LEADERSHIP STYLE AND JOB SATISFACTION: A DEVELOPING ECONOMY PERSPECTIVE

Jeevarathnam Parthasarathy Govender, Hari Lall Garbharran**,
Roland Loganathan***

Abstract

Research has suggested a relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction. This paper examines this relationship in the context of a developing country, viz., South Africa. The objective of the paper is to assess the relationship between the two variables as well as the influence of biographical variables on leadership style and job satisfaction. The survey was based on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The results suggest a significant correlation between the three leadership styles, viz., transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership, and job satisfaction. There were no significant differences between the biographical variables and the three leadership styles.

Keywords: Ledership, Job Satisfaction, Leadership Styles

* Corresponding author, Department of Marketing, Durban University of Technology, P O Box 1334, Durban, 4000, South Africa
Tel.: +2731 3735396
Fax: +2731 3735480
E-mail: govendej@dut.ac.za
** Durban University of Technology, Durban, South Africa

1. Introduction

Research has demonstrated a relationship between leadership styles and employee job satisfaction levels. Emery and Barker (2007) found that employees managed under a transformational leadership style displayed higher levels of job satisfaction, against associated factors such as charisma and intellectual stimulation. Conversely, employees managed under a transactional leadership style, displayed higher levels of job dissatisfaction, against associated factors such as management by exception.

According to Uhl-Bien, Marion and McKelvey (2007), organizations are being faced with competitive landscapes shaped by globalization, technology, economy and politics. The world of business is constantly faced with challenges by the external environment, demand for increased participation and competition. Employees are seen as intangible assets that contribute to the continued success and development of an organization in this dynamic environment. Job satisfaction can be broadly defined as the extent to which employees are content with their jobs (Mester, Visser & Roodt, 2003). A major breakthrough into understanding job satisfaction was through the Hawthorne studies (Olson, Verley, Santos and Salas 2004). Findings of the study revealed that good working conditions enhanced job satisfaction levels among employees.

It also emerged that people work for purposes other than pay. Employees' moods and emotions are core building blocks that form the affective element of job satisfaction. Job satisfied employees show higher levels of commitment to their jobs and organisations.

Leadership theory suggests that transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership styles are related to job satisfaction. According to Mester et. al. (2003), several studies have indicated that transformational leadership results in higher levels of job satisfaction than transactional or laissez-faire leadership. However, findings from studies conducted by Naidu and Van Der Walt (2005) reveal that transformational and transactional leadership styles did not correlate significantly to the construct of job satisfaction. The context of the study is a paper mill situated in South Africa. It is envisaged that the study and its findings will bear relevance to organisations, particularly in other developing economies, and also serve as a basis for further discussion and debate.

2. Research Problem and Objectives

According to Madlock (2008), job satisfaction is related to job performance. Pattersen, Warr and West (2004) suggest that a job satisfied employee is a productive employee. As a result, this paper

intends to establish job satisfaction levels associated with varying leadership styles in order to investigate the relationship between these two variables.

The objective of this paper is to investigate the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction. The sub-objectives are: to identify employee perceptions of their leader's style; to determine employee job satisfaction levels related to their leader's style and; to examine the influence of selected biographical variables on job satisfaction and leadership style, respectively.

3. Literature Review

Leadership

Leadership is a process by which an individual influences colleagues towards accomplishing common goals (Flynn, 2009). It involves influencing the participation of colleagues and providing guidance in a specified course to be navigated. According to Naidu and Van Der Walt (2005), an effective leadership style influences change and creates the impetus for transformation. The role played by a leader could be viewed as an influential change-agent. Banerji and Krishnan (2000) view leadership as a process whereby leaders develop a shared vision, set the tone and influence the behaviours of all in the organisation to work towards common values. The shared vision creates alignment by developing a common mental model for employees to follow. Jones and Rudd (2007) define leadership as a relationship between leaders and followers within a social group. It entails supplying a vision, creating power and using this power for individuals to realize the vision.

