

# University Administrator's Leadership Styles Affecting Instructors' Job Satisfaction in a Normal University in Jiangxi Province, China

Anqi Liu\*

EMILIO AGUINALDO COLLEGE, Manila, Philippines

\* Corresponding author: Anqi Liu (Email: anqi.liu.mnl@eac.edu.ph)

**Abstract:** This study aims to explore how university leaders' leadership styles influence instructors' job satisfaction. Effective university leadership is crucial to the success of educational institutions, as leaders directly impact instructors' satisfaction by shaping the work environment and decision-making processes. The study examines various types of leadership styles, including autocratic, democratic, transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership, and analyzes their different impacts on job satisfaction. The findings suggest that democratic and transformational leadership styles generally contribute to higher levels of job satisfaction among instructors, while autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles may lead to lower satisfaction. These insights provide valuable guidance for university leaders in enhancing instructors' job satisfaction.

**Keywords:** University Leadership; Instructors' Job Satisfaction; Autocratic Leadership; Democratic Leadership; Transformational Leadership; Transactional Leadership; Laissez-Faire Leadership.

## 1. Introduction

Effective university leadership is a critical factor in the success of educational institutions. University administrators play a pivotal role in shaping the university's culture and influencing the job satisfaction of instructors. The leadership style adopted by an administrator can have a significant impact on the overall work environment, which, in turn, affects the job satisfaction of instructors.

In the field of education, leadership styles can vary widely. Some administrators adopt an autocratic approach, where they make decisions unilaterally, while others prefer a democratic style, involving instructors in the decision-making process. Transformational leaders inspire and motivate their staff, while transactional leaders use rewards and punishments to achieve compliance. Laissez-faire leaders give instructors considerable autonomy. Each of these leadership styles can impact instructors' job satisfaction differently.

**Autocratic Leadership:** Administrators with this style often impose decisions without consulting instructors. This can lead to frustration among educators, diminishing their job satisfaction as they feel disempowered and undervalued.

**Democratic Leadership:** Involving instructors in decision-making can foster a sense of ownership and collaboration, enhancing job satisfaction. Instructors appreciate having a voice in shaping their work environment.

**Transformational Leadership:** Transformational leaders inspire instructors by setting a compelling vision and fostering a culture of innovation. This can significantly boost job satisfaction, as educators feel motivated and valued.

**Transactional Leadership:** While transactional leaders provide rewards for good performance, an overreliance on this style can create a transactional atmosphere, where instructors focus solely on meeting expectations for rewards, potentially reducing job satisfaction.

**Laissez-Faire Leadership:** While some autonomy can be empowering, excessive autonomy without guidance can lead

to confusion and frustration among instructors, negatively affecting job satisfaction.

Instructors' job satisfaction is a crucial determinant of their effectiveness and the overall quality of education. Satisfied instructors are more likely to be engaged, enthusiastic, and committed to their work, which positively impacts student learning outcomes. Conversely, dissatisfied instructors may experience burnout, leading to decreased performance and potentially impacting students' academic progress.

Instructors' job satisfaction is influenced by a myriad of factors, including leadership styles, workload, compensation, professional development opportunities, and the overall university climate. Leadership styles, as one of these factors, can either contribute to or detract from instructors' job satisfaction.

Studies have shown that an administrator's leadership style can significantly affect instructors' job satisfaction. Educators often report higher job satisfaction when they perceive their administrator as approachable, supportive, and willing to listen to their concerns. Transformational leadership and a collaborative approach tend to correlate positively with instructor job satisfaction, while autocratic or laissez-faire leadership styles often have a negative impact.

The assessed university administrator's leadership style is undeniably linked to instructors' job satisfaction. Effective leadership that fosters collaboration, motivation, and empowerment tends to result in higher levels of job satisfaction among educators. Understanding the various leadership styles and their potential impact on instructors can help educational institutions create a positive work environment that benefits both instructors and students. Ultimately, nurturing job satisfaction among instructors is essential for the overall success and quality of education within a university.

## 2. Statement of the Problem

This study determined the university administrators' leadership styles affecting their instructors' job satisfaction.

The results of the study will be used as a basis for a leadership development program among university administrators.

Specifically, the study answered the following questions:

(1)What is the demographic profile of the instructor respondents in terms of:

- 1)sex;
- 2)age;
- 3)educational attainment;
- 4)position;
- 5)length of service?

(2)What is the assessment of the university instructor respondents of their university administrator's leadership style:

- 1)authoritative;
- 2)democratic;
- 3)facilitative; or
- 4)situational?

