		Correlations	Collinearity statistics

	B	std Error	Beta		Sig	(part)	Tolerance	VIF
1 (constant)	1.300	0.342		3.796	0.000			
Contingent reward	0.092	0.039	0.397	2.376	0.022	0.299	0.569	1.759
Management by exception	0.061	0.044	0.235	1.407	0.167	0.177	0.569	1.759

Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction. (Source: Computed from study data, 2015)

Finally a regression analysis between two independent variables, transformational and transactional leadership, and overall job satisfaction was performed. The Pearson's correlation coefficients between transactional and transformational leadership styles and overall job satisfaction were strong, positive and significant. The study has shown that there is a strong and positive correlation between transactional leadership style and overall job satisfaction ($r=0.562$, $n=45$, $\rho<0.0005$) and same between transformational leadership and overall job satisfaction ($r=0.595$, $n=45$, $\rho<0.0005$). The study has thus shown that high levels of perceived transformational and transactional leadership styles, individually, associate with higher levels of perceived overall job satisfaction. Though the model was found to be significant ($F=12.781$, $n=45$, $\rho< 0.0005$) the contribution of transactional leadership style was generally insignificant with $\rho=0.203$ (Refer Table 4).Though the relationship between management-by-exception and overall job satisfaction was insignificant,the model helped explain 37.8% of the variance in perceived overall job satisfaction. Table 4 further shows the unique contributions of each independent variable to the total variance (R^2). The part correlation analysis indicates that transactional leadership styles uniquely contributed 2.4% to the explanation of variance in overall job satisfaction while transformational leadership style on the other hand, contributed 6% uniquely to the explanation of variance in perceived overall job satisfaction.

Table 4: Regression results between transformational leadership and transactional leadership and overall job satisfaction.

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig	Correlations (part)	Collinearity statistics	
	B	Std error	Beta				Tolerance	VIF
1 (constant)	1.095	0.342		3.201	0.003			
Transactional leadership	0.212	0.164	0.251	1.294	0.203	0.157	0.394	2.538
Transformational leadership	0.321	0.156	0.399	2.060	0.046	0.251	0.394	2.538

Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction (Source: Computed from study data, 2015)

Discussion

Research question one investigates the relationship between transformational leadership dimensions and extrinsic job satisfaction. Associations were between strong and moderately strong and positive. Though only idealized influence showed strong and positive relationship it is undoubtedly evident that generally, transformational leadership could influence extrinsic

job satisfaction. Previous studies as indicated above gives empirical evidence to this effect (Webb, 2009; Hukpati, 2009, Koh et al., 1995), since it was found that (Malik et al., 2016) transformational-job satisfaction models do predict strong relationship between independent dimensions of transformational leadership and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction.

Similarly, though stronger, a positive association between transformational leadership dimensions and intrinsic job satisfaction was established, answering the second research question. With the exception of inspirational motivation which gave a moderately strong association, the relationship between idealized influence, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration and intrinsic satisfaction were strong and positive, dominating the extrinsic factors of job satisfaction. Bass (1985) gave a plausible explanation by suggesting that transformational leaders encourage followers to be independent, recognize the self-importance of subordinates thus raising their confidence, and the contributions of employees in dealing with job-related tasks. By giving the opportunity to think critically and innovating new ideas in solving problems followers satisfaction levels are raised, enhancing commitment and engagement and consequential increase in productivity.

Combining results of studies by Hukpati (2009) in Ghana; Nguni et al. (2006) in Tanzania; and Ejimofor (2007) in Nigeria and the present study, the establishment of the positive association between transformational leadership and job satisfaction is gradually becoming evident. It is even more established from the point of view of the association between transformational leadership and overall job satisfaction from the present study where three dimensions of transformational leadership, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration, are strongly and positively linked with overall job satisfaction. It is evidently seen that, from a general perspective there is a strong and positive correlation between the attributes of transformational leadership and job satisfaction. It is by no means surprising that the major attribute of transformational leadership, charisma (idealized influence) had the highest association with overall job satisfaction while the entire group of charisma variables correlates positively, strongly and significantly with job satisfaction.

The first and second research questions as stated indirectly examine the degree of association to which transformational leadership relates overall job satisfaction of faculty members. The results indicate that transformational leadership is associated with overall job satisfaction and that the relationship is positive, strong and significant. This supports earlier findings (Lowe et al., 1996; Greenberg & Baron, 1995; Koh et al., 1995; Tossi et al., 1994) which validate the assertion that transformational leadership is associated with employee job satisfaction. The present study also confirms contemporary studies by Durrani et al. (2015); Malik et al. (2016); Girma (2016); and Hukpati (2009) which also are evidential of the effect of transformational leadership on teacher job satisfaction.

