

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

LEADERSHIP STYLE AND JOB SATISFACTION LEVELS AMONG
FACULTY-MEMBERS OF CAPE COAST POLYTECHNIC

BY

EMMANUEL BAFFOUR-AWUAH

Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Accountancy of College of
Humanities and Legal Studies, University of Cape Coast in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Award of Master of Business Administration, General
Management.

NOVEMBER 2015

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of my own original work and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Signature: Date:

Name: Emmanuel Baffour-Awuah.

Supervisor's Declaration

I hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the dissertation were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of dissertation laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Signature: Date:

Name: Mr. Samuel KwakuAgyei.

ABSTRACT

This study sought to ascertain the type of leadership skills among heads of department and the satisfaction levels of faculty members in Cape Coast Polytechnic using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The study also sought to establish the relationship between transformational leadership style of heads of department and job satisfaction of faculty members of the institution. The simple random sampling technique was adopted to sample both departments and faculty members. Nine departments and forty-five faculty members, fifteen from each school, took part in the study. Analysis was quantitative utilizing the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Both descriptive statistics and the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation statistical tools were employed in the analysis. The study showed that Heads of Departments in the institution exhibit transformational leadership (33.3 percent), transactional leadership (34.0 percent) and laissez-faire leadership (33.7 percent) styles while all faculty members were satisfied with their jobs (mean = 2.75; SD = 0.628). The study also showed that there is a strong and positive correlation between transformational leadership of heads of department and faculty-member job satisfaction ($r = 0.595$; $p = 0.005$). It is recommended that policy makers in collaboration with the Human Resource Department of the institution should organize programmes that will equip department heads with transformational and transactional leadership principles.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My appreciation and gratitude go to my distinguished and amiable supervisor, Mr. Samuel KwakuAgyei for accepting to supervise this work. The encouragement and alacrity with which he supervised this research work is par excellence. I also want to thank Dr. Essaw of Institute for Development Studies for the contributions he made in shaping the topic.

I also want to express my profound appreciation to all the Heads of Department and faculty members of Cape Coast Polytechnic for accepting to partake in the study. Finally I wish to thank all my lecturers of School of Business, University of Cape Coast, for their wonderful love. May the Almighty bless you.

DEDICATION

To all my students and colleagues of Cape Coast Polytechnic

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF ACRONYMS	x
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Objectives of Study	6
Research Questions	6
Scope of Study	7
Significance of the Study	7
Limitations	9
Definition of terms	10
Organization of Chapters	11
CHAPTER TWO	12
LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Introduction	12
Nature of Leadership	12

Theory of Transformational Leadership	16
Employee Job Satisfaction	22
Empirical Review	25
CHAPTER THREE	36
METHODOLOGY	36
Introduction	36
Research Approach	36
Study Design	37
Study Area	37
Study Population	38
Sample Size and Sampling Design	38
Sources of Data	40
Study Instruments	42
Ethical Considerations	44
Data Presentation and Analysis	45
CHAPTER FOUR	46
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	46
Introduction	46
Background of Respondents	46
Levels of Transformational Leadership Attributes among HODs	48
Levels of Transactional Leadership Attributes among HODs	57
Levels of Laisser-faire Leadership Attributes among HODs	60
Job Satisfaction Levels of Faculty Members	63

Discussion on Leadership Styles	77
Discussion on Job Satisfaction	77
Relationship between Transformational Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction	78
CHAPTER FIVE	81
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	81
Introduction	81
Summary of Results	81
Conclusion	83
Recommendations	83
REFERENCES	85
APPENDIX A	97
APPENDIX C	108
APPENDIX D	110

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1 Mean, Standard Deviation and Skewness of leadership attributes of HODs based on Likert scale 1 to 5	50
2 Mean, Standard Deviation and Skewness of faculty members satisfaction levels based on Likert scale 1 to 5.	65
3 Average Means and Standard Deviations of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction based on Likert scale 1 to 5	78

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CCCU:	Council for Christian Colleges and Universities
HND:	Higher National Diploma
HODs:	Heads of Department
MLQ:	Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire
MSQ:	Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
NAB:	National Accreditation Board
NCTE:	National Council for Tertiary Education
PNDC:	Provisional National Defense Council
SPSS:	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
T _f :	Transformational Leadership
T _l :	Laisser- faire Leadership Style
T _s :	Transactional Leadership Style

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Leadership in organizations, to a large extent, affects the various facets of the working environment (Winston & Patterson 2006). This includes how work is performed; the management of people in the work place; issues concerning how employees gain knowledge and skill through interactions for a period of time; how both co-workers and managers communicate; spend time and react to one another. Thus the main purpose of leadership is to shape both the internal and external working environment in the interest of employees, shareholders, and the public at large (Judge & Piccolo, (2004).

Leaders are, therefore, required to apply leadership skills accruing from the possession of various traits as well as complete and charismatic characteristics (Niesche, 2011). This skill is required to reflect in the effectiveness of the leader so that institutional (Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985) and employee outcomes (Arnold & Feldman, 1982; Breugh, 1981) may be realized. While institutional outcomes deal with achieving institutional targets, employee outcomes are concerned with satisfaction of employees.

Effective leadership has become more relevant for the very survival of organizations, given the recent pace and way at which society and its organizations are changing. Failure to change according to the pace will lead to the demise of the organization (Hukpati, 2009). Many organizations have on one

occasion or another failed to catch up with globalization and its consequential scale of competition as a result of bad leadership.

Leadership that can yield positive results depends on many factors including traits, behavior, competency of followers and contingencies. The role of coworkers and subordinates may also influence the effectiveness of a leader (Bratton, Callinar, Foroshaw&Sawchuk, 2007).

In the view of Winston and Patterson (2006), the leader is required to creatively guide, direct and influence followers to choose and attain specific objectives and goals by liaison between the organization and the individuals so that maximum returns could be achieved. Leadership is an activity that influences people by trying as hard as they could, willingly, but not under duress or coercion, to achieve the mutual objectives of the organization (Bass, 1998). Effective leadership is therefore pertinent in order to achieve the satisfaction of employees on the job (Jain &Saakshi, 2005). Leadership may be considered as process by which individuals and groups interact to involve structured or unstructured situations, group-members expectations and perceptions (Bass, 1990).

Good leadership influences followers. It ensures employee satisfaction. It motivates employees to give off their best. Good leadership is one that stimulates and inspires followers to work beyond their average capacities and allows independence that results in production maximization (Bass, 1985). According to Bass (1985), the ability to influence subordinates to cooperate enthusiastically to achieve the goals of the organization constitutes transformational leadership. Every organization including academic institutions therefore need effective

leaders with skillful leadership styles that can help cope with competition in this globalized world.

Cape Coast polytechnic, officially mandated under PNDC Law 321 to run tertiary programs is no exception. In 1992, the PNDC law 321 commonly referred to as the polytechnic law was enacted with the aim of providing tertiary education opportunity to run full time courses in the field of manufacturing, commerce, science, technology, applied science, applied arts and such other areas as may be determined for the time being responsible for higher education, to encourage study in technical subjects at tertiary level and to provide opportunities for development, research and publications of research findings (Law 321, 1992). In response to this mandate, Cape Coast Polytechnic runs a number of Higher National Diplomas (HND); and Bachelor Degree programs in Building Technology and Mechanical Engineering.

The polytechnic was established in 1984, coming into operation in 1986. It operated under the ambit of the Ghana Education Service until 1992 when the PNDC law 321, (1992) was promulgated. The polytechnic was placed under the Ministry of Education through National Council for Tertiary Education (N.C.T.E.) like all the other polytechnics in Ghana under the polytechnic law.

The National Accreditation Board (NAB) is responsible for maintaining the required academic quality and standards, authorizing the award of diplomas and degrees through affiliated institutions and establishing equivalent qualifications awarded by internal and external institutions of Ghana (PNDC Law, 217) with reference to quality academic, faculty and instructional strength.

Academic programs in the institution are therefore run after due accreditation and recognition by the National Accreditation Board. The National Accreditation Board provides guidelines in engaging the service of lecturers and heads of department in the polytechnic though the polytechnic council directly does employment.

In view of the mandate of the polytechnic, the vision of the polytechnic is to be a leading polytechnic that offers high quality career-orientation, vocational and technical education for national development. To be able to achieve this vision the institution is committed to the training of high and middle level skilled human resources in Business, Engineering, Applied Sciences and Applied Arts in close collaboration with industry and commerce (Baffour-Awuah, 2010; Cape Coast Polytechnic, 2007).

These responsibilities call for effective institutional management with leaders who share the vision of the institution. Leaders with transformational style of leadership are, therefore, required. The employee as a focal point to achieving the vision of the institution can also not be relegated to the background. Without employee job satisfaction, institutional vision, mission, goals and objectives could be hardly achieved (Poulin & Walter, 1992; Reyes, 1989). However, it appears faculty-member job satisfaction in the Institution is on the low side. It is against this backdrop that a study on employee job satisfaction in the institution is relevant. Employee job satisfaction in Cape Coast Polytechnic, therefore, calls for investigations. Transformational leadership style among heads of department in

the Polytechnic, as a measure to achieving the optimum employee satisfaction, also invites further investigations.

Statement of the Problem

Management of organizations needs leaders who would perform to the optimum advantage of the organization through effective leadership to achieve set goals. This orientation and direction demand new and different ways of influencing and directing faculty members to support their heads of departments to achieve the organizational goals. The purpose is to satisfy employees to give off their best with the view to achieving organizational objectives. However, a pilot study appears to show that employee job satisfaction among faculty members in Cape Coast Polytechnic is low. This could negatively affect productivity. Review of literature appears to indicate that studies on leadership styles among academic departments in Ghanaian polytechnics (Hukpati, 2009) in general, and among academic heads in Cape Coast Polytechnic in particular are non-existent. The gaps include one, the absence of the knowledge of the type of leadership styles exhibited by academic heads of the institution; two, whether faculty members are satisfied with the job they do; and three, lack of case studies concerning the relationship between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction in Ghanaian polytechnics.

A study on leadership styles among heads of academic department and faculty-member satisfaction in Cape Coast Polytechnic was relevant to help strategically and productively, adjust to face both current and new challenges. The

goal is to help strategize so that leaders will achieve the utmost level of leadership through leadership style development. Such strategies can effect change initiation by creating the enabling environment and motivate followers to mutually and individually develop, embrace, realize and sustain the organizational vision.

Objectives of Study

The aim of the study was to examine leadership styles of heads of academic department in Cape Coast Polytechnic. However the specific objectives were to:

1. Identify leadership styles among academic heads of department in Cape Coast Polytechnic;
2. Determine the level of job satisfaction of faculty members in Cape Coast polytechnic;
3. Establish the relationship between transformational leadership styles of heads of department and job satisfaction among faculty members.

Research Questions

Based on the objectives of study the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the leadership styles among academic heads of department in Cape Coast Polytechnic?
2. What are the levels of leadership styles among heads of department in Cape Coast Polytechnic?

3. What is the level of job satisfaction among faculty-members in Cape Coast polytechnic?
4. How does transformational leadership style of academic heads of department relate job satisfaction among faculty members?

Scope of Study

Leadership has been identified as situational and contingent. Thus all leadership attributes among heads of department, within the transformational-translational-laisser-faire leadership continuum, may be exhibited depending on the circumstance, state, condition, eventuality and exigency (Bass, 1985; Fairholm, 1994; Kotter, 1990). The present study focused on the academic segment of the polytechnic. Only the teaching staffs, i.e. those in Assistant Lecturer position and above, were involved. Leadership styles among heads of department in the three schools were considered. Job satisfaction levels among those in the position of Assistant Lecturer and above were also investigated.