With the view that leadership is about coping with change, this study identifies leadership as the ability to influence employees to engage in transformation interventions by aligning individual goals with that of the leader, and ultimately, the organisation. Transformation is viewed as the ability to do things differently than in the past. It can also be viewed as the creation of a new entity, not improving on something that already exists. Therefore, transformation interventions will be defined as interventions that bring about change to do things differently, a view supported by Naidu and Van Der Walt (2005).

The literature on leadership identifies transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership as the three common leadership styles in the current climate, with transformational leadership and transactional leadership being the most dominant (Mester et al., 2003).

Transformational leadership

Transformational leaders inspire, develop, encourage and coach followers through trust and support. According to Adler and Reid (2008), employees are most satisfied when their leader is supportive and considerate. A successful transformational leader influences followers to perform extraordinary behaviours to go beyond the call of duty. Naidu and Van Der Walt (2005) view transformational leaders as people who inspire their followers to work towards the good of the company, both in the short-term and long-term. Inspiration is created through influence and awareness about outcomes that relate to the realization of the organisation's vision. Ozaralli (2002) describes transformational leadership as a process whereby a strong personal identification is maintained with the leader. Employees are energized and empowered through participation to embrace an exciting and optimistic vision of the future rather than receiving personal monetary gain. The transformational leader is able to create stamina to effectively implement and sustain transformation initiatives in an organisation. Key elements of transformational leadership are ideolised influence, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration.

Ideolised influence

The leader embraces high moral and ethical values and reinforces pride, respect and faith in followers. The leader makes an effort to promote his or her beliefs and values through influence (Flynn, 2009). Ideolised influence comes into play when the leader expresses a sense of conviction and confidence, when making high-impact decisions in the face of threats (Nielsen,Yarker, Brenner, Randall and Borg , 2008). Through role modeling, followers are encouraged to take calculated risks when solving complex problems and observe how they can become more responsible and confident.

Intellectual stimulation

Intellectual stimulation centres on promoting innovative ideas and creativity among followers. Intellectual stimulation occurs when the leader encourages creativity among followers to look for new and more efficient ways of solving problems compared to methods employed in the past (Mester et al., 2003). Much effort is placed on encouraging followers to proactively search for new ideas and to "think out of the box" when faced with challenges during daily activities

Individualised consideration

Individualised consideration centres on identifying and addressing individual needs of followers

through coaching and mentoring initiatives. Mester et al. (2003) explain individualised consideration as a process whereby the leader identifies individual uniqueness, links the individuals' current needs to the organisation's needs and provides coaching, mentoring and growth opportunities. Effective leaders must demonstrate concern for individual needs and attend to these needs on an individual basis. A common realization is that the skills and experience levels, needs and expectations vary considerably among individuals. Therefore, an interpersonal connection is paramount to understanding followers personally, with the view of strategically addressing their concerns. A supportive and caring climate is created by the leader, who plays the role of a listener who carefully identifies strengths, weaknesses and development potentials of individuals. The leader's aim is to assist with individual personal development, while assessing ways to help individuals in meeting their aspirations. Leaders allow followers to grow through personal challenges, through the process of delegated authority.

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership refers to a task-orientated leadership style, relating to reward-based performance initiatives. Transactional leaders motivate employees towards attainment of stated goals by clarifying job roles. Transactional leaders are seen as leaders who reward employees for task completion, thereby attaining power from the transactions. According to Naidu and Van De Walt (2005), a high degree of focus is placed on goal achievement together with a rational exchange reward system for good performance and punishment for sub-standard performance. Cilliers, Van Deventer and Van Eeden (2008) also view transactional leadership as a social exchange process whereby tasks are agreed to and clarified between the leader and follower on the basis that a successfully completed task will result in a reward and avoidance of punishment. The key dimensions of transactional leadership are active management by exception and constructive transaction.

Active management by exception

The leader actively monitors activities of followers, in search of errors, deviations from standards or failures. Mester et al. (2005) also agree and view this dimension as a proactive management style whereby the leader closely watches performance of followers and takes corrective action to avoid potential problems before they arise. The leader is inclined to reinforce rules in order to minimize mistakes, utilising negative reinforcement patterns. This dimension is known to be more task than relation orientated. In summary, the leader

intervenes if actual effort does not match expected effort by the follower, which is viewed as an exception.