(3)Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the university instructor respondents of their university administrator's leadership style when their profile is used as test factor?

(4)What is the self-assessment of the university instructor respondents on their job satisfaction level in terms of:

- 1)security;
- 2)work environment;
- 3)job responsibilities; and
- 4)community linkages?

(5)Is there a significant difference in the self-assessment of the university instructor respondents on their job satisfaction level when their profile is used as a test factor?

(6)Is there is significant relationship between the assessment of the university instructor respondents of their university administrator's leadership style and the self-assessment of the university instructor respondents on their job satisfaction level?

(7)Based on the results of the study, what leadership development program among university administrators can be proposed?

### 3. Hypothesis of the Study

These hypotheses undergo testing at 5% level:

Ho1: There is no significant difference in the assessment of the university instructor respondents of their university administrator's leadership style when their profile is used as test factor.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in the self-assessment of the university instructor respondents on their job satisfaction level when their profile is used as a test factor

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between the assessment of the university instructor respondents of their university administrator's leadership style and the self-assessment of the university instructor respondents on their job satisfaction level.

### 4. Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study was done in Shangrao Normal University in Jiangxi Province, China.

The scope of the study covers the assessment of the relationship between the university administrator's leadership style and instructors' job satisfaction, assessed by instructors from Shangrao Normal University in Jiangxi Province, China.

The study has evolved around the selected profile variables

of the instructors such as sex, area of specialization, age, educational attainment, years of experience, and position.

To be specific, the assessment of the administrator's leadership style revolved around the four leadership styles, namely, authoritative, democratic, facilitative, and situational. This variable were correlated with the assessment of the instructor respondents of their job satisfaction in terms of security, work environment, job responsibilities, and community linkages.

In data gathering and utilizing more complex statistical treatment, the study included descriptive statistics and correlational analysis with One-way ANOVA and post hoc analysis to interpret further and investigate the respondents' demographic data and their significant relationship of the administrator's leadership style and instructors' job satisfaction.

## 5. Research Design

In this study, the research approach employed was the descriptive-comparative-correlational method. This methodology encompasses the processes of describing, recording, analyzing, and interpreting conditions and relationships. As outlined by Ary et al. (2019), descriptive research is characterized by the collection of data aimed at testing hypotheses or addressing inquiries pertaining to the present state of the subject under investigation. This type of research is instrumental in ascertaining and presenting the current situation, providing a systematic and scientific account of events, phenomena, or facts within a specific domain or among a particular population.

This study aimed to investigate the assessed university administrator's leadership style as assessed by the instructors and its relationship to the instructors' job satisfaction.

This research approach allows the researcher to numerically analyze, compare, and correlate the relationships among the dependent and independent variables included in the study.

By utilizing this approach, the researcher was able to find any significant difference or relationship in the instructors' job satisfaction and their demographic data such as age, sex, educational attainment, length of service, and position. The instructors' assessment was then correlated to their assessed university administrator's leadership style.

All the above discussions on the descriptive research method suited the nature of research that this present study would do; hence this method was adopted.

## 6. Results

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution of the university instructor respondents' profile in terms of sex, age, educational attainment, position, and length of service.

**Table 1.** Frequency Distribution of Instructor Respondents' Profile

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	134	44.7%
Female	166	55.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Age</b>		
26-35 years old	188	62.7%
36-45 years old	81	27.0%
46-55 years old	26	8.7%
More than 55 years old	5	1.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Educational Attainment</b>		
Bachelor's degree	34	11.3%
With Master's units	18	6.0%
Master's degree	157	52.3%
With Doctoral units	66	22.0%
Doctoral degree	25	8.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Position</b>		
None	38	12.7%
Teaching Assistant	62	20.7%
Lecturer	138	46.0%
Associate Professor	53	17.7%
Professor	9	3.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Length of Service</b>		
Less than 5 years	71	23.7%
5-10 years	109	36.3%
11-15 years	67	22.3%
16-20 years	22	7.3%
21-25 years	24	8.0%
More than 25 years	7	2.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100%</b>

Sex. One hundred thirty four (134) or 44.7% of the instructor respondents are male, while one hundred sixty six (166) or 55.3% are female. This goes to show that majority of the instructor respondents are female.

Age. One hundred eighty eight (188) or 62.7% of the instructor respondents are 26-35 years old, eighty one (81) or 27% are 36-45 years old, twenty six (26) or 8.7% are 46-55 years old, and five (5) or 1.7% are more than 55 years old. The result shows that majority of the instructor respondents are within the age group of 26-35 years old.