Significance of the Study

It is hoped that the study shall be of immense benefit to management; first line managers at the operational level, tactical level managers, strategic management level; and employees in the departments at the operational level. Employees by knowing the predominant leadership styles of their operational managers could adopt by adjusting their attitudes to cope with that of their heads

of department. Their perception about their heads of department may change when they get to know more about their heads principal leadership styles.

Similarly heads of department, in trying to deal with the job satisfaction levels of their subordinates in the various facets, may adopt different leadership styles that will bring higher satisfaction levels to improve productivity in their departments. Change in their perception of department members may change their orientation on how they manage the affairs of the department.

The findings of the study will also enable tactical managers to know the leadership styles of operational managers. This will enable them adopt leadership styles that shall cope or change these styles to ensure improved worker satisfaction and increase in productivity.

At the strategic management level, policies on leadership training shall be given a new outlook and seriousness to deal with the deficiencies in leadership skill of current and future heads of department in the institution. Leadership training programs shall be tailored to suit the situation on the ground, with the view to increasing employee satisfaction and improving productivity at the departmental and school levels.

Policy makers at the ministerial and national level may also find this study useful. In charting the national course in polytechnic administration, findings of this study shall serve as a guide in organizing leadership programs for academic staff of polytechnics in the country. Researchers and professionals may also find the study beneficial by serving as reference material. It will also open new

avenues of academic and professional research in polytechnics and other tertiary institutions in the country.

Limitations

Leaders performing as managers in educational institutions have dual responsibilities, particularly those in academic departments. They perform managerial responsibilities and teaching responsibilities. The first limitation of the study arose from the fact that questionnaires were intended to be responded by academic managers at the workplace. This appeared to put some pressure on the respondents in answering the questionnaire. However, with some persuasions and tolerance, heads of department were able to do so voluntarily and without duress nor compulsion.

Various instruments have been developed to test the value of leadership theories. However no single theory or model has been able to totally cover the membrane of leadership. There is therefore no acceptable and universally tested leadership theory. Nearly all leadership instruments that are available are restricted in relevance to supervisors and managers due to their design to suit supervisory leadership. There is therefore no general or broad range instrument for leadership measurement. Within these constraints the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire, 6S (MLQ/6S) designed by Bass and Avolio (1994) was used to measure the leadership styles of operational managers in the institution. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was also employed to measure job satisfaction of the teaching staff.

In spite of its advantages the MLQ instrument is limited to measures of effects on followers, singularly lumping the leader's behavior as a sole homogeneous pattern without regard to significant group characteristics (Shamir, Zakay, Brenin & Popper, 1998). Caution was therefore taken when interpreting sub-scales due to high correlation among variables. The relevance of the questionnaire is also limited when used in strict rule-driven bureaucratic settings. The MSQ is also limited in its advantages in term of length and its affect-based effect on respondents (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1967). Thus responses indicate liking or dislike instead of description.

Definition of terms

For the purpose of this study the following terminologies have been defined as follows:

Faculty member/member: Any academic staff purposely employed in the polytechnic with the sole responsibility to teach.

Head of department: Head of academic department who act as operational head in the faculty/school.

Faculty/school: An academic section comprising two or more academic departments and headed by a dean.

Job: Any work that could be assigned to an academic staff in the department including coordination of department activities.

Follower: An employee working under a transformational leader.

Subordinate: An employee working under a transactional or laissez-faire leader.

Organization of Chapters

In response to requirements for writing dissertation in University of Cape Coast this report has been divided into five main chapters. Chapter one is the introduction with background to the study, statement of problem, aim and objectives, research questions, scope of study, significance of study, study limitations and chapter organization. Chapter two is the literature review. This deals with conceptual framework, theoretical framework. Issues discussed include types of leadership style, meaning and scope of leadership, employee job satisfaction, leadership style theories, job satisfaction theories, and theoretical framework of transformational leadership style in relation to job satisfaction. Chapter Three is titled Research Methodology and is made up of subtitles such as target population, source of data and data collection, sampling design, sample size, data processing and analysis, and ethical considerations. Chapter four contains data collected, data analysis and discussion of results obtained from the data analysis. The last section (chapter five) contains the summary, conclusion of study and recommendations based on the conclusion.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter looks at the nature and scope of leadership, the theory of leadership applied to the study. The nature, scope and theory of transformational leadership and other leadership styles were also discussed in furtherance to their relationship with job satisfaction of employees in organizations in general and educational institutions in particular.

Nature of Leadership

Management has been of interest to businesses, with the pursuit of leaders becoming of great concern to many organizations (Trevino & Bart, 1992). It has become evidential that effective leaders require ethical and influential performance in the discharge of their duties and responsibilities (Jewell & Reitz, 1981). Effective leaders, should therefore be sought for, and trained, to the benefit of organizations. Though leadership has been widely studied, its understanding continues to make it one of the most elusive concepts (Burns, 1978).

Leadership is viewed in terms of behaviour, personality, contingency, power linkages, group process or a blend of these parameters (Bratton et al, 2007). Many definitions are available from different writers. For example, leadership may be defined as a course of action by which a person inspires, influences and guides others to take part in a collective endeavor with a view to achieving a common goal (Dubrin, 2001). In achieving this role of leadership

there is the need for applying authority, power, personal attributes, vision and social skills in various combinations and in response to the need at any particular instant.

According to Haimann and Scott (1970), a leader guides, directs and gives direction and purpose to the efforts of his followers by affecting and changing their behavior. In this effect the leader influences follower behavior not through cohesion or duress nor threats but through enthusiastic and zealous collaborations in achieving organizational or group objectives. In this regard therefore, Haimann and Scott (1970) define leadership as the process by which an executive imaginatively directs, guides, influences the work of others in choosing and attaining specified goals by mediating between the individuals and the organization in such a manner that both will obtain maximum satisfaction. They explain that trying to achieve maximum satisfaction demands that the leader uses artistic means to accomplish more than what the science of management says is possible.

Yukl (2013) defines leadership 'as the process wherein an individual member of a group or organization influences the interpretation of events, the choice of objectives and strategies, the organization of work activities, the motivation of people to achieve the objectives, the maintenance of cooperative relationships, the development of skills and confidence by members and the enlistment of support and cooperation from people outside the group or organization.' This definition considers leadership in terms of the skills of the

individual in relation to the surface features and dynamics of the leader's social influence processes (Bratton et al, 2007).

For this reason leadership is seen as a persuasive effort encouraging and enticing followers to commit themselves through efforts, which on the average, would not be committed to. It is a social construct through which both leader and followers relate to achieve goals and objectives. It is voluntary and deliberate, though requires efforts greater than normal (Harari, 2002).

Leadership is gradually moving from the traditional command and control principle to new models such as transformational, charismatic or self-leadership. The aim of such models are to encourage the commitment of team-members or associates, introduce flexibility in the way team-members are controlled, directed, guided and influenced; develop human resource capacity and nurture team members' innovative capabilities (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

According to Jain and Saakshi (2005), an effective leader is a goal determinant agent, he is an organizer, a coordinator, and representative of team-members, provides guidance in the face of difficulties, serves as an inspirer, motivates, creates confidence and builds the morale of team members. An effective leader develops team spirit and team-work by combining the existing factors; environmental (organizational and external), team-members and his qualities with the aim of whetting worker appetite to productive work. They explain that an effective leader integrates organizational objectives, goals and team-work, bearing in mind that team and objective integration is the fabric in the attainment of organizational goals. He is also a counselor, using power not to

suppress, coerce team-members to submit to his will arbitrarily but such as the situation will demand.

A good leader uses all types of power; rewards, power, coercive power, legitimate power, referent power and expert power on contingent basis. While using power in the best interest of his team-members, an effective leader may adopt either formal or informal power in order to improve upon the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. A good leader must go all out to be effective, adopting reward and nurturing systems that will improve productivity. A good leader must also delegate power when required and motivate employee participation through proper communication channels and systems and resource availability. An effective leader is a good manager of time while combining all available resources in the right proportions. A good and effective leader therefore makes sure there is existing fraternal relationship to enhance good climate for amicable industrial harmony which will develop cooperation among team-members to achieve higher productivity (Mullins, 2010).

An effective leader should communicate authority, power, responsibility and duty. An effective leader must also convey the message of the organization. The effective leader must further communicate his good or bad performance, motivating followers to improve upon his past performance (Jain & Saakshi, 2005). Leaders are required to lead team-members to achieve organizational objectives and goals. They need to plan, take decisions, have good human relations, organize, communicate, motivate, control and be involved in staffing through recommendations particularly in formal settings. Effective leaders are

therefore supposed to adopt styles that will help achieve the goals of the organization. Their indispensability, in this regard cannot be overemphasized.

Theory of Transformational Leadership

James McGregor Burns, a leadership expert and presidential biographer was the first to introduce the concept of transformational Leadership (Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership is a component of the Transformational-Transactional leadership continuum.

The aim of transformational leadership is to transform their followers to be able to become leaders themselves. According to Bass and Riggio (2006) “Transformational leadership is a leadership approach that is defined as leadership that creates valuable and positive change in the followers; a transformational leader focuses on transforming others to help each other, to work out for each other, to be encouraging and harmonious, and to look out for the organizational, morale and performance of his follower group.”

From Bass and Riggio (2006), “Transformational leaders are those who stimulate and inspire followers to both achieve extra ordinary outcomes and in the process develop their own leadership capacity. They continue that these “leaders help followers grow and develop into leaders by responding to individual follower’s needs by empowering them and aligning the objectives and goals of individual followers, the leader, group, and the larger organization. They explain that “evidence has accumulated to demonstrate that transformation leadership can move followers to exceed expected performance as well as lead to high levels of

follower satisfaction and commitment to the group or organization (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

Bass (1985) explaining the work of Burns indicated that the extent of transformational leadership measured, based the leaders influence on his followers in terms of not only the gains that will be accrued by follower but the identification of follower with inspiring mission and vision as well. According to him, such followers will admire, trust, remain loyal and respect the leader and remain hard-working. In his observation, a transformational leader motivates to transform followers, encourages them to be creative and innovative, dare the existing state of affairs and way of doing things and changes the environment so that worker objectives and organizational goals can be achieved. Bass was of the view that leadership styles can be both transformational and transactional.

Transformational leadership assumes that a leader who inspires will get trustworthy followers; a leader with vision and passion is likely to succeed and that through the infusion of enthusiasm and energy things can be get done. This leadership style believes in the development of a vision, selling the vision, finding the way forward to achieve the vision and finally leading the change process. In transformation leadership, while developing the organizational vision and group objectives on one hand and leading change on the other are the initial and final stages of the transformation respectively, the process of selling the vision and finding the way forward are parallel. The transformational leadership style is charismatic in nature, though not narcissistic (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

The transformational leadership theory was first propounded by McGregor Burns in 1978 and later developed by Bass in 1985 (Bass, 1985). The authors were of the view that being in the company of an individual with good morals could be infectious and practically demonstrating in the life of the other persons. He did not believe in self-centeredness but that working with a team and trusting in cooperation with partnership is more rewarding than working as an individual. Burns (1978) assumed that putting the energies of individuals together in an organization produces more than the sum of individuals working separately in a group; and that in every organization group must work in synergy.

According to Burns (1978) transformational leadership is a process by which both leaders and followers work mutually to nurture by educating each other to achieve elevated echelon of moral and motivational dimension. Transformational leadership is never satisfied with the level of achievement. The author believes that better results can always be achieved through appreciating the little achievements of followers. To achieve his objectives the transformational leader may design systems and adopt influential techniques that will encourage and motivate the aim of achieving group and organizational objectives and goals.