Constructive transaction

The leader-follower interaction is proactive where emphasis is placed on rewards for meeting expected goals. The leader obtains agreement from followers on what must be done and what the rewards would be for the followers involved with the task. Success criteria are agreed upon by both parties with the achievement being either rewarded or punished. Positive reinforcement patterns are used where the leader implicitly clarifies performance standards in order to reinforce follower credibility that valued rewards will be a result of good performance (Xirasagar, 2008).

Laissez-Faire leadership

According to McColl-Kennedy and Anderson (2005), laissez-faire leadership is a passive style that is reflected by high levels of avoidance, indecisiveness and indifference. It is also commonly viewed as the absence of leadership where the leader takes a "hands-off" approach, abdicating responsibility, delaying decisions and gives no feedback to employees' (Xirasagar, 2008). The leader makes no attempt to motivate followers or to satisfy their individual needs. It is also viewed as an avoidance of leadership responsibilities which could result in a lack of direction for the organisation. The laissez-faire leader is also viewed as an inactive rather than proactive individual and procrastinates, wherever possible. There are no rewards or feedback to subordinates and developmental needs are left to individuals for self -management.

Jones and Rudd (2007) view laissez-faire leadership as a lethargic leadership style where the leader displays no sense of motivation or urgency. The leader assumes that followers are intrinsically motivated and should be left alone to accomplish their tasks.

Leadership styles and job satisfaction

Mester et al. (2005) believe that the role of a leader has a direct influence on job satisfaction among followers. Madlock (2008) explains that employees are most satisfied when they perceive their leaders to possess a combination of relational (transformational) and task-oriented (transactional) behaviours. The main attributes of transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership in relation to job satisfaction are discussed below.

Transformational leadership and job satisfaction

Studies conducted by Berson and Linton (2005) support previous findings that a positive relationship exists between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction. Results of a study conducted by Nielsen et al. (2008) reveal that transformational leadership was positively associated with better employee working conditions. Results of the study are also supported by Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which suggests that good working conditions lead to increased job satisfaction levels.

Ideolised influence and job satisfaction

Bruch and Walter (2007) argue that the effect of Ideolised influence is more likely to emerge among upper rather than middle managers. This happens in a practical setting where followers are constrained by organisational regulations within its hierarchy. Their ability to engage in innovative decision making is far reaching, which results in a lower appeal to the effects of ideolised influence. Hence, their span of discretion is limited and they are more inclined to adapt to the expectations of their leaders. Cilliers et. al. (2008) also believe that role clarity and goal alignment need to be clear and unambiguous for successfully bringing out ideolised behaviours in followers.

Intellectual stimulation and job satisfaction

Results of a study conducted by Emery and Barker (2007) support the use of transformational leadership to increase job-satisfaction levels among employees, through mission alignment and intellectual stimulation. Andreassen, Hetland, Hetland, Notelaers and Pallesen (2011) believe that challenging the status quo encourages followers to develop more efficient and new ways of solving problems. Transformational leaders are able to challenge outdated assumptions and traditions, thereby creating an atmosphere of creativity and innovation. Transformational leaders are also mindful of the intellectual ability of followers. They encourage approaching problems from different angles, thus creating readiness for change (Cilliers et al., 2008). This claim is supported by McClelland's need for achievement whereby satisfaction is gained from the success of doing things differently. The job characteristics model of Oldham and Hackman also supports the claim whereby internal motivation is gained through experienced meaningfulness from task variety and task significance (Oshagbemi, 2003).

Individualised consideration and job satisfaction

Bruch and Walter (2007) are of the opinion that individualised consideration enhances follower satisfaction through the process of advising, supporting and addressing individual needs. A stable platform is thus created allowing followers space to develop and self-actualise. It becomes increasingly important for the leader to exercise emotional intelligence when aligning personal needs of followers to that of the organisation. Moreover, the ultimate goal of the process is for the organisation to benefit through the transactional leadership process (Mester et. al., 2005).