Educational Attainment. Thirty four (34) or 11.3% of the instructor respondents are Bachelor's degree holders, eighteen (18) or 6% have already earned Master's units, one hundred fifty seven (157) or 52.3% are Master's degree holders, sixty six (66) or 22% have earned Doctoral units, and twenty five (25) or 8.3% are Doctoral degree holders. This indicates that majority of the instructor respondents are Master's degree holders.

Position. Thirty four (34) or 11.3% of the instructor respondents have no position, sixty two (62) or 20.7% are Teaching Assistant, one hundred thirty eight (138) or 46% are Lecturers, fifty three (53) or 17.7% are Associate Professor, and nine (9) or 3% are Professors. The result shows that most of the instructor respondents are holding the position as Lecturers.

Length of Service. Seventy one (71) or 23.7% of the instructor respondents have been in the service for less than 5 years, one hundred nine (109) or 36.3% for about 5-10 years, sixty seven (67) or 22.3% for 11-15 years, twenty two (22) or 7.3% for 16-20 years, twenty four (24) or 8% for 21-25 years,

and seven (7) or 2.3% for more than 25 years. This indicates that most of the instructor respondents have been in the service for not more than ten years.

## 7. Conclusion

(1) Majority of the instructors are young female who have obtained Master's degree, mostly are lecturers and have been in the service for not more than ten years.

(2) Facilitative leadership style was the most evident leadership style among the university administrators while democratic leadership style tends to be the least evident among them as perceived by the instructors.

(3) The leadership style exhibited by the university administrators has been observed by male instructors to be more evident among them than how it was observed by the female instructors.

(4) Instructors have relatively the same perceptions on the leadership style of their administrators regardless of their age, educational attainment, position, and length of service.

(5) Instructors have manifested a high level of job satisfaction specifically on job responsibilities and work environment, while to a moderate degree on security and community linkages.

(6) Instructors have relatively the same level of job satisfaction regardless of their age, sex, educational attainment, position, and length of service.

(7) It can be said that the instructors' level of job satisfaction can be influenced by the leadership style of the university administrators.

## 8. Recommendations

(1) Implement regular leadership training and development programs for university administrators to enhance their skills and capabilities.

(2) Encourage continuous learning and self-improvement among administrators, by supporting their participation in professional development programs and conferences.

(3) Foster a culture of resilience and adaptability, encouraging university administrators to embrace change and navigate challenges with a positive mindset.

(4) Promote and reward innovation and creativity in leadership approaches, encouraging university administrators to think outside the box and explore new solutions to challenges.

(5) Provide professional development opportunities for university instructors to enhance their community engagement skills, such as communication, relationship-building, and networking.

(6) Improve the system for tracking and evaluating the impact of community linkages on teacher job satisfaction, student outcomes, and overall school success which can be used to inform decision-making and continuous improvement efforts.

(7) Recognize and reward instructors who demonstrate exemplary safety practices and contribute to a secure learning environment.

## References

- [1] Adair, J. E. (2019). *Develop Your Leadership Skills*. London: Kogan Page Publishers. W.-K. Chen, *Linear Networks and Systems* (Book style). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1993, pp. 123-135.