Developing transformational leadership as propounded by Bass (1985) and Burns (1985), the assumption was that, the more people create value psychologically and physically for duty, the higher motivational they tend to become, and that the people perform better when they focus on the interest and welfare of the team or organization. He was of the view that transformational leaders can change performance levels of followers by making them aware, of the

worth, benefit and net significance of their job; think of the importance of the success of the team or organizational first rather than themselves; that believe that team or organizational success permanently brings about individual prosperity and not the other way round; and that focusing on individual interest first rather than the team or organization brings total collapse of the organization and consequent penury to group members. From Bass (1985), leaders can transform followers when they can identify themselves with the leader by stirring up followers' feelings through passionate pleas. Coaching and mentoring can also transform followers, according to Bass (1985).

In the recent write-ups of Bass, it was thought that for a leader to be transformational, there should be underlining leadership principles of moral foundation and characteristic (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Judge & Bono, 2000; Bass & Steidmeirr, 1998; Bass, 1990). The four moral foundations as listed by Bass (1990) include Idealized influence; Inspirational motivation; Intellectual stimulation; and Individualized consideration. Moral characteristics, in his view, of an authentic leader are moral character of the leader; ethical values embedded in the leader's vision, articulation, and program (which followers either embrace or reject); morality of the processes of social ethical choice and actions that leaders and followers engage in and collectively pursue.

Bass (1990) further explained that transformational leadership respects, encourages and influences followers. It is also in this context that he outlined the four elements of transformational leadership mentioned above.

The element of individualized consideration deals with the degree of leadership mentoring, coaching, empathy, support, communication and respect to followers. It is also concerned with the extent to which the leader celebrates followers' contribution to the group and the followers desire to nurture their internal motivation and occupational development.

Intellectual stimulation leadership is about followers' innovation and creativity. The extent to which leaders encourage good deeds by not dwelling on followers' faults or mistakes is very essential. It considers the status quo to be stimulating but not the most important element in productive modernism.

In inspirational motivation, the leader's visionary skills should be inspiring and appealing to his followers. The leader invokes followers' energy by giving meaning and purpose to the future goals of individual, the team and organization. This element eschews pessimism. It also challenges the satisfaction of followers comfort zones by giving understanding to vision through inspirationally precise, powerful and engaging communication. By so doing followers become desirous in putting in more effort on the job, motivated, have hope in the future and themselves and develop confidence in themselves and the leader.

The promotion of consistent vision, mission, objectives, moral and ethical values through example, respecting admiring and encouraging followers to give off their best are likely to translate into others who engage with the followers of the leader. The leader achieves this through his inspirational abilities. To the idealized influence leader his vision, mission, objectives and moral and ethical

values compel followers to imitate him. This also brings enthusiasm and optimism into group-members thus committing themselves to the course of the leader, team and the organization.

Transactional leadership style is based on the Pavlov's classical conditioning and the skinner's operant condition theories (Bass, 1990). It assumes that rewards and punishment motivates followers; that when there is clear chain of command social systems achieve maximum output; and that there is a social and psychological contract between a manager and her followers that followers will obey commanding and authoritative conditions without any iota of hesitation, regardless of environment conditions in the organization. The theory is grounded in contingency (Bouton, 2007; Pavlov, 1960).

In transactional leadership there is the believe that once employees are working to the set rules, there is no need for attention but to give rewards in cash, kind, gestures or words. In contrast, corrections are made when employees work below expected performance levels. Employees are expected to be fully responsible once jobs are assigned. Negative and positive reward systems are put in place and applied depending on whether followers work below or above the expected performance levels (Pollice, 2009).

Another component of the transformational-transactional-leadership continuum model is the laissez-faire leadership style. The laissez-faire leadership style is a no leadership style. The model is the full range of leadership styles as propounded by Bass (1990). The fundamental principle governing the model is that every leader exhibits each of these styles to some degree. The frequency with

which leaders exhibit each of these behaviors is what the model seeks to ascertain. This study adopted this model in determining leadership styles of HODs of the institution.

Employee Job Satisfaction

Bratton et al (2007) define job satisfaction as a person's attitude towards his or her job and work content. Satisfaction deals with already experienced outcomes while achieved satisfaction is the happiness experienced when a desire is achieved (Jain & Saakshi, 2005). As a global construct, employee job satisfaction consists of particular elements of jobs that influence the satisfaction level of the individual (Griffin & Bateman, 1996). These elements include career prospects, salary, benefits, promotion opportunities, supervision and colleagues and working conditions. Thus job satisfaction is a function of attitude of employees towards work.

Job satisfaction therefore encompasses performing enjoyable work, performing it well and receiving commensurate reward for work done (Ghazi, 2004). Employee job satisfaction consequently leads to promotion recognition, income, goals that lead to overall fulfillment of wellbeing and feeling. Job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state that results from one's job appraisal and job experience. This gives the relational characteristics between what one's job offers and what one expects from a job. It also leads to positive attitude towards work because creativity, flexibility, loyalty and innovation arise from job satisfaction (Steers & Black, 1994). It is therefore essential to mention

that job satisfaction is a product of work conditions and events experienced on the job (Bratton et al, 2007; Jain &Saakshi, 2005; Griffin & Bateman, 1996).

The conceptualization of job satisfaction can be considered as the assessment of job in the content of fulfillment of essential job values in relation to individual needs (Boon, Arumugan, Vellapan, Yin & Wei 2006; Hackman & Oldham, 1975). It has also been established that employee job satisfaction is a function of variables such as economic rewards, working conditions, organizational policy, administrative mechanisms, achievement, interpersonal relationships, recognition, responsibility, work and individual growth and development (Nnadi, 1997). This finding is corroborated with Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnelly (2000) that employee attitude towards work is influenced by attitude related to work environment such as supervisor style, work conditions, work procedures, work policies and fringe benefits.

Job satisfaction also relates with motivation. Though there is a perception that job satisfaction and motivation are similar there is a marked difference. Thus while satisfaction deals with experienced contentment through satisfied desire, motivation as a continuous process and related to the totality of the individual is concerned with the drive towards an outcome (Jain &Saakshi, 2005).

It is in line with this that Bogler (2001) identifies two major factors in his definition of job satisfaction. There are thus intrinsic and extrinsic factors of employee job satisfaction. Intrinsic factors include achievement, professional prestige, work autonomy and professional growth and development. Extrinsic satisfiers are related to benefits, remunerations and work conditions. This concept

on job satisfaction is rooted in the early studies of Bolger (2001), Dinham and Scott (2000) and Herzberg, Mouser and Syderman (1959).

The theories of Herzberg et al (1959) appear to support employee job satisfaction studies when it comes to dealing with teacher job satisfaction in educational settings. These theory view motivation as the embodiment of all promptings that encourage and entice an individual to endeavor, even in the face of risks, to perform in order to achieve organizational, group and individual goals and targets. Thus in the opinion of Greenberg and Baron (1995) the Herzberg two factor theory becomes essential in explaining satisfaction and dissatisfaction at the workplace.

According to the two factor theory (Herzberg et al, 1959), the intrinsic factors, also called motivators are those the presence of which motivates employees to give better performance. They therefore enhance job satisfaction. They are related to the job itself, achievement, individual growth and development, recognition for achievement and responsibility. On the other hand, extrinsic factors also referred to as hygiene factors or dissatisfies are those that function to prevent job satisfaction.

Though extrinsic factors may not necessarily motivate workers, their absence may lead to job dissatisfaction. They include supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, salary, organizational policy and administration, supervisor and employment security. According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2001) satisfaction and dissatisfaction is a straight line continuum with zero midpoint where both satisfaction and dissatisfaction are absent representing neutrality. It

could therefore be surmised that in a work environment where there is laborious work ethnics in conjunction with good remuneration, supervision and conditions of work, workers would never be satisfied or dissatisfied. More motivators than dissatisfies should exist in the workplace in order to move into the positive domain of the continuum, i.e., employee job satisfaction. The theory further suggests that both satisfaction factors and extrinsic factors are disjoint, distinct and separate.

Empirical Review

Various research works have proved that the behavior of a leader can have an immense and persistent effect on many aspects of employee satisfaction (Vroom & Jago, 1988; Griffin & Bateman, 1986; Bass, 1985; Steers & Rhodes, 1978). In the ideal environment the responsibility of leadership is to create an environment that will make the employee satisfied and provide the achievement of organizational goals and objectives by prohibiting and withdrawing impediment that generate negative attitudes, frustrations, dysfunctional behaviour and satisfaction needs (Maslow, 1954).

Thus, in order to succeed as a leader in educational organizations, leaders must be supportive of administrators, teachers and students, create opportunities for members to perform their roles and responsibilities by contributing to quality teaching and learning process in order to provide enhanced teacher satisfaction both within and outside the work environment (Drysdale, Ford, Gurr & Swann, 2003).

This finding is corroborated by the findings of Mine (2008) in Cyprus, where it was observed that considerate behaviour of leaders has significant positive relationship between leaders and teachers in terms of maintenance of job satisfaction. The study further revealed that considerate leader behavior can transform job satisfaction into expressly high levels. It is therefore undisputable to suggest that educational institutional leaders with considerate behaviors could satisfy their subordinates by creating awareness and opportunities that lead to job satisfaction at the workplace.

In support of Mine (2008), Ryan (1980) earlier observed through a Newfoundland study that there is a positive relationship between management styles and job satisfaction of teachers. A quantitative investigative study by Delaney (1991) on teachers' perceptions and the effect of management or administrative practices on teacher morale and job satisfaction also concluded that teacher morale is significantly affected by management practices. The study further showed that there is a relationship between leadership practices and teacher morale and teacher satisfaction. It was also found that job security, working conditions and management practices were three factors that could greatly influence teacher morale and satisfaction.

In another work, a five-year study that concentrated on teacher morale, employee job satisfaction, and motivation found that leadership style of head teachers was a pertinent factor since it could be a generator of micro politics in institutions (Evans, 1998). This finding is in agreement with Delaney (1991). It was therefore concluded by Evans (1998) that consultative and collaborative

leadership style in educational institutions was more successful in realizing high employee job satisfaction and morale among teachers.

Not is leadership style a factor in worker satisfaction and morale only in educational institutions. In studying the relationships between leadership features and employee job satisfaction in hospital settings, Medley and Larochelle (1995) found that there exists a relationship between leadership features and job satisfaction. It was also revealed that there was 85% nurse retention rate where employee job satisfaction was high. In a similar vein Cohen and Cohen (1993) found that job satisfaction has a high impact on retention rate among employees and that good leadership features influence employee job satisfaction.

But it appears good leadership styles do not abound in Ghanaian educational institutions. For example, Zame and Hope (2008), studying leadership style among basic school head teacher in Ghana divulged that there is lack of leadership style proficiencies among head teachers as a result of absence of preparation programmes of school leaders. They further affirmed that heads lack professional administrative behavior, practical management and leadership preparation. They therefore concluded that head teachers' professional development in Ghanaian basic institutions has leadership challenges.

Studies have shown that employee job satisfaction is a function of employee commitment to the organization (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979; Reyes, 1989), employee absenteeism (Breaugh, 1981), reduced employee turnover (Steers & Black, 1994) and organizational effectiveness (Ostroff, 1992). In similar work, Carsten and Spector (1957) have shown that there exists a

relationship between job satisfaction and productivity, retention, performance and employee absenteeism. Increasing job satisfaction has also been shown to lower employee grievances, turnover, tardiness and absenteeism (Montana & Charnov, 1993). It also reduces job stress, low morale, low productivity and gloomy work environment. It reduces cost resulting from replacing performing staff or restraining new staff resulting from replacements.