Transactional leadership and job satisfaction

Active management by exception and job satisfaction

Xirasagar (2008) believes that the leader displays behaviours intended to prevent potential problems before they arise. Applying the job characteristics model of Oldham and Hackman, feedback will provide employees with knowledge of results about a particular task. Although the follower may fear reprimand for non-compliance, satisfaction could be gained from knowing that tasks are over inspected in order to proactively prevent potential failures. Followers will also be motivated to ensure that tasks are performed with diligence in order not to face reprimand.

Constructive transaction and job satisfaction

According to Emery and Barker (2007), linking individual needs to what the leader expects to accomplish, as well as providing rewards desired by followers, enhances job satisfaction among followers. The exchange agreement between leader and follower is proactive, where followers are confident to receive rewards when tasks are successfully completed. The act of engaging in constructive transaction is adequately supported by the hygiene factors of Herzberg's Two- Factor Theory, where the exchange of rewards, praise or recognition reduces dissatisfaction among followers. In addition, the exchange of rewards, praise and recognition will motivate followers to perform at higher levels to achieve agreed upon objectives set by the leader. This claim is adequately supported by the job characteristics model of Oldham and Hackman, where feedback from the job and knowledge of actual results of work activities, result in satisfaction among followers. Additionally, the need for achievement will result in motivation to

strive for excellent results in pursuit of agreed goals set by the leader. This finding is supported by McClelland's needs theory (Oshagbemi, 2003).

Passive management by exception and job satisfaction

The passive style of the leader, as indicated by a more reactive rather than proactive approach, may create a perception among followers that some degree of autonomy is afforded in performing tasks to completion. The perception would appear prudent given the common understanding that the leader would only intervene once problems become evident. Hence, followers may experience some fulfillment in their needs for autonomy, which is supported by the job characteristics model of Oldham and Hackman (Madlock, 2008).

The fear of failure would be embedded in the minds of followers due to the reactive approach of the leader who intervenes only when performance does not meet expectations, often reacting with negative consequences. Results of studies conducted by Emery and Barker (2007) reveal that a negative correlation exists between job satisfaction and management by exception (passive and active). According to Madlock (2008), common factors that lead to job dissatisfaction are largely driven by interpersonal relationships between the leader and follower. The finding is reinforced when the leader is viewed by followers as less supportive and absent when needed, especially during the initial stages of problem identification.

Laissez- Faire leadership and job satisfaction

Little or no involvement by the leader could enhance autonomy and empowerment of followers to accomplish goals, thereby leading to their self-development and progress, which is supported by the job characteristics model of Oldham and Hackman. Followers, in this case, are afforded the opportunity to make decisions in order to shape their work environment to satisfy individual needs. Cilliers et al. (2008) also agree that laissez-faire leadership affords followers the opportunity for self-management. They view the process of avoidance by the leader as an opportunity for followers to work unsupervised and become leaders in their own way, through self-development.

Madlock (2008) argues that inadequate supervision, as in the case of the laissez-faire leader, could lead to weak interpersonal relationships, resulting in low employee satisfaction and productivity levels. This finding is supported by Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory.

4. Methodology

This research study was descriptive, quantitative and cross-sectional in nature. The target population for this study consisted of the 240 employees, ranging from grade 7 to grade 12, involved in operations on a daily basis. According to Sekaran and Bougie (2010), 148 is a reliable sample size for a population size of 240. Simple random sampling was used as the preferred type of probability sampling. Bell and Bryman (2007) explain that, with this sampling method, there is almost no opportunity for human bias because the process is not dependent on the employees' availability.

The questionnaire consisted of three sections, namely, biographical information, job satisfaction and leadership styles. Overall job satisfaction was measured using an adapted version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), developed by Weiss, Darwiss, England and Lofquist (1967). The questionnaire was designed to measure satisfaction levels for various personal and job related facets. Measurement comprised a five-point Likert measurement scale, with "very dissatisfied" forming the one end of the continuum and "very satisfied", the other end. Instructions were given regarding the rating of the questions. "Very dissatisfied" indicated low levels of job satisfaction while "very satisfied" indicated high levels of job satisfaction. The instrument was used in studies conducted by Patterson et al. (2004) where a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of 0.92 was reported, suggesting a high degree of reliability.