Besides these studies, Bolger (2001) and Nguni et al (2006) found positive relationships between transformational leadership and other organizational outcomes including organizational citizenship behaviors, perceived extra stress, job satisfaction. Healthy work environment (Pourbarkhordari et al, 2016); work stress (Muthania et al., 2015); organizational productivity (Amofa et al, 2016); employee performance (Yunikewaty, 2015) and employee engagement (Brenya&Damoah, 2016). On the basis of the confirmed association between transformational leadership and overall job satisfaction, further examining the associations between transformational leadership and overall job satisfaction in the present study employing different statistical tools also showed a strong association, further vindicating the proposition that there is an influence of transformational leadership on job satisfaction.

The present resultscorroborates with Hukpati (2009) and Nguni et al (2006) that charismatic leadership dimension of transformational leadership correlates positively and significantly while accounting for a large variation in teachers' job satisfaction. A plausible explanation is given by Hukpati (2009), in this regard, that in tertiary institutional settings, the

nature of work which is geared towards collaborative, participative and the reciprocity of leader-staff relationship could raise margins between charisma and the other dimensions of transformational leadership. Hukpati (2009) further argues that when conjoined, idealized influence and inspirational motivation (charismatic leadership) correlates better with job satisfaction than the other dimensions of transformational leadership.The present study thus affirms this finding.

The third research question was considered by using a regression model (refer Table 4). Though transactional leadership correlates positively and strongly with job satisfaction its support to the model was insignificant. This finding does not support the augmentation effect of the transformational-transactional leadership theory whereby transactional leadership style builds on the transactional base in contributing to the extra effort exhibited by followers (Burns, 1998). Thus transformational leadership statistically accounted for the unique variance in ratings above that accounted for by transactional leadership. Using various performance criteria several studies have however validated the augmentation effect (Podsakoff et al 1990; Bass et al., 2003, Nguni et al, 2006; Howell &Avolio, 1993). It is therefore recommended that further studies relating the augmentation-effect be carried out with large samples to compliment further the debate of the transformational-transactional leadership model.

Conclusion
On the basis of the results of the study transformational leadership has a positive relationship with job satisfaction. The relationship between idealized influences was strong, positive and significant with extrinsic job satisfaction; while the association was moderately strong with inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. The results of the study further indicated a positive and significant association between idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulations and individualized consideration and intrinsic job satisfaction.While the association between idealized influence, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration and intrinsic job satisfaction were strong; the relationship with inspirational motivation was moderately strong. Generally, the association between inspirational motivation and overall job satisfaction was moderately strong, positive and significant while the association between idealized influence, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration and overall job satisfaction were strong, positive and significant. The contribution of transactional leadership to the overall job satisfaction was however found to be insignificant implying that its contribution is likely to be per chance. However transactional leadership correlates positively with overall job satisfaction implying that high levels of perceived transactional leadership style associated with higher levels of perceived overall job satisfaction. The association between transformational leadership and overall job satisfaction was positive and significant. Leadership by no means is a contributory factor in determining the satisfaction of employees as far as job-related environmental activities are concerned in the institutions. If teaching and learning activities are to be enhanced then employees, particular teaching staff, should be handled, treated and accorded the needed support to ensure enhanced delivery. If heads of departments could adapt transformational leadership techniques, coupled with transactional leadership methods teaching staff would be motivated to give off their best since this will go a long way to boost their satisfaction and contentment to increase institutional productivity.The study recommends future studies in similar settings but specifically in other technical universities in Ghana with larger sample sizes from institutions. A comparative study relating the traditional public universities, private universities and newly fledged public (technical) universities could also be of interest and benefit to educationists, academicians, educational managers and researchers.

References

Alam, S. S., Talha, M., Sivanand, C., & Ahsan, M. N. (2005). Job satisfaction of university women teachers in Bangladesh. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(2), 88-91.

Allen, D.G., Shore, L. M. & Griffeth, R.W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, *29*, 99–118.

Amofa, A. K, Okronipa, G. A & Boateng, K. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational productivity: A case study of Ghana cement Limited. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 8(2), 131-143.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J. & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2013). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 14,261-295.

Armstrong, S. (1993). *A study of transformational leadership of athletic directors and head coaches in selected NCAA Division III colleges and universities in the Midwest.Kent State University.*Dissertation Abstracts International, 53(11), 3811A.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M. & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership.*Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* 72, 441-462.

Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma and beyond. In J.G. Hunt, B.R. Baliga, H.P. Dachler, & C.A Schriesheim(Eds.), *Emergingleadership Vistas, 29*-50. Lexington, MA: Lexington.