Boyer, Altbach and Whitelaw (1994) study in Australia, Korea, Japan, Russia, Sweden, Mexico, Brazil, Chile, U.S.A, U.K, Germany, Israel, Hong Kong, Netherlands, revealed a direct positive relationship between job satisfaction and courses taught, intellectual lives and relationship among workmates. A study cited by Ssenga and Garrett (2005) on the satisfaction of academics were in tune with findings of Boyer et al (1994). In Australia, Germany, U.S.A, Canada, Mexico, Israel, Sweden and U.K the findings showed issues concerning laborious work nature and remuneration levels. It was also revealed that job satisfaction or otherwise could result from both context-related and content-related work variables. The study, therefore, concluded that there are generally four job-related variables that could bring employee job satisfaction among academics. These are job security, general work conditions, pursuing own ideas and relationship among colleagues.

This finding corroborates that of Ssenga and Garrett (2005) in two Uganda universities. It was found that colleague behavior, supervision and intrinsic aspects of teaching are the main variables that influence the satisfaction of lecturers. In academia the issue of opportunities available to pursue one's own

ideas and interrelationship among colleagues as a major satisfaction variable had earlier been shown by Hall, Pearson and Carol (1992) and Poulin and Walter (1992). Ssenga and Garrett (2005) also indicate that in tertiary institutions in Uganda, incentives, leadership styles, pay packages and conditions at the workplace are four major satisfaction parameters among academics.

Studies have revealed that transformational leadership produces greater job satisfaction. It gives mission and intellectual stimulation to the worker. It encourages followers to embark on more challenging responsibilities, gives autonomy, and ensures that tasks motivate subordinates, increasing employee accomplishment and satisfaction. It has been established that transformational leadership exists in many public institutions, including primary, secondary and tertiary institutions. This has a direct influence on job satisfaction (Emery & Barker, 2007).

Studying on the topic: “leadership and teacher job satisfaction: comparative study of private and public tertiary institutions in Ghana,” Hukpati (2009) found some relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction among two private and public tertiary institutions thus supporting the works of Lowe, Kroeck and Sivasubramaniam (1996); Greenberg and Baron (1995); Koh, Steers and Terborg (1995); Tosi, Rizzo and Carroll (1994); Hatter and Bass (1989); and Gritman and Bateman, (1996).

Transformational leadership is one of the leadership styles exhibited by leaders in organizations. The commitment of employees to the organization has a direct relationship to transformational leadership. It has also been established that

transformational leadership produce job satisfaction and leader satisfaction (Hatter & Bass, 1988; Koh, Steers & Terborg, 1995; Lowe et al, 1996).

This is also confirmed by Bass (1990). Thus transformational leadership empowers employee, resulting in expected citizenship behavior in the organization settings (Graham, 1988). According to Graham (1988) with reference to Avolio and Bass (1988), when a leader individually focuses his contribution to empower his followers, they become autonomous, giving job satisfaction, leader satisfaction and achievement of organizational goals. Graham (1988) adds that, stimulating the intellect and considering group members in the performance of duties in organizational set-up generates empowerment.

Various research findings support this empirical observation. For example, Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990), studying petrochemical employees found that, though there was moderate degree of trust of subordinates to leaders, the behavior of a transformational leader has effect on employee behavior, satisfaction and trust. This is also supported by empirical findings that there is a direct relationship between transformational leadership and employee motivation and morality leading to empowerment (Dvir, Eden, Avolio & Shamir, 2002).

The findings of Bryman (1992) also indicate that job satisfaction, perceived extra effort and citizenship behavior in the organizational setting has a positive relationship with transformational leadership. According to him consideration from the transformational leader gives birth to this relationship and

makes its contribution to followers' trust, empowerment and job satisfaction significant.

Examining the effects of transformational leadership on decision-making strategies of school principals and teachers' occupation perceptions on teacher job satisfaction, Bolger (2001), using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), discovered that transformational leadership directly and indirectly has influence on teachers' satisfaction. Bolger (2001) also established that this, though, was perceptual. He also found that teachers' satisfaction increased when they perceived the leader as more transformational. He further observed that teachers' occupation has a positive relationship with job satisfaction.

This supports the findings of Koh et al (1995) that a transformational leader allows subordinates to participate in organizational duties and responsibilities. The authors found that in secondary educational Institutions in Singapore, transformational leadership could influence teacher and student behavior. Using the split sample method the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and a sample of 846 secondary school teachers, the study showed that transformational leadership can be used to predict teacher satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment. It also has significant add-ons effects on transactional leadership thus substantially linking these behaviors.

It could be argued from the foregoing that transformation leadership is an effective instrument to enhance employee attitude and behavior in organizations. Using an approximate model with 104 higher education institutions in North

America, Webb (2009) affirms that transformational leadership is a significant predictor of employee job satisfaction. This attunes to the findings of Koh et al (1995). Upon investigation into the extent by which transformational leadership, transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership combine as a practice by college and university presidents in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU), it was revealed that charisma; individual consideration and contingent reward could significantly predict employee job satisfaction (Webb, 2009). Combining these three models, it was concluded that, leadership behavior capable of enhancing employee perceptions of leadership effectiveness enhances follower satisfaction. It was also concluded that it is a motivator to hard work with consequential effect of increase in follower perceptions of leadership.

The other aspect of transformational leadership was showed by Hetland and Sandal (2003) in a Norwegian study, investigating the relationship between transformational leadership and followers work motivation, effectiveness and satisfaction. Similarly, the relationship between transformational leadership and personality in five public intuitions were investigated. Findings revealed a strong link between motivation, effectiveness and satisfaction though the relationship between transformational leadership and personality was found to be moderate. This is an indication that a leader's trait is a contributor to his/her success.

In addition, it was revealed that, for leadership to be transformational, it depends on the one who perceives and rates. Thus a positive correlation exists between transformational leadership and sub-ordinate perception, efforts, willingness to contribute and degree of satisfaction to leader's manifestations

(Hater & Bass, 1988). This contrives to the assessment of Judge and Bono (2000) that work motivation is substantial factor when predicting followers' satisfaction in rating transformational leadership. They further support the assertion that transformational leaders brings about progress and stability in staff turnover and student performance.

It appears transformational leadership and employee job satisfaction in public institutions; particular polytechnics have not proportionately been researched into. According to Ihrke (2003) this is one of the least investigated areas. Wofford, Whittington and Goodwin (2001) also maintain that leadership studies in public institutions have not been sufficiently assessed. However, few studies show that transformational leadership yields high employee performance (Suarva, 2002). Studying the use of transformational leadership approach, Javidan and Waldman (2003) also identified that there were not enough references to support the studies. However, Mine (2008) studying transformational leadership in public schools in Cyprus revealed that perceived transformational leadership behaviour of principals had significantly positive effect on teacher job satisfaction.

These findings corroborate with the findings of Parry and Proctor-Thompson (2003) when researching transformational leadership in the federal public sector. It was revealed that transformational leadership generates higher employee performance and satisfaction. Other studies by Ejimofor (2007); Koh et al (1995); and Nguni, Slegers and Denessen (2006) also corroborate the findings of Mine (2008).

It is evident that most studies concerning transformational leadership and organizational performance have been carried in the Western world. For example, Walumbwa, Orwa, Wang and Lawler (2005) on a comparative study involving Kenya in Africa and United States of America (USA) using the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) and Smith, Kendall and Hulins (1969) Job Descriptive Index (JDI), found that there is a strong and positive effect of transformational leadership on employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the two environments. This study appears to show the universality of transformational leadership.

Nguni et al (2006) have also documented very few references in supporting their work on transformational leadership and job satisfaction in primary and secondary schools in Tanzania. This study showed that transformational leadership behavior has strong to moderate positive impact on organizational citizenship behavior, value commitment and job satisfaction among teachers. Another African study in this area by Ejimofor (2007) in Nigeria in secondary school settings indicated that transformational leadership has effect on teacher's job satisfaction. The study also revealed that creating opportunities for teachers' professional growth and development and involving them in decision-making improves job satisfaction.

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the extent of transformational leadership in Cape Coast Polytechnic and whether it relates to employee job satisfaction in the institution. It is also expected to bridge the gap between leadership studies in Ghanaian polytechnics Ghana. Additionally it will establish

whether similar or different scenario exists in Ghana in comparison with African and global experiences.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter considers the research method and design used to acquire the necessary data for the study. It therefore dilates on information pertaining to the target population, source of data, data collection method, sampling design, sample size, study instrument, data processing and analysis as well as ethical considerations.

Research Approach

The inductive method was employed in the study. The Bass (1985) transformational model was examined to ascertain the type of leadership styles within the context of the transformational-transactional-laisser-faire continuum in Cape Coast Polytechnic. As a case study the author established the levels of leadership styles within the continuum and relates the results with established relationships of empirical studies. Similarly, the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction was sought as a contribution to the generalization that transformational leadership is the common and the most widely practiced type of leadership in organizations, including educational institutions, and that it increases with job satisfaction (Bryman& Bell, 2015; Saunders, Lewis &Thornhill, 2012). Since few studies on transformational-transactional leadership styles appear to avail in literature (Hukpati, 2009), the study intends to fill the gap of availability in general and the gap between studies

in the Western world and Africa, with particular reference to Ghana. The study also intends to bequeath to the discussion concerning transformational leadership style and its relationship with job satisfaction in tertiary institutions.

Study Design

The study was designed through the elicitation of the views of respondents from Cape Coast Polytechnic with regards to the perception of faculty members with respect to leadership qualities of academic heads of department and their (faculty members) personal job satisfaction. The descriptive survey was utilized for several reasons. First, it has the potential to give the required information to deal with the objectives and research questions of the study. Second, access to as large a group as possible was available, who otherwise would have been difficult to solicit information from. Thirdly, there was the opportunity to interact with the respondents directly about the topic through the data collection, from which inferences were drawn.

Study Area

Cape Coast Polytechnic is located in Cape Coast, the capital of the Central Region of Ghana close to the Abubonkorperi-urban community. The institution was established as a polytechnic in 1984. It was elevated to tertiary status under the PNDC Law 321 in 1996, to take retrospective effect from January 1996. Presently the institution has three schools (faculties) namely, School of Engineering, School of Business Studies and School of Applied Science and arts, as the academic section. The Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering

Civil Engineering and Building Technology Departments are under the ambit of School of Engineering. The School of Business Studies operates the Accountancy, Marketing, Secretaryship and Management Studies; and Purchasing and Supply departments. School of Applied Science and Arts runs the Statistics, Tourism, Catering, Fashion and Liberal Studies departments. The institution also has a non-academic section that supports teaching, learning and research activities on- and off-campus. Currently, the polytechnic has 102 teaching staff and 235 non-teaching staff (Planning Unit, 2015).

Study Population

Cape Coast Polytechnic has full-time academic staff strength of 102 (Planning Office, 2014); comprising 88 males and 14 female. It has 13 operational academic managers in 13 departments, and three tactical managers who are also strategic managers (academic Deans). All 13 academic departments were targeted, though 80 subjects were targeted due to members on study leave, sick leave, absent to duty and other unforeseen reasons. Ranks of assistant lecturer position and above in the faculties, were considered for the study. Tactical and operational heads were not included since their personal leadership styles were to be determined.

Sample Size and Sampling Design

Sampling is a process by which a portion of a population is chosen to represent the target population. It has many advantages. In most cases it is quite

impossible to cover the entire population. Sampling therefore saves time and allows valid results to be compared thus making the study effective. Research work, that involves sampling, takes less time to complete and gives quick results. As far as labor is concerned, studies using sampling process are also less demanding (Sarantakos, 2005). Generally, sampling is more economical in terms of costs, printed materials, travelling and accommodation. Samples ensure more detailed information and yields high degree of accuracy since relatively small populations are dealt with (Benjamin & O'Reilly, 2011; Becker, Ayman&Korabik, 2002: 1989).