Leadership styles were measured using an adapted version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Avolio, Bass and Jung (1997). The purpose of the questionnaire was to distinguish the three leadership styles. The questionnaire measured five components of transformational leadership, three components of transactional leadership and one component of laissez faire leadership. The questionnaire consisted of 33 questions. Eighteen questions dealt with the three attributes of transformational leadership. Eleven questions dealt with the three attributes of transactional leadership. Four questions addressed laissez-faire leadership.

A pilot test was conducted. Necessary alterations were then done to the questionnaires before conducting the research. The data analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The level of significance was set at 95% (p= 0.05)

5. Findings and Discussion

5.1 Biographical data and descriptive statistics

Table 1 illustrates the distribution of the biographical variables of the sample group. It emerged that the majority of the participants were males (88.2%). In terms of age, the majority of the participants were between 21 and 40 (73.2%) followed by the 41-50 group (17%), the 51-60 group (7.2%) and the 17-20 group (2.6%). Regarding job grades, the majority of subjects were operators (32.7%) followed by senior operators (21.6%), shift charge hands (19%), shift supervisors (16.3%) and first-line supervisors (10.5%).

Table 2 presents the results with regard to respondent perceptions of leadership style displayed by their supervisors.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of biographical variables

		n	%
Gender	Male	135	88.2
	Female	18	11.8
		153	100.0
Age	17-20	4	2.6
	21-30	52	34.0
	31-40	60	39.2
	41-50	26	17.0
	51-60	11	7.2
	Over 60	0	0
		153	100.0
Job Grade	First Line Supervisor	16	10.5
	Shift Supervisor	25	16.3
	Shift Charge hand	29	19.0
	Senior Operator	33	21.6
	Operator	50	32.7
		153	100.0

The mean value for overall transactional leadership (M=3.234) indicates that supervisors displayed a transactional leadership style sometimes. The standard deviation (SD=0.615) reflects the variation in responses. Some respondents perceived their supervisors practising this style occasionally (Min=2), while others view their supervisors using this style always (Max=5).

The dimensions of transactional leadership reveal that active management by exception is displayed by supervisors sometimes bordering on fairly often (M=3.692), constructive transaction is displayed sometimes (M=3.415) and passive management by exception being displayed occasionally (M=2.709). The standard deviation was highest for constructive transaction (SD=0.865) followed by active management by exception (SD=0.645). The variation in responses reveal not at all (Min=1) to always (Max=5) in the case of active management by exception and constructive transaction and a maximum score of 4 (fairly often) perceived for passive management by exception.

Overall, the results for a transformational leadership style also reveal that supervisors displayed this style sometimes (M=3.029). The standard deviation (SD 0.629) indicates a variation in responses. Some respondents perceived their supervisors practising this style (Min=2) while others view their supervisors using this style always (Max=5). The dimensions of transformational leadership reveal that idealised influence (M=2.913), individualised consideration (M=0.296) and intellectual stimulation (M=3.165) are displayed by supervisors sometimes, bordering on fairly often. The standard deviation was highest for individualised consideration (0.879), followed by intellectual stimulation (0.700), and idealised influence (0.681).

In terms of job satisfaction, respondents were satisfied sometimes (M=3.470). The standard deviation (SD = 0.601) shows a variation in responses. Some subjects were dissatisfied (Min=2) while others were very satisfied (Max=5).

As far as laissez-faire leadership was concerned, respondents perceived their supervisor as displaying this style occasionally to sometimes (M=2.792). The standard deviation (SD=0.665) shows the variation in their responses. The minimum score of 1 indicates that some participants felt that their supervisors did not display a laissez-faire leadership style while others (maximum=5) perceived their supervisors as always using this style.

Table 2. The study variables

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Transactional leadership: overall	153	2	5	3.234	0.615
Transactional leadership: Active management by exception	153	1	5	3.692	0.848
Transactional leadership: Constructive transaction	153	1	5	3.415	0.866
Transactional leadership: Passive management by exception	153	1	4	2.709	0.645
Transformational leadership: overall	153	2	5	3.029	0.629
Transformational leadership: Ideolised influence	153	1	5	2.913	0.682
Transformational leadership: Individualised consideration	153	1	5	2.996	0.879
Transformational leadership: Intellectual stimulation	153	2	5	3.165	0.700
Laissez-Faire leadership	153	1	5	2.792	0.666
Job satisfaction	153	2	5	3.470	0.601