Bass, B. M, Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. L. & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership.*Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J (1993). Transformational leadership and culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, *17*(1), 112-121

Bass, B. M. &Avolio, B. J. (1990). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 17, 541-554. http://dx.doi.org/1.1080/01900699408524907.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19-31.

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

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., &Berson, Y. (2003).Prediction unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership.*Journal of Applied Psychology,* 88(2), 207–218. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207

Bass, B.M. &Avolio, B.J. (eds.) (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Birasnav, M. (2014). Knowledge management and organizational performance: The role of transactional leadership beyond the effects of transactional leadership. *Journal of Business Research*. 67.1622-1629.doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.

Breevaart, K., Backker, A., Hetland, J., Bemerouti, E., Olsen O. K &Espevik, R. (2014).Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement.*Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87, 138-157. http://dxdoi.org/10.111/joop.12041.

Brenya, R., & Damoah, O. B. (2016). Strategic leadership styles and employee engagement in the telecommunication sector of Ghana. *European Journal of Business and Management*. 8(7), 48-51.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, Harper and Row.

Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (Third Edition). Sage Publication.

Choi, J. N. (2007). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: Effects of work environment characteristics and intervening psychological process. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 28, 467-484.

Conger, J. A, & Kanungo, R. N. (1990). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 471-482.

Cronbach, L. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests.*Psychometrika*, 6(3), 297-334.

Downton, J. V. (1973). Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in the revolutionary process. Free Press.

Durrani, A. B., Cheema, S. Pasha, A. T. (2015). Direct and Indirect Impact of Leadership on Perceived Work Motivation and Perceived Job Satisfaction.*European Journal of Business and Management,* 7(36), 42-48.

Ejimofor, F. (2007). *Principal transformational leadership skills and their teacher job satisfaction in Nigeria*. Unpublished Doctoral, Cleveland state university, Ohio.

Gharibvand. S., Mazumdar, N. H., Mohiuddin, M. & Su. Z. (2016). Leadership Style and Employee Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Malaysian semiconductor industry. *Transnational Corporations Review*, 5(2), 93-103.

Girma, S. (2016). The relationship between leadership styles and employee satisfaction study federal and Addis Ababa sport organization management setting in Ethiopia. *European Journal of Business and Management,* 8(7), 52-56.

Grant, A. M. (2012). Leading with meaning: Beneficiary contact, pro-social impact, and the performance effect of transformational leadership.*Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 458, - 476. doi:10.5465/amj.2010.0588.

Greenberg, J. & Barron, R. A. (1995). *Behavior in organizations: Understanding and managing the human side of work*, 5th edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hackman, J. R. &Oldman, G. R. (1974). *The job diagnostic survey: An instrumental for the diagnosis of job and the education of job redesign projects* (Technical Report No. 4). New Haren, CT: Yale.

Hanjukar U. M., Nagar, V. & Sankaranarayanan, K. G. (2014).Content analysis of transformational leadership style.*Radix International Journal of Economics & Business Management*, 3(5), 1-13.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. (1959).*The motivation to work*. John Wiley and Sons.

Hina, S. (2015). The impact of leadership styles on job satisfaction and mediating role or perceived organizational politics. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 172 (27).563-569. doi:10.1016/j.sbspr0.2015.01.403.

Hoon Song, J., Kolb, J. A., Hee Lee, U & Kyoung Kim, H. (2012). Role of transformational leadership in effective organizational knowledge creation practices: Mediating effects of employee's work engagement. *Human Research Development Quarterly,* 23, 65-101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21120.

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness.*Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321-339.

House, R. J. (1996). Path-theory of leadership: lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *The Leadership quarterly*, 7, 323,-352.

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

Hukpati, C. A. (2009). *Transformational leadership and teacher job satisfaction: A comparative study of private and public tertiary institutions in Ghana*. Master's degree thesis submitted to the faculty of Behavioral Science, University of Twente.

Hussain H. M. & Riaz, A. (2010). Role of transformational and transactional leadership with job satisfaction and career satisfaction.*Business and Economic Horizons*, 01, 29-38.

Iiacqua, J. A, Schumaker, P. & Li., H. C. (1995). Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education. *Education*, 116(1), 51-61.

Keloway, E. K., Turner, N., Barling, J. & Loughlin, C. (2012). Transformational leadership and employee psychological well-being: The mediating role of employee trust in leadership work and stress. *An International Journal of Work, Health & Organizations,* 26, 39-55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.660774.

Kest, R. (2007, February). *Transformational leadership and its outcomes in a local government*.Walden University Dissertation. Retrieved from .

Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M. & Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore.*Journal of OrganisationalBehaviour*, 16, 319-333

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2000).The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 38(2), 112.

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

Lowe, K. B, Kroeck, K. G. & Svasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytical review of the MLQ literature. *The leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385-425.

Malik, A., Farooqi, Y. A. & Ahmad, M. (2016).Job satisfaction and job commitment through Transformational leadership.*European Journal of Business and Management*, 8(13), 55-61.

Muthumia, S., Lewa, P. & Nduiga, M. (2015). Effects of transformational Leadership on work stress among top managers in state-owned enterprises (SOEs) in Kenya. *European Journal of Business and management,* 7(36), 185-194.

Ngumi, S., Sleegers, P. & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teacher's job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 145-177.

Nunally, J. O. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York. McGraw-Hill.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B. &Bommer, (1996).Transformational Leader Behaviors and Substitutes for Leadership as Determinants of Employee Satisfaction, Commitment, Trust, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Management,* 22(2):259-298.

Pourbarkhordari, A, Zhou, E. H & Pourkarimi, J. (2016). Role of transformational leadership in creating a healthy work environment in business setting.*European Journal of Business and Management*, 8(3), 57-70.

Rafferty, A. E. & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership.Conceptual and empirical extensions.*The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 329-354. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009.

Rouche, J. E., Baker, G. A. & Rose, R.R. (1989). *Shared vision: Transformational leadership in American community colleges*. Washington Press, DC: Community College.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). *Value added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools*. New York. Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.

Sergiovanni, T. J., (1990). *Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results*. Educational leadership, 47, 23-27

Shahzad, K. Bashir, S. & Ramay, M.I. (2008). Impact of HR practices on perceived performance of university teachers in Pakistan.*International Review of Business Research Papers*, 4(2), 39-52.

Sherman, R. & Pross, E. (2010). Growing future nurse leaders to build and sustain healthy work environment at the unit level. OJIN. *The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, 15.doi:10.3912/OJIN.10115No01man01.

Shuck, B. & Reio, T.G (2014). Employee engagement and well-being: A moderation medel and implications for practice. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 21, 43-58. Doi:10:1177/1548051813494240.

Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2002). Leadership and school results. In K. Leithwood, P. Hallinger, G. Furman, P. Gronn, J. MacBeath, B. Mulford, and K. Riley. (eds.) (2002). *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer. 561-612.

Strom, D. L., Sears, K. I. & Kelly, K. M. (2014). Work engagement: The role of organizational justice and leadership and leadership style in predicting engagement among employees. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies*, *21*, 71-82.

Surgji, K. M. (2015). Understanding leadership and factors that influence leaders' effectiveness.*European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(33), 154-167.

Takahashi, K., Ishikawa., J. & Kanai, T. (2012). Qualitative and quantitative studies of leadership in multinational settings: Meta-analytic and cross cultural reviews. *Journal of World Business*, 47, 530-538. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B. & Xanthopoulou, D. (2011). Do transformational leaders enhance their followers daily work engagement? *The leadership Quarterly,* 22, 121-131.http://dx.doi:org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.12.011.

Tossi, H. L, Rizzo, J. R. & Carroll, S. J. (1994). *Managing organizational behavior* (3rd Edition). Blackwell.

Tyssen, A. K., Wald, A. & Spieth, P. (2014). The challenge of transactional and transformational leadership.*Journal of Project Management*, 32, 365-375. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.

Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M. & Yaminirino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent reward behavior: The augmentation effect of charismatic leadership.*Group and Organizational Studies*, 15(4), 381-394.

Webb, K. S. (2009). Creating satisfied employee's Christian higher education: Research on leadership competencies. *Christian Higher Education*, 8(1), 18-31.

Yamane, T. (1967). S*tatistics: An introductory Analysis* (2nd Edn), New York: Harper and Row.

Yi-Feng, Y. & Islam M. (2012). The influence of transformational leadership on job satisfaction: The balanced scorecard perspective. *Journal of Accounting and Organizational Change*, 8(3), 386-402. http://dxdoi.org/10.1108/.

Yunikewaty (2015). Effect of transformational leadership style and cultural organization on employee performance (Case study in oil company in Gunung Mas Regency, Central Kalimantan Province). *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(36), 144-150.

Zame, M. R & Hope, W.C (2008). Educational Reforms in Ghana: The leadership challenge. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 22(2), 115-128.

Zhu, W., Newman, A., Miao, Q. & Hooke, A. (2013). Revisiting the mediating role of trust in transformational leadership effects: Do different types of trust make a difference? *Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 94-105. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.