The multi-stage sampling technique was used. The sampling design ensured that sampling units were given equal chance to be selected. In the process all departments and faculty-members were first identified by contacting the planning office. The lottery sample method was used to select the participating departments. The department list provided was then numbered on pieces of paper with the corresponding department names. The papers were folded and put in a box. The selector was blind-folded and then allowed to pick 9 departments, three from each school, one after the other, to represent the sample. Three departments were sampled from each of the three schools so that the schools could be as representative as possible.

The final stage was approached using the Yamane (1967) formula to determine the sample size at precision value of 10%. Thus the sample size is given by

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

Where n =sample size
 N =target population = 80
 e =level of precision = 0.1

Substituting the values, the recommended sample size was given by

$$n = \frac{80}{1+80(0.1)^2}$$

= 44.44 (approximately equal to 45 for human subjects).

The lottery method was also employed to select 6 subjects (faculty-members) from each of the selected departments except Marketing (7) and Secretaryship and Management Studies Departments (5). The two departments have the maximum and minimum faculty-membership respectively. Thus 54 faculty-members took part in the study though 45 questionnaires were returned and with no errors.

Two sets of instruments, viz, the MSQ 1977 Short-Form and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form) 6S, were self-administered accompanied by covering letter (inclusive), that provided information about the study. Respondents were then asked to insert the questionnaire in sealed envelope after responding to the questions.

Sources of Data

A collection of raw facts about events, places, people and objects with the intent of processing to produce information that is meaningful to contemplate is referred to as data (Pallant, 2011). In order to test hypotheses or research questions for research purpose to be answered, there is the need to collect

meaningful and related data. It is for this reason that all research work encompasses the collection of data (Gay, 1992).

Social research deals with unearthing the social world by questioning to understand the actions of individuals and how these individuals attribute and explain expressions, significance and importance relating their personal lives (Eyles& Smith, 1988). Individual actions and inactions, dos and don'ts pertaining to real, actual and total behavior therefore need to be sought using quantitative data collection methods.

Data used for the study were primary and secondary. Primary data include responses that related to attributes of leadership styles of heads of department and employee job satisfaction in Cape Coast Polytechnic. The Planning Department and the Human Resource Department of the Polytechnic were consulted for the lists of faculty members in the various departments. Other secondary data were sought from journals, textbooks and the internet.

Secondary data include the list of staff in each department and rank of faculty-members. The questionnaires were submitted in person. For those respondents who had time to respond immediately, the opportunity was given. Those who required more time to fill the questionnaire were also allowed. The Questionnaire was distributed and collected in the month of July (2015) when the institution was in recess. This was to enable respondents have enough time and space to respond. A period of 14 working days was taken distribute to collect the questionnaire.

Study Instruments

The MLQ is used to measure transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership in a leader's performance. These leadership styles deal with many sub-scale dimensions and associated behaviors (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The scale is also used to measure the three leadership styles as seen by followers.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire has become more popular for several reasons. Firstly, deep knowledge about leadership and prediction of organizational output were employed in its design. Secondly, factors considered in its design makes it personal to individuals and therefore diligently distinguish between exceptional leaders and marginal ones. Thirdly, it is applicable to all organizations and all cultures (Bass, 1998). Fourthly, comprising 45 questions, it takes less time; a maximum of 15 minutes to administer. In addition, the MLQ has been extensively researched and validated in several independent studies in journal articles; and finally, it has been found that the MLQ provides the best relationship between "survey data" and "organizational outcomes" as far as leadership assessment methods are concerned.

The scale has both self and rater forms. The self-form is responded by the leader who assesses himself of perceptions of his leadership behavior. Other people use the rater form to indicate their perception of the leader; all in a bid to measure leadership styles. The MLQ could, therefore, be used to show the difference between how the leader sees him/her and how others also do so. This gap provides a platform for the leader to make the necessary amends in terms of leadership performance in his organization. In the context of this study, only the

rater form was used by faculty members to indicate their perception on the leadership behavior of their heads of department. The Likert scale was used with scores ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Frequently if not always). In-between these are 2 (once in a while); 3 (sometimes); and 4 (Fairly often).

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was also employed to measure job satisfaction of the subjects (refer Appendix A). The questionnaire was a result of Studies in Minnesota Vocational Rehabilitation, commonly referred to as the Work Adjustment Project (Weiss et al, 1967). First published in 1967 and was revised and updated later in 1977. It was chosen because of its ability to identify with Cape Coast Polytechnic employee job satisfaction. The questionnaire has many advantages. It makes it possible to portray clearer individualized characteristics of worker satisfaction than when more general measures of satisfaction with the job in totality is considered. The individualized assessment is essential because it is possible for two persons to express the same quantity of gross satisfaction with their work though reasons may be entirely different (Weiss et al., 1967).

Two versions of the MSQ are available. The MSQ Long-Form (1967 and 1977) comprises 100 questions that assess job satisfaction on a 20-scale questionnaire. On the other hand, the MSQ 1977 Short-Form consists of 20 questions that most suitably represent each of the 20 scales featured on the MSQ 1977 Long-Form. It has the highest correlation.

The MSQ 1977 Short-Form was chosen for the study. Five alternative responses for each question on the MSQ Short-Form: Very Dissatisfied, with

assigned value of (1), Not Satisfied; (2), Somewhat Satisfied;(3), Satisfied; (4),Very Satisfied; and (5)Extremely Satisfied (Ghazi, 2004; Weiss et al., 1967). While the MSQ Long-Form takes the average person 15 to 20 minutes to complete, the MSQ Short-Form takes less time to score. The MSQ also has high validity (Weiss et al., 1967).

Ethical Considerations

Gathering the data for the study, respondents were allowed to respond to questionnaire without duress or coercion. They were also informed of the purpose and significance of the study. In addition to this, participants were assured of confidentiality, while their privacy was also not disregarded. Respondents identities were never disclosed anywhere, including the report. The method used in collecting data and the study in general ensured that respondents physical, emotional and social rights were not compromised (Osuala, 1993).

Respondents were also adequately informed of the information that was needed. They were also given enough time to respond to the questionnaire. They were further informed about how the collected data were going to affect them individually, their departments in particular and the institution in general. Those who declined to the questionnaire were allowed to do so willingly. Questionnaires were discarded after use to ensure further confidentiality. For the purpose of further anonymity numbers and letters were used to identify subjects instead of names. Research was conducted systematically and objectively without bias. Acceptable research procedures were also followed (Sproul, 1988).

Data Presentation and Analysis

During the study personal data such as age, years in service, sex, position held, number of years in position held, department, school, and highest educational attainment, in relation to other responses, were analyzed. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS Version 21) software package was utilized. Descriptive Statistical tools such as measures of central tendency and dispersion were used in the analysis. Means, standard deviations and skewness were therefore employed. Tables, figures, frequencies and percentages were employed to display various responses. The Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was utilized to establish the relationship between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction of faculty-members of the institution.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter presents data obtained from the study including instrument reliability. Data obtained also include personal information from the respondents, leadership attributes of heads of department in the selected schools and departments, and satisfaction levels of faculty members. Correlation results among the leadership attributes and satisfaction levels are also presented. Discussions of the results obtained are also submitted in the chapter.

Background of Respondents

A Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.91 for the MLQ and 0.88 for the MSQ, which were obtained after the instruments were tested, indicated a satisfactory degree of reliability as they are greater than 0.7 (Normally & Bernstein, 1994; Cronbach, 1951). A Cronbach alpha coefficient value above 0.7 is an indication of internal consistency and therefore making the results reliable and hence acceptable (Pallant, 2011). Measurements were thus accurate and precise, reflecting that the values of the study are relevant, respected and expected and for that matter acceptable by users of research as well as the researcher (Sarantakos, 2005). The instrument validity were therefore assured since they measured what they were supposed to measure (Normally & Bernstein, 1994).

Appendix B shows the graphics of demographic profile of respondents. Out of the sample of 45 members, 44 representing 97.8 percent were male. The

mean age was 39 years and 7 months within a range of 28 and 56 years. The minimum of the multimodal age was 34 with 6.7 as the standard deviation. The mean working age was 9 years and 8 months, ranging from 2 to 24 years. The modal working age was 9 years. Ninety-one percent were Master degree holders. Ranks in employment were Lecturers (84.5 percent), Senior Lecturers (6.7 percent) and Assistant Lecturers (8.9 percent). Nine departments in three faculties were considered; School of Engineering, School of Business Studies and School of Science and Applied Arts.

As indicated in the Methodology, the proportion of respondents include 13.3 percent from Marketing Department and 8.9 percent from Secretaryship and Management Studies Department; and the rest (Accountancy, Building Technology, Electrical Engineering, Liberal Studies, Marketing, Mechanical Engineering, Statistical and Tourism departments) constituting 11.1 percent each. In terms of faculties, 33.3 percent of respondents from each school participated in the study. About 56 percent of the respondents were married. While 15.6 percent were single and 13.6 percent divorced. The remaining 15.6 percent were in a relationship.

Levels of Transformational Leadership Attributes among HODs

This section presents the data on the responses of the perception of faculty members in terms of Heads of Department's leadership behavior using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Attributes are denoted by T_f in the questionnaire (refer Appendix A). Mean responses, standard deviations and skewness are displayed in Table 1. Details of the responses are available in Appendix B. The study revealed that majority of faculty members (35.6 percent) sometimes feel good around their heads of department while 11.3 percent representing the minority do not feel good at all. At a mean score of 2.8, HODs generally did not either exhibit this attribute at all, or did so once in a while. This implies that HODs do not hold the trust of subordinates. When this happens, the faith and respect of faculty members cannot be maintained. Similarly, the hopes and dreams of HODs could not be appealing to faculty members, and finally, HOD acting as a role model will encounter some difficulties. In order to deal with these challenges HODs should be open, develop sense of humor, and show that numbers concern and welfare are important by dealing with issues that bother most to the faculty members.

Forty percent of the respondents indicated that heads of departments express few simple words by instruction as to what they should do. Only 4.4 percent representing minority said heads do not do so at all. The mean score was 3.02 showing that faculty members fairly often observe or frequently, if not always, observe this trait among HODs. It is expected that for HODs to impact positively on faculty members, they should express in few simple words what or

should be done in relation to departmental activities. Though members are fairly often or frequently, if not always satisfied, there is the need for improvement since the mean score is close to 3.00, which is the neutral point where there is neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction. HODs could improve upon this attribute by providing clear vision, encourage members to focus on their work and also endeavor to make members feel they are important.

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation and Skewness of Leadership Attributes of HODs based on Likert scale 1 to 5

	Mean	Standard deviation	Skewness
I feel good around my HOD		1.187	0.085
HOD expenses few simple words that others could understand	3.02	1.076	0.412
HOD enables others think about old problems in new ways	2.95556	0.928	-0.087
HOD helps others develop themselves	3.089	1.104	0.135
HOD tells other what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work	3.089	1.145	0.105
HOD is satisfied when other meet agreed upon standards	3.465	1.10	-0.180
HOD is content when others continue working in the same ways as always	2.956	1.021	0.092
Other have complete faith in HOD	3.31	1.20	-0.65

Table 1 Cont'd.