5.2 The relationship among the variables

5.2.1 Transformational leadership and job satisfaction

The results show that there was a significant correlation between overall transformational leadership and its dimensions, viz., ideolised influence, individualised consideration and intellectual stimulation, and job satisfaction. The following values were observed:

- Overall transformational leadership and job satisfaction (r=0.501;p<0.05);
- Ideolised influence and job satisfaction (r=0.343;p<0.05);
- Individualised consideration and job satisfaction (r=0.445;p<0.05); and
- Intellectual stimulation and job satisfaction (r=0.501; p<0.05).

The correlations ranged from weak to moderate, and statistical significance was found (p<0.05 in all instances), leading to the conclusion that there was a significant correlation between transformational leadership, (and its dimensions) and job satisfaction.

This correlation concurs with the findings of Adler and Reid (2008) where a significant correlation between overall transformational leadership and job satisfaction was found. A correlation of r=0.646 was observed. A study conducted by Berson and Linton, (2005) also showed that transformational leadership was a strong predictor of job satisfaction. A correlation of r=0.64 for p<0.01 was observed in this case. Studies conducted by Emery and Barker (2007) reveal that intellectual stimulation was positively correlated with job satisfaction (r=0.130, p<0.5). Therefore, results from other studies corroborate with the findings of this study.

5.2.2 Transactional leadership and job satisfaction

It emerged that there was a statistically significant correlation between overall transactional leadership and its attributes (active management by exception and constructive transaction and passive management by exception) and job satisfaction. The following correlations were observed:

- Overall transactional leadership and job satisfaction (r=0.403, p<0.05);
- Active management by exception and job satisfaction (r=0.360, p<0.05);
- Constructive transaction and job satisfaction (r=0.442, p<0.05); and
- Passive management by exception (r=0.109, p<0.05).

Studies by Adler and Reid (2008) show a statistically significant correlation between overall transactional leadership and job satisfaction. A correlation of r=0.582 was observed. Findings by Berson and Linton (2005) reveal that a negative, weak correlation existed between transactional leadership and job satisfaction. A correlation of r= -0.08 for p<0.05 was observed. Also, findings from the study conducted by Emery and Barker support the argument that a negative relationship exists between active management by exception and job satisfaction. A correlation of r= -0.244 for p<0.1 was observed. The findings of this study are in agreement with those of others, that there was a statistically significant correlation between overall transactional leadership and its attributes

Finally, the results of the study also indicate a statistically significant correlation between laissez-faire leadership and job satisfaction (r=0.230; p<0.05).

5.2.3 Transformational leadership and the biographical variables

The results regarding transformational leadership, its dimensions and the biographical variables, gender, grade and age are presented in Table 3.

The results show no statistically significant difference in the perceptions of overall transformational leadership and its dimensions, and the biographical variables of gender, grade and age. The results of the t-test reflect no significant difference between males and females with regard to transformational leadership as well as its dimensions (p>0.05) in all instances.

Table 3. Biographical variables and transformational leadership

T-test		
Variable: Gender	t	p
Transformational leadership	1.080	0.282
Ideolised influence	1.055	0.293
Individualised consideration	1.125	0.262
Intellectual stimulation	0.655	0.513
ANOVA		
Variable: Grade	F	p
Transformational leadership	0.081	0.988
Ideolised influence	0.022	0.999
Individualised consideration	0.163	0.957
Intellectual stimulation	0.564	0.689
Variable: Age		
Transformational leadership	0.605	0.660
Ideolised influence	0.802	0.526
Individualised consideration	0.506	0.732
Intellectual stimulation	0.772	0.545

The ANOVA also reflected no significant difference between the different grades and age groups and their perceptions of transformational leadership and its dimensions (p>0.05) in all instances.