- [2] Ali, T. (2018). Raising instructors' voices: An in-depth qualitative inquiry into instructors' working conditions and professional development needs in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, a province of Pakistan. *Teaching and Instructor Education*, 22, 78–104.
- [3] Baig, S. A., Iqbal, S., Abrar, M., Baig, I. A., Amjad, F., et al. (2021). Impact of leadership styles on employees' performance with moderating role of positive psychological capital. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 32, 1085–1105.
- [4] Bass, B. M., and Steidlmeier, P. (2021). Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational Leadership Behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(issue), 181–217.
- [5] Blatt, D. A. (2018). A Study to Determine the Relationship between the Leadership Styles of Career Technical Directors and University Climate as Assessed by Instructors. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(12).
- [6] Bogler, R. (2023). The Influence of Leadership Style on Instructor Job Satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662–683.
- [7] Bush, T., Bell, L., and Middlewood, D. (2022). Introduction: New Directions in Educational Leadership. *Principles of Educational Leadership and Management*, 3–12.
- [8] Chen, Y. G., Cheng, J. N., & Sato, M. (2023). Effects of university administrators' leadership behaviors: A comparison between Taiwan and Japan. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 17, 145–173.
- [9] Damai, S., Efendi, R., & Sulaiman. (2019). The Instructor Achievement Motivation as an Intervening Variable in the Relationship between Instructor's Professionalism, Administrator's Leadership, and Instructor's Performance of State High University in Banjarmasin City. *Journal of K6, Education, and Management (J-K6EM)*, 2(1), 33-35.
- [10] Dembelé, M., and Rogers, F. H. (2019). "More and Better Instructors: Making the Slogan a Reality," in *More and Better Instructors for Quality Education for All: Identity and Motivation, Systems, and Support*. Editors J. Kirk, M. Dembelé, and S. Baxter, 174–180.
- [11] Ekosiswoyo, R. (2022). Administrator Leadership Effective Keys to Achieving Educational Quality. *Journal of Educational Science*, 14(2), 76-82.
- [12] Eyal, O., and Roth, G. (2023). Administrators' Leadership and Instructors' Motivation. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(3), 256–275.
- [13] Feng, B. (2019). A Study of Instructor Job Satisfaction and Factors that Influence It. *Chinese Education and Society*, 40, 5.
- [14] Fuller, J. B., Patterson, C. E. P., Hester, K., and Stringer, D. Y. (2018). A Quantitative Review of Research on Charismatic Leadership. *Psychological Reports*, 78(1), 271–287.
- [15] Ghazi, S. E. (2018). Job Satisfaction of Head Instructors for Selected Twenty Dimensions of Job. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(1), 652-665.
- [16] Gorton, R., Alston, J., & Snowden, P. (2018). *University leadership and administration: Important concepts, case studies and simulations*. Open University Press. The McGraw-Hill.
- [17] Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 46, 5–24.
- [18] Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2023). Collaborative leadership and university improvement: Understanding the impact on university capacity and student learning. In *International Handbook of Leadership for Learning* (pp. 469–485).
- [19] Hu, Y., & Chen, X. (2020). Administrator leadership styles and their impact on instructor job satisfaction: A comparative analysis. *Chinese Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(3), 325-342.
- [20] Ibrahim, M. S., Ghavifekr, S., Ling, S., Siraj, S., & Azeez, M. I. K. (2020). Can transformational leadership influence instructors' commitment towards organizational, teaching profession, and students' learning? A quantitative analysis. *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.*, 15, 177-190.
- [21] Kanat-Maymon, Y., Elimelech, M., and Roth, G. (2020). Work Motivations as Antecedents and Outcomes of Leadership: Integrating Self-Determination Theory and the Full Range Leadership Theory. *European Management Journal*, 38(4), 555–564.
- [22] Lambersky, J. (2022). Understanding the human side of university leadership: Administrators' impact on instructors' morale, self-efficacy, stress, and commitment. *Leadership and Policy in Universities*, 15, 379–405.
- [23] Li, Q., & Wang, H. (2018). Exploring the dimensions of administrator leadership styles in K-12 universities. *Chinese Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 44(1), 67-84.
- [24] Mumford, M. D. (2018). *Pathways to Outstanding Leadership: A Comparative Analysis of Charismatic, Ideological, and Pragmatic Leaders*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [25] Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. New York: Sage publications.
- [26] Robbins, S. P. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (10th ed.). San Diego: Prentice Hall.
- [27] Sawati, M. J., Anwar, S., and Majoka, M. I. (2019). Do qualification, Experience and Age Matter for Administrators' Leadership Styles?. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(7), 403–413.
- [28] Tajasom, A., and Ahmad, Z. A. (2023). Administrators' Leadership Style and University Climate: Instructors' Perspectives from Malaysia. *International Journal of Leadership in Public Services*.
- [29] Terosky, A. L. (2022). Enacting instructional leadership: perspectives and actions of public K-12 administrators. *University Leadership and Management*, 36, 311–332.
- [30] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2018). *International Task Force on Instructors for Education 2030: Strategic Plan 2018–2021*.
- [31] Wardhani, E. W., & Soetomo, W. E. (2023). Effect of Administrator Leadership and Work Motivation on Instructor Performance with Instructor Job Satisfaction as Mediation Variables in SMA Negeri 11 Semarang. *Journal of Vision Management*, 2(2), 139-155.
- [32] Younas, A., Wang, D., Javed, B., & Haque, A. U. (2022). Inclusive leadership and voice behavior: the role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Social Psychology*. Advance online publication.
- [33] Zein, A. K. A., & Hadijah, H. S. (2018). Effect of Organizational Commitment and Work Motivation on Instructor Performance in Pasundan 1 Vocational High University Cimahi. *Journal of Office Management Education*, 2(1), 62-68.
- [34] Zidle, M. (2018). What is Job Satisfaction. *Online Integrated Library for Personal, Professional and Organizational Development*.