HOD provides appealing images about what we can do	3.36	0.91	-0.024
HOD provides others with new ways of looking at puzzling things	3.16	0.952	-0.490
HOD lets others know the things they are doing	2.93	1.01	0.000
HOD provides recognition/rewards when other reach their goal	3.00	1.17	-0.179
As long as things are working HOD does not change things	3.04	1.107	-0.014
Whatever others want to do is okay with him	3.00	1.17	-0.358
Others are proud to be associated with HOD	3.07	1.195	-0.217
HOD helps others find meaning to their work	3.18	1.072	-0.139
HOD gets other rethink ideas that they had never questioned before	3.00	1.02	-0.134
HOD gives personal attention to others who seen rejected	3.11	1.21	-0.302

Table 1 Cont'd.

HOD calls attention to what others can get for what they accomplish	3.1	1.24	-0.325
HOD tells other the standards they have to know to carry out their work	33.36	1.151	-0.565
HOD asks no more than what is absolutely essential.	3.16	1.24	-0.755

Source: Field data, 2014.

The study also revealed that majority of faculty member (48.9 percent) perceive that HODs sometimes enable faculty members think about old problems in new ways, while 6.7 percent being the minority, thought HODs do not do so all. At a mean score of 2.96, faculty members did not generally observe this attribute. Thus they did not observe it at all or did so once in a while. This implies that HODs do not encourage members to be creative enough to work for new ways in solving problems. This also implies that HODs are intolerant when positions between them and members seem to be at the extremes. Dealing with such limitations requires HODs to endeavor to groom followers to be capable of questioning their own beliefs and values in relation to those of the institution.

On whether HOD's help members develop themselves, it was found that 40 percent of respondents were of the view that HODs sometimes help faculty members to do so. About 7 percent representing the minority said they do not do so at all. A mean value of 3.09 indicates that HODs may fairly often exhibit, or

frequently, if not always exhibit this characteristic. Though this is encouraging, the level of satisfaction is low compared to full satisfaction response score of 5.0 and neutral satisfaction score of 3.0. In order to improve this characteristic, HODs must improve upon the extent to which they show interest in the well-being of members. HODs may also not be assigning projects to cronies, friends, relatives and informants. In other words, projects may be assigned with respect to experience, qualification, and above all, those who can do the best job. Achieving these goals further require that department authority should be attentive to seemingly less important members and involve them in departmental and faculty activities.

While 26.7 percent being the majority indicated members once in a while have completed faith in their HODs, 26.7 percent thought members fairly often have complete faith in them. However, only 4.4 percent representing the minority thought members don't have complete faith in their heads at all. This response is relatively encouraging. Thus generally, HODs fairly often or frequently if not always, command faith from members. At a mean score of 3.31, the exhibition of this attribute is relatively appealing though there is room for improvement. HODs may command more faith from faculty members by dedicating themselves to them by holding followers trust, maintaining respect and faith, acting as role models and appealing to members' dreams and hopes.

The study showed that majority of respondents perceived that HODs sometimes provide appealing images about what their followers could do. About percent being the minority indicated they frequently do so but not always (refer

Table 1). Thus respondents were of the view that HODs fairly often or frequently, if not always, do so. The mean score was 3.36. This is the highest score in the scores of leadership style attributes. This means that the degree to which HODs are visionary makes members feel that their work is important.

Providing others with new ways of looking at puzzling issues is one of the attributes of leadership skills within the transformational leadership requirements. The study revealed that 42.2 percent of faculty members thought heads fairly often provide followers with new ways of looking at puzzling things. About 4 percent thought their heads do not do so at all. The study also showed that HODs exhibit this characteristics fairly often or frequently, if not always ($M= 3.16$; $SD=0.952$). In spite of the fact that this response is encouraging, HODs could improve upon this attribute by nurturing members so that they can question their beliefs and values with regards to that of the institution. They should also motivate members to be creative by emulating new methods to solve old problems and create a more tolerant environment that can deal with locations at the extreme left end of the continuum.

On whether heads of departments let faculty members know how they think they are doing, majority of faculty members (33.3 percent) said they sometimes do so. About 4.4 percent indicated they frequently, if not always do so. It is important that leaders let followers know how they think they are doing. When tested, mean score was 2.93. This means that leaders do not either exhibit this attribute at all, or do so once in a while. This score is below the neutral score of 3 and therefore not satisfactory. This implies that the degree to which HODs

show interest in the well-being of members; distribute projects and assignments to members; as well as pay attention and involve seemingly less important members of the department needs more to be desired. To improve the situation, all members should be treated equally. HODs may further give adequate respect and recognitions to all members and avoid discrimination, cronyism, egocentrism, and altruistic tendencies.

About 13 percent of respondents were of the opinion that others are not proud to be associated with their heads at all. Majority of the respondents representing 33.3 percent thought members are sometimes proud to be associated with them. Members indicated that HODs fairly often or frequently, if not always, portray this characteristic ($M= 3.07$; $SD=1.2$). The score was above the neutral point ($M=3$), though it is on the low side. HODs therefore need to improve upon this attribute by ensuring they kindle the dreams, hopes and aspirations of members. They may show love and concern to members to earn their faith and respect. Winning the trust of followers and creating an enabling environment so that followers will learn and follow their goals, as well as dedicating to members in a way that will make them feel at home even at the work place, will go a long way to ideally influence members in the department.

There are situations when leaders assist followers to find work meaningful. This could be done through several ways. First, the leader should make followers feel that the work they do is important. Second, the leader must adopt the required techniques that will make followers focus on what they do and thirdly, the leader should have vision objectives, goals and purpose. About 37.8

percent, representing the majority of faculty members, were of the opinion that HODs help followers find meaning to their work. However, 6.7 percent being the minority said HODs do not so at all. In testing this attribute, respondents agreed that HODs fairly often or frequently, if not always, show this feature ($M= 3.18$; $SD=1.07$). This score may appear appealing; nevertheless, there is room for improvement. In relative terms, though it is one of the features exhibited most, it could be maximized by making sure HODs introduce visionary ideas, discuss and adopt techniques that will help members focus on what they do and ensuring that the work members do are useful and therefore put to good use.

The study revealed that 31.1 percent of faculty members were of the opinion that heads of department fairly often get others rethink ideas that they had never questioned before. Another 31.1 percent also thought they sometimes do so. However 6.7 percent, the minority was of the view that they do not do so at all. Followers may usually not question the ideas of leaders or their own ideas. However, rethinking existing ideas is one way by which followers could be creative, innovative and re-applicative. Transformational leaders are therefore expected to exhibit this characteristic by encouraging followers rethink; and by questioning old ways of doing things. Respondents mean score on HODs attribute with respect to this characteristic was 3.00 ($SD=1.02$). Thus HODs do neither exhibit nor exhibit this behavior. In order to improve upon the attribute HODs should groom members so that they can question HODs beliefs and values by encouraging them to ask questions as the need may be. Intimidation and victimization towards outspoken members when eschewed may go a long way to

deal with the challenge in this regard. Leaders may also be more accommodating and assimilating towards opposing views. They may further encourage teamwork and practice both idea-sharing and consensus building.

Majority of the respondents (31.1 percent) said heads of department fairly often give personal attention to followers who seen rejected. On the other hand the minority representing (11.1 percent) were of the view that they frequently do so, though not always. One moral feature that is characterized by transformational leaders is the ability to draw close to followers who feel rejected by the rest of the working group member. Rejection could bring forth dejection. It could yield frustration, generate depression, anger, envy and sometimes, in the extreme situation, suicide or homicide. Though HODs fairly often or frequently, if not always give personal attention to rejected members, the level is not encouraging ($M= 3.11$; $SD=1.21$), considering the consequence that the lack of it brings. HODs may improve upon this attribute by getting closer to those who appear to feel rejected. They may also get them involved in various activities in the department or even in the faculty so that they may feel as “being part of the team.” The welfare of members should be of interest to HODs, and finally, members’ wellbeing must be of greater concern.

Levels of Transactional Leadership Attributes among HODs

Six items in the questionnaire were used to examine the level of transactional leadership style among heads of department. Attributes are denoted by T_s in the questionnaire (refer Appendix A). Mean, standard deviation and

skewness are in Table 2. Detail responses are in Appendix C. The scores of these attributes are discussed in this section. About 31 percent being the majority of the respondents indicated that HODs sometime tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work. Minority (6.7 percent) however indicated that they do not all do so. Majority of faculty members (40 percent) also perceived that HODs are satisfied when followers meet agreed upon standards. On the other hand only 4.4 percent representing the minority said HODs are not satisfied at all. About 33 percent of faculty members however, were of the view that HODs sometime do not provide recognition/rewards when members reach their goals. This represents the majority of the respondents. On the other hand the minority (13.3 percent) indicated they do not all provide rewards or recognition when members do so at all.

Leaders who portray these three attributes do exhibit transactional leadership styles. The mean score for HODs sometimes telling others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work was found to be 3.09 (SD= 1.15), a little above neutrality. Respondents response as to whether HODs provide recognitions/rewards when members reach their goal was that they sometimes do so (M= 3.00; SD= 1.17). Respondents however observed that HODs frequently often or frequently, if not always, call attention to what others can get for what they accomplish (M=3.1; SD= 1.24).

It must be recalled that according to Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1993), transactional leadership is an inferior type of leadership. Scores above 3.00 are therefore unacceptable in an organization. In order to improve upon the

above three attributes, therefore, it is expected that leaders should not tell members they shall be rewarded before jobs are assigned. HODs must not be emphatic on what is expected from subordinates. They must also recognize what members accomplish. By doing these, leaders gradually move from that portion of the continuum towards the left, thus trying to be more transformational than transactional.

The other three transactional leadership attributes include leaders being satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards; leaders not trying to change anything as long as things are working; and leaders telling subordinates the standards they have to know to carry out their work. Forty percent, being the majority of the respondents were of the opinion that as long as things are working their heads of department do not change anything. The minority (8.9 percent) were however of the view that as long as things are working their HODs do not change things. About 33.0 percent of respondents perceive that whatever others want to do is okay with HODs. Only 6.7 percent were of the view that they frequently do so but not always.

The study further showed the distribution related to HODs' attitude towards calling attention to what others can get for what they accomplish. While 31.1 percent representing the majority thought they fairly often do so, 11.1 percent representing minority said they do not do so all. From Appendix B, majority of followers (40 percent) also thought heads tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work. However, 8.9 percent representing minority indicated they do not do so at all.

Means and standard deviations obtained were M= 3.47: SD= 1.1; M= 3.04: SD=1.107;and M= 3.36: SD= 1.15respectively for the above three attributes. Thus HODs in the institution fairly often or frequently, if not always, exhibit these negative characteristics. In order to improve upon the situation HODs must not wait till situations get out of hand before they put in measures to solve the problem; they must be proactive in solving problem. HODs should also endeavor to always improve upon related performances by being agents and medium of change themselves. In addition to this, they should not be quick to tell subordinates the job requirements but rather, give them the opportunity to come out with what they think and feel before contributing to solutions to challenges of the job.

Levels of Laisser-faire Leadership Attributes among HODs

Within the transformational-transactional-laissez-faire leadership continuum, the least acceptable style is the laissez-faire leadership style which is at the right of the continuum. The three attributes tested were: leaders being content to let others continue working in the same way always; leader being content with whatever subordinates want to do; and leader asking no more of others than what is absolutely essential. Attributes are denoted by L_f in the questionnaire (refer Appendix A). Mean scores, standard deviation and skewness are in Table 2. Detail responses are in Appendix C. On the issue of HODs being content when followers continue working in the same ways as always, 37.8 percent of faculty members indicated they sometimes do so while the minority

(6.7 percent) thought they do not do so at all. About 33.0 percent of respondents perceive that whatever others want to do is okay with HODs. Only 6.7 percent were of the view that they frequently do so but not always.