5.2.4 Transactional Leadership and the biographic variables

The results of transactional leadership and its dimensions and the biographical variables are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Biographical variables and transactional leadership

T-test		
Variable: Gender	t	p
Transactional leadership	-0.024	0.981
Active management by exception	-0.156	0.876
Constructive transaction	-0.732	0.465
Passive management by exception	1.077	0.283
ANOVA		
Variable: Grade	F	p
Transactional leadership	0.395	0.812
Active management by exception	0.910	0.460
Constructive transaction	0.562	0.691
Passive management by exception	0.642	0.633
Variable: Age		
Transactional leadership	0.769	0.547
Active management by exception	0.784	0.537
Constructive transaction	1.100	0.359
Passive management by exception	1.763	0.139

The results show no statistically significant differences in the perceptions of the gender groups, the job grade categories and the age groups with regard to overall transactional leadership and its dimensions (p>0.05 in all instances).

5.2.5 Laissez-Faire leadership and the biographical variables

Table 5. Biographical variables and laissez-faire leadership

T-test	t	p
Variable: Gender		
Laissez-faire leadership	1.223	0.220
ANOVA	F	p
Variable: Grade		
Laissez-faire leadership	1.586	0.181
Variable: Age		
Laissez-faire leadership	1.351	0.254

The results, as reflected in Table 5, show no statistically significant differences in the perceptions of laissez-faire leadership between males and females. Furthermore, it emerged that there was no significant difference in the perceptions of laissez-faire leadership and its dimensions between the variables of job grade and age.

5.2.6 Biographical variables and job satisfaction

The results, as indicated in Table 6, reflect no statistically significant differences in job satisfaction between males and females.

Table 6. Biographical Variables and Job Satisfaction

T-test		
Variable: Gender	t	p
Job satisfaction	0.170	0.865
ANOVA		
Variable: Grade	F	p
Job satisfaction	0.362	0.835
Variable: Age		
Job satisfaction	0.772	0.545

Furthermore, it emerged that there was no significant difference between the age groups as well as the different grades, in so far as job satisfaction is concerned ($p > 0.05$) in all instances.

6. Managerial Implications

This paper has various managerial implications. Emery and Barker (2007:87) believe that followers strive to emulate their leaders. They trust their leader's judgment and support their leader's values, often forming strong emotional ties with their leader. The leader is thus seen as a role model. To this end, the manager needs to lead by example, and employee engagement should reach down to the lowest level of the organization.

Intellectual stimulation centres on promoting innovative ideas and creativity among followers. Intellectual stimulation also occurs when the leader encourages creativity among followers to look for new and more efficient ways of solving problems compared to methods employed in the past (Mester et al., 2005:73). Managers, therefore, need to utilise innovative and creative thinking models to stimulate thinking among employees. The application of trouble shooting techniques and problem solving guides should involve all employees affected by problems.

Mester et al. (2005:73) regard individualised consideration as a process whereby the leader identifies individual uniqueness, links the individuals' current needs to the organisation's needs and provides coaching, mentoring and growth opportunities. Leaders, therefore, need to demonstrate a concern for employees' individual needs and adopt a personalized approach. It must also be borne in mind that skills and experience levels, needs and expectations vary considerably among individuals. A strong interpersonal connection between the leader and employee is required in order to sustain a supporting and caring climate.

The laissez-faire leadership style should not be dominant in the leadership mix as this style is viewed as the absence of leadership (Xirasagar, 2008:603). The proposed leadership style for the organisation should contain a mix of transactional attributes (active management by exception and constructive transaction) with the transformational attributes (inspirational motivation, individualised consideration and ideolised influence) being more dominant. Transformational leadership attributes

(intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration and ideolised influence) are key variables to create a culture that supports continuous learning, innovation and knowledge sharing.

7. Conclusion

This paper sought to establish the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction. Employee perceptions of leadership style, job satisfaction and the influence of biographical variables on these two variables were examined. The results suggest a significant correlation between transformational leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership and job satisfaction. It emerged that there were no significant differences in job satisfaction, based on the biographical characteristics of gender, job grade and age category. Some managerial implications are presented.

References

1. Adler, R.W. and Reid, J. (2008). "The effects of leadership styles and budget participation on job satisfaction and job performance", *Asia-Pacific Management Accounting Journal,* Vol. 3 No.1, pp. 21-46.
2. Andreassen, C.S., Hetland, J., Hetland, H., Notelaers, G. and Pallesen, S. (2011). "Leadership and fulfillment of the three basic psychological needs at work", *Career Development International*, Vol.16 No.5, pp.507-523.
3. Avolio, B., Bass, B. and Jung, D.I. (1997). *A replicated confirmatory factor analysis of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (Form 5x). Redwood City.
4. Banerji, P. and Krishnan, V.R. (2000). "Ethical preferences of transformational leaders: an empirical investigation", *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, Vol. 28 No.1, pp.405-403.
5. Bell, E. and Bryman, A. (2007). *Business Research Methods*. Oxford University Press, New York.
6. Berson, Y. and Linton, D. (2005). "An examination of the relationships between leadership style, quality and employee satisfaction in R&D versus administrative environments". *R&D Management*, Vol.35 No.1, pp. 51-60.
7. Bruch, H. and Walter, F. (2007). "Leadership in context: investigating hierarchical impacts on transformational leadership". *Leadership and Organisational Development Journal*, Vol.28 No.8. pp.710-726.
8. Cilliers, F., Van Deventer, V. and Van Eeden, R. (2008). "Leadership styles and associated personality traits: Support for conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership". *South African Journal of Psychology*, Vol.38 No.2, pp.253-267.
9. Emery, C.R. and Barker, K.J. (2007). "The effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel". *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict,* Vol.11 No.1, pp.77-90.
10. Flynn, S.I. (2009). "Transformational and Transactional Leadership". *Research Starters Sociology:* Vol.1 No.1, pp.1-6.
11. Jones, D.W. and Rudd, R.D. (2007). "Transactional, Transformational or Laissez-Faire Leadership: An assessment of College of Agriculture Academic Program Leaders (Deans) Leadership Styles". *Proceedings of the AAAE Research Conference,* Vol. 3.
12. Madlock, P.E. (2008). "The link between leadership style, communicator competence and employee satisfaction". *Journal of Business Communication,* Vol.45 No.1, pp.61-78.
13. McColl-Kennedy, J.R. and Anderson, R.D. (2005). "Subordinate – manager gender combination and perceived leadership style influence on emotions, self-esteem and organizational commitment". *Journal of Business Research,* Vol.58 No.2, pp.115-125.
14. Mester, C., Visser, D. and Roodt, G. (2003). "Leadership style and its relation to employee attitudes and behavior". *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology,* Vol.29 No.2, pp. 72-82.
15. Naidu, J. and Van Der Walt, M.S. (2005). "An exploration of the relationship between leadership styles and the implementation of transformation interventions". *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.3 No 2, pp.1-10.
16. Nielsen, K., Yarker, J., Brenner, S.O., Randall, R. and Borg, V. (2008). "The importance of transformational leadership style for the well-being of employees working with older people". *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol.63 No.5, pp. 465-475.
17. Olson, R., Verley, J., Santos, L. and Salas, C. (2004). "What we teach students about the Hawthorne Studies: A Review of Content within a sample of Introductory IO and OB Textbooks", *The Industrial Organisation Psychologist,* Vol.41 No.3, Available online: https:www.siop.org/tip/backissues/Jan 2004/TOC.aspx [Accessed 1 March 2013].
18. Oshagbemi, T. 2003. "Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities", *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol.30 No.12, pp. 1210-1232.
19. Ozaralli, N. (2002). "Effects of transformational leadership on empowerment and team effectiveness". *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, Vol.24 No. 6, pp.335-344.
20. Pattersen, M., Warr, P. and West, M. (2004). "Organizational Climate and Company Productivity: The role of Employee Affect and Employee Level". *London Economic and Social Research Council*, Vol.1 No.1, pp.1-31.
21. Sekaran, U. and Bougie, R. (2010). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Building Approach,* John Willey & Sons Ltd, West Sussex.
22. Uhl-Bein, M., Marion, R., and McKelvey, B. (2007). "Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting Leadership from the Leadership Age to the Knowledge Era", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol.18 No. 1, pp.298-318.
23. Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W. and Lofquist, L.H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*, University of Minnesota: St Paul, MN, USA.
24. Xirasagar, S. (2008). "Transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership among physician executives". *Journal of Health Organisation and Management*, Vol.22 No.6, pp.599-613.