Heads of department may ask no more of others than what is absolutely essential. This trait when questioned to faculty followers 53.3 percent of the respondents being the majority said HODs fairly often asks no one of others than what is absolutely essential. About 4 percent being the minority indicated that though they frequently do so, it is not always done. The respective scores for the three characteristics are $M=2.96$; $SD=1.021$; $M=3.0$; $SD =1.17$: and $M= 3.16$; $SD =1.24$. Since the characteristics are negative, it is expected that leaders do not exhibit any at all. HODs in the institution are therefore required to demand more from subordinates. They should not be content when “water finds its own level.” Furthermore, they must not be content to let things ride as subordinates may want them to be.

Table 1 displays measures of central tendencies and dispersion of faculty members’ perception of their HODs’ leadership behavior. The largest mean was 3.3556. Two variables were identified: leaders tell members the standards they have to know to carry out their work and leaders provide appealing images about what followers could do. They also fairly often provide appealing images about what faculty members should do. The minimum mean was 2.9556. This implies that heads of department sometimes let faculty members know how they think they are doing.

Fourteen of the 21 variables were negative. This means that faculty members are of the view that heads of department fairly often or frequently, if not always exhibit those attributes. The 21 attributes include: leaders telling others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work, leaders being satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards, leader being content when followers continue working the same ways as always and faculty members having complete faith in their HODs. Others are, leader providing appealing images about what followers can do, leader providing followers with new ways of looking at puzzling things, leaders providing recognition/ rewards when other followers reach their goals and leaders seeing whatever followers want to do so okay.

The rest are, followers are proud to be associated with their work, HODs help followers find meaning to their work, HODs get followers rethink ideas that they had never questioned before, HODs giving personal attention to followers who seem rejected, HODs call attention to what followers can get for what they accomplish and HODs tell followers the standards they have to know to carry out their work. On the variable “followers know how HOD thinks they are doing” the skewness was zero. The responds for this variable thus follows the normal distribution. Thus fifty percent of respondents perceived that (for this variable) HODs once in a while or do not exhibit this attribute at all. Fifty percent also think that HODs fairly often or frequently if not always exhibit the attribute.

On the other hand six of the variables (28.6%) were positive. This implies that followers were of the view that heads of department once in a while or do not exhibit those attributes at all. These attributes are follower feeling good around

heads of department, HODs expressing few simple words what others could/should do, HODs helping develop themselves, HOD being content when follower continue working in the same ways as always, HOD telling others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work and HODs refusing to change anything as long as things are working.

The measure of spread or variability of the responses from the mean (standard deviations of the variables) ranged from 0.908 and 1.242 (leaders fairly often exhibiting the attributes). This implies that indeed leaders fairly often exhibit these characteristics since the range is not too dispersed from zero, the mean standard deviation being 0.68. The mean employee assessment on the heads of department was 3.0547. This implies that, generally, employees perceive that HODs sometimes exhibit the characteristics considered on the MLQ scale.

Job Satisfaction Levels of Faculty Members

This section presents the data and analysis on the responses of faculty membership in relation to their job satisfaction levels using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Form 6S. Details of the responses are available in Appendix D. Means scores, standard deviations and skewness are also displayed in Table 2. Twenty questions were posed in accordance with the MSQ employee satisfaction model.

The study revealed that majority of faculty members was somewhat satisfied of being able to keep busy on the job all the time. It is rather gratifying to note that a magnanimous portion (33.3 percent) was satisfied of being able to

keep busy on the job all the time. About 13 percent were very satisfied on the variable while the minority of the respondents was extremely satisfied on the assertion. It is not rather satisfying that 48.9 percent of followers were also somewhat satisfied with being given the chance to keep busy on the job all the time. If about 18 percent were satisfied and 4.4 percent extremely satisfied, this could be rather relatively gratifying. In order to improve on employee satisfaction, members need to be regularly engaged. Engagement should be interesting with consultations and consensus with subordinate as to what an employee could do best. A mean satisfaction score of 2.64 (SD=0.83) is an indication that, generally, faculty members are not satisfied on the job.

It is interesting to note that 44.4 percent of followers are somewhat satisfied with being given the chance to work alone on the job. About 33 percent were also satisfied with this attribute of HODs. Decreasing downwards, 17.8 percent were very satisfied while 4.4 percent were extremely satisfied. It could be disheartening when one is not given the chance to invoke one's creative abilities to work on a particular job. At mean score of 2.87 (SD=0.89), faculty members are dissatisfied. Given the chance to work alone on the job could go a long way to improve upon the job satisfaction level of faculty members.

Table 2: Mean, standard deviation and skewness of faculty members satisfaction levels based on Likert scale 1 to 5.

	Mean	Standard deviation	Skewness
Being able to keep busy on job all the time	2.64	0.83	-0.764
The chance to work alone on the job	2.82	0.89	0.775
The chance to do different things from time to time	2.87	0.885	-0.092
The chance to be somebody in the community	1.844	1.021	1.263
The way my boss handles his/her workers	2.889	1.153	0.225
The competence of my HOD in making decisions	3.02	1.22	0.035
Being able to do things that do go against my conscience	3.13	1.14	-0.278
The way my job provides for steady employment	3.00	1.02	0.134
The chance to do things for other people	2.80	1.14	0.123

Table 2 Cont'd.

The chance to tell people what to do	2.98	1.16	0.229
The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	2.89	1.13	-0.067
The way organizational policies are put into practice	3.07	1.21	-0.053
My pay and the amount of work I do	2.73	1.07	0.680
The chance of advancement of the job	2.44	1.03	0.413
The freedom to try my sun methods of doing my job	2.84	1.19	0.40
The freedom to try my sun methods of doing my job	2.78	1.17	0.095
The working conditions	2.78	1.13	0.261
The way my co-workers get along with each other	2.69	1.29	0.089
The price I get for doing a good job	2.6	1.27	0.254
The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	2.53	1.22	0.117

Source: Field data, 2015.

It is gratifying to note that 48.8 percent of respondents were satisfied with the fact that they are given the chance to do different things from time to time. About 27 percent were, however, somewhat satisfied of this attribute; 22.2 percent were interestingly very satisfied. A small percentage (2.2%) was extremely satisfied. Repetitive jobs could lead into boredom and eventual brain and other organic inactivity. The mean score for the item was 2.87(SD=09), implying employee job dissatisfaction. Job rotation in terms of taught-courses as well as departmental appointments, assignments and faculty responsibilities could be of immense help. Assigning members on external responsibilities could also help reduce boredom and enhance organic activities.

Giving recognition to individuals in an organization is a very important parameter of satisfaction. It is therefore sad to note that majority of faculty members (46.7 percent) were not satisfied in this regard; this is followed by as much as 33.3 percent who were somewhat satisfied in the context. Recognizing that 11.1 percent was satisfied, 6.7 percent very satisfied and 2.2 percent extremely satisfied do not need to be desired. The mean satisfaction score was 1.84 (SD=1.02). This implies that members may not be given the opportunity to upgrade themselves, get promoted and or take certain deserving positions. As the lowest score among the items, it is pertinent that this attribute is carefully dealt with and given an utmost consideration.

If majority of followers (35.6 percent) are somewhat satisfied and 22.2 percent are satisfied then there is perhaps some reason to feel uncomfortable though 24.4 percent and 8.9 percent each were respectively very satisfied as well

as not satisfied and extremely satisfied. Respondents thus showed dissatisfaction ($M=2.889$; $SD=1.153$). Behavior of HOD in this regard could be how, when, where, and what members concerns are addressed. The courtesy and respect with which members are personally addressed could also be important factors that may need attention.

Forty percent of the respondents indicated that heads of departments express few simple words by instruction as to what they should do. The distribution in terms of the competence of HODs making decisions appears to be close to a normal distribution. This is because 30 percent were satisfied. About 24 percent were somewhat satisfied while 22.2 percent were very satisfied. In contrast, 13.3 percent were extremely satisfied and 11.1 percent not satisfied. Only 4.4 percent representing minority said heads not do so at all. Respondents were generally satisfied ($M=3.02$; $SD=1.22$). Though the mean score indicates over-satisfaction, there could be room for improvement. Improving team work in decision-making could be more beneficial. Brain-teasing, consensus building and idea-sharing could be some of the ways by which decision-making activities could be enhanced.

It is gratifying to note that majority of the respondents (35.6 percent) were very satisfied that HODs allow them to do things that do not go against their conscience. About 24 percent were satisfied in this regard, while 22.2 percent were somewhat satisfied. The 8.9 percent each not satisfied and extremely satisfied might be due to biased perception resulting. It is not however palatable that less than 32 percent of the respondents were somewhat satisfied in terms job

providing steady employment. The same percentage was somewhat satisfied. In terms of 26.7 being satisfied, 6.7 percent extremely satisfied and 4.4 percent not satisfied, this obviously needs much to be desired.

Being intimidated, victimized and or openly-reprimanded before colleagues could degenerate an individual's ability to act in accordance with his/her conscience. Fortunately respondents were generally satisfied that they were allowed to do things that do not go against their conscience. Though this is encouraging, leaders could improve upon their performance by adopting open-discussion policy, encouraging idea-sharing, introducing forums, workshops and seminars so that members could share ideas freely. If such programmers are devoid of intimidations persecutions and victimization, this behavioral tendency could be improved to the advantage of the institution in general (M=3.13; SD=1.14).

A tie of 28.9 percent of respondents who were somewhat satisfied or satisfied appears give an indication of hope. About 22.2 percent of respondent were very satisfied with regard to how HODs gives them chance to do things for other people; 6.7 extremely satisfied and 13.3 percent not satisfied might be a consolation to the organization. With mean score of 3.0 and SD=1.02, members need assurance and hope of security on the job. Hope may not only come from employers but authorities including heads of department and management.

Majority of the respondents consisting 35.6 percent indicated they were satisfied with regards to the chance given to them to tell people what to do. This may include acting on behalf of others in the same rank or position, assisting

subordinates to solve problems and also deal with occupational challenges. About 27 percent and 15.6 percent respectively were somewhat satisfied and very satisfied. The study also showed that 8.9 percent and 13.3 percent of respondents were not satisfied and extremely satisfied respectively. With the mean score being 2.8 (SD=1.14), authorities may remove barriers such as blatantly and flagrantly disallowing faculty members to get involved in such actions and activities. Avoiding intimidation and victimization may also encourage members to assist people on the job when there is the need to do so.

In assessing the satisfaction level of faculty members in terms of their abilities majority (33.3 percent) were satisfied; 24.4 percent very satisfied while 22.2 percent were somewhat satisfied; Those who were not satisfied (13.3 percent) were about twice (6.7 percent) those extremely satisfied. The mean score obtained was 2.98 (SD=1.13). This implies respondents were generally not satisfied since the neutral score is 3. This may be due fear of intimidation, victimization and or suppression. Removing barriers may eliminate blocks such fear; thus motivating members when the opportunity comes.

When organization policies were put to test, 28.9 percent said they were satisfied with the way company policies are put into practice. About 22.2 percent were somewhat satisfied while 24.4 were very satisfied. The remaining 24.4 were either not satisfied or extremely satisfied. Thus respondents were also generally dissatisfied when the chance to do something that makes use of their abilities was considered (M=2.89; SD=1.13). This implies that members may be unduly controlled. They may not be given the freedom to go about their duties

using their creative abilities. Thus members are either not satisfied or sometimes satisfied. The introduction of teamwork in decision-making may help deal with the situation.

The study shows the satisfaction levels of the faculty members in terms of how their pay relates to the amount of work they do. It is sad to acknowledge that as many as 44.4 percent of the respondents were somewhat satisfied with 26.3 percent being satisfied. The other 28.9 percent were very satisfied, extremely satisfied or not satisfied. The mean score was 3.07 (SD=1.21). Respondents were therefore either satisfied or extremely satisfied. Though this trend is encouraging there is more room for improvement. Communicating the organizational mission, vision and the objectives to every member may improve the situation. The trend can further be improved by getting all members involved during the planning stages of policies. Sharing ideas and communicating the purpose of policies to seemingly less important members may also go a long way to improve implementation of policies.

The study also showed that about 58 percent of faculty members were satisfied, somewhat satisfied or not satisfied, when it comes to the time between work done and payment of allowances. About 50% of these respondents were satisfied. Those who were either satisfied or extremely satisfied constituted only 13.3 percent. Respondents were generally not satisfied with regards to remuneration vis-à-vis the amount of work done (M=2.73; SD=1.07). There are two component of remuneration; internal and external. This means that respondents may be ether not satisfied or sometimes satisfied with regards to

monthly salaries and allowance from Controller and Accountant General's Department, or allowances paid by the polytechnic directly. To improve the situation there is the need for the polytechnic authorities to sit down with faculty members to dialogue on the issue of remuneration. Ordinary assurances and acknowledgment of existing challenges as well as hopeful discussions may be enough to deal with the challenge.

On the issue of respondents getting chances of advancement on their job, over half (57.8 percent) were either not satisfied or somewhat satisfied. This is below the satisfaction level and therefore not encouraging. As displayed in table 2, 24.4 percent were also satisfied while the remaining 17.8 percent were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied. One way to motivate employees is to give them the opportunity to be promoted to a higher level on the organizational ranking ladder. Respondent shared general dissatisfaction ($M=2.44$; $SD=1.03$). This implies that respondents were either not satisfied or sometimes satisfied. It must be emphasized that getting promoted depends on experience and qualifications. To deal with the issue, members should be encouraged to upgrade themselves. Sponsorships by means of scholarships and bursaries and well grants may encourage members to take up the challenge of upgrading themselves. Gaining experience by working for the institution for a relatively long period of time may also enhance members' opportunity for advancement.

The study revealed faculty member satisfaction levels in terms of freedom to try their own methods in going about their duties. Forty percent of the respondents representing the majority were somewhat satisfied, 20 percent were

satisfied and another 20 percent were very satisfied. While 11.1 percent were extremely satisfied, 8.9 percent were not satisfied. In other words 48.9 percent were below the satisfaction level while 31.1 percent were above the satisfaction level. This revelation is not in the interest of the institution. Respondents were either not satisfied or sometimes satisfied, with mean score of 2.84 (SD=1.19). This means that respondents were generally not satisfied and that they are not given the opportunity to be creative or innovation on the job. Over-supervision and the tendency to instruct without allowing members to freely invoke their intuitive powers to their advantage may bring about dissatisfaction.

The study also revealed satisfaction levels in terms of freedom given to faculty members to try their own methods of doing their job. Majority of the respondents (40 percent) was somewhat satisfied; 40 percent were either satisfied or very satisfied; while the remaining 20 percent were also either not satisfied or extremely satisfied. The mean score of respondents was 2.78 (SD=1.17). The implication is that respondents were either not satisfied or sometimes satisfied. Thus generally respondents are not satisfied. Allowing members to try their hands as well as give them the opportunity through assignments and with intermittent supervision may encourage them to introduce their own techniques to solve organizational challenges.

The satisfaction levels of the respondents in terms of working conditions were also assessed. About 38 percent were satisfied, 40 percent below satisfaction and 22.2 percent above. On working conditions, respondents were also either not satisfied or sometimes satisfied. The mean score was 2.78 (SD=1.13). This means

that, generally, respondents were not satisfied with their working conditions. Working conditions may be either internal or external and may vary from financial to work security. In dealing with the situation, therefore, organizational associations may dialogue with both employers and organizational authorities for common satisfactory grounds to be reached.

The way co-workers get along with each other was also assessed. Only 20 percent of faculty members were satisfied. About 47 percent of the respondents were dissatisfied. About thirty-three percent was also above satisfaction level. At a mean score of 2.69 (SD=1.29) respondents were generally not satisfied. They were either not satisfied or sometimes satisfied. This shows that there may be lack of interpersonal relationship coupled with acrimony among members. Organizing social events for informal interactions may be a solution to this challenge. It must be stated that organizing such programmes may be one thing, and getting people to participate is another. There is therefore the need to build trust and confidence among members and ensure that interpersonal and inter-sector confidence and confidentiality may prevail between authorities and faculty members.

Motivation is an important factor in encouraging people to work harder than average. The praise faculty members get for doing a good job was therefore assessed with the result that over half (51.1%) of the respondents were below satisfaction level. While 20 percent were satisfied, the remaining 28.9 percent were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied. Respondents were therefore not generally satisfied (M=2.6; SD=1.27). This implies that respondents were either not satisfied or sometimes satisfied. It is important to note that praise has been

acknowledged as an essential tool of motivation. However, praise where it is not due, could serve as a de-motivating technique in dealing with issues. In dealing with the challenge, way-of-mouth praise, annual awards (or occasional ceremonial awards), written acknowledgement and appreciations may contribute in enhancing the satisfaction levels of faculty members in this regard.

The study revealed that 33.3 percent of respondents were satisfied when it comes to feeling accomplished from their jobs. About 30 percent were not satisfied, 17.8 percent very satisfied, 15.6 percent somewhat satisfied and 4.4 percent extremely satisfied. The feeling one gets by accomplishing a job is an intrinsic motivational tool. The respondents scored below satisfaction level when asked to do so. At mean score of 2.53 (SD=1.22), respondents were not satisfied or sometimes satisfied. The implication is that respondents are generally not satisfied with the feeling they get from accomplishing a job. Respondents may improve satisfaction level by endeavoring to internally motivate themselves. Leaders may have to draw closer to subordinates before they can know and appreciate the cause of such behavioral tendencies.

Table 2 displays the means, standard deviations and skewness of the measured variables. The means ranged from 1.844 to 3.133 with average mean being 2.752. Standard deviations also ranged between 0.688 and 1.844. The average standard deviation is calculated to be 0.628. The skewness of the measured variables also ranged from -0.93 to 1.175.

The variable with the largest mean was being able to do things that do not go against faculty members' conscience. The variable with the least mean was

identified to be the chance to be somebody in the polytechnic community. Thus the satisfaction levels of the respondents are between somewhat satisfied and very satisfied; the average being satisfied on the satisfaction scale. Eighteen of the variables had positive skewness. This implies that respondents are not satisfied or somewhat satisfied as far as these variables are concerned. This may not augur well for the polytechnic. The variables are: being able to keep busy on the job all the time, the chance to work alone on the job, the chance to be somebody in the polytechnic, the way heads of departments handle faculty members, and the competence of heads of department in making decisions.

Others are being able to do things that do not go against the conscience of faculty members, the way the job provides for steady employment, the chance to do things for other people, the chance to tell people what to do and faculty members pay and the amount of work done. The rest are the time between work-done and payment of allowances, The chance of advancement on the job, the chance to try their own methods of doing job, working conditions, the way co-workers get for doing a good job and the feeling of accomplishment when job is done. On the other hand faculty members are very satisfied or extremely satisfied as far as the other variables are concerned. Variables are: the chance to do different things from time to time, being able to do things that do not go against ones conscience, the chance to do something that makes use of one's abilities and the way company policy are put into practice. With the measure of spread being 0.628 which is close to zero members were indeed somewhat satisfied on the satisfaction scale.

Discussion on Leadership Styles

Summarily, the study has shown that faculty members perceive that HODs exhibited transformational leadership and its behaviors fairly often ($M = 3.078$; $SD = 0.781$) (refer Table 4). This is a relatively high value with the implication that HODs can manage change successfully. Ideally HODs should be exhibiting these behaviors and style rather frequently, if not always. In the perspective of faculty members HODs also exhibited transactional leadership style and behaviors fairly often ($M = 3.1553$; $SD = 0.744$) (refer Table 3), thus being transactional in their leadership behaviors. Relatively, this is also on the high side. The implication is that, in the view of faculty members these HODs also lead by applying the exchange relationship with their followers. The study also showed that faculty members perceive that HODs exhibit laissez-faire leadership behaviors fairly often ($M = 3.023$; $SD = 0.832$). This is also on a high side; the impact, though, will not augur well for the best change management for the institution.

Discussion on Job Satisfaction

Evaluating the results obtained for faculty member job satisfaction, the average mean and average standard deviation obtained were 2.75 and 0.628 respectively (refer Table 3). The Likert scale 1 to 5 was used. The results imply that faculty members are satisfied with the conditions as questioned using the MSQ. This is an average value indicated by the 45 faculty members who correctly completed the questionnaire. At 0.628, the SD. is low against the mean of 2.75.

This implies that the variation around the mean is low. Thus the mean is a typical value meaning that all faculty members are satisfied with the conditions pertaining to the questions in the MSQ.

Table 3: Average Means and Standard Deviations of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction based on Likert scale 1 to 5

Variable	Valid	Missing	Average Means (M)	Average Std. Deviations (SD)
Transformational leadership	45	0	3.078	0.781
Transactional leadership	45	0	3.1553	0.744
Laissez-faire leadership	45	0	3.023	0.832
Job satisfaction	45	0	2.77	0.628

Source: Field data, 2015.

Relationship between Transformational Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction

In trying to establish the relationship between transformational leadership and faculty-member job satisfaction the Pearson product moment correlation tool was employed. At 0.01 (2-tailed) significant level, the correlation coefficient was 0.595 at 0.001 significance. Thus the study showed that transformational leadership has a positive and strong correlation with job satisfaction. This finding therefore supports earlier studies which proves the nexus between transformational leadership and job satisfaction (Hukpati, 2009; Hetland,

&Sandal, 2003; Lowe &Kroeck, 1996; Greenberg & Barron, 1995; Koh, Steers &Treborg, 1995; Toss Rizzo &Caroll, 1994; Hatter & Bass, 1989; Griffin & Bateman, 1986). The study also confirms findings by Bolger (2001), and Nguni et al (2006) which has evidential outcomes of the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction of teachers. Bryman (1992) has also established the positive effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction.

It must be noted that principals' transformational leadership styles showed direct and indirect correlation with teachers satisfaction and that teacher's satisfaction increased as their principals' leadership styles are perceived to be more transformational as indicated by Bryman (1992). Bass (1985) gives a plausible explanation to why transformational leadership relates the satisfaction of followers. The findings by Webb (2009) and Koh et al (1995) in corroboration to this relationship are also explained by Bass (1985). In the opinion of Bass (1985) transformational leadership encourages critical thinking of followers. Transformational leadership also searches for new approaches in the delivery of jobs. This serves as follower motivation, encouraging them to be more involved in their roles, duty and responsibilities resulting in rise in the quantum of satisfaction in relation to organizational work and commitment.

It is interesting to observe that studies conducted by Hukpati (2009) in Ghana, Ejimofor (2007) in Nigeria, Nguni et al (2006) in Tanzania and by Walumbwa et al (2005) in Kenya and the United States all attest to strong and positive relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction as

has been supported by the recent study. These results, it can be surmised, are gradually contributing to the generalization and suitability as proof to the universality of the nexus between transformational leadership and job satisfaction which happens to be strong and positive. Thus idealized influence, inspirational motivation intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration are gradually being proved universally that they actually strongly and positively relate to job satisfaction of employees of which faculty members of Cape Coast Polytechnic is no exception. Another reason is that, as indicated by Hukpati (2009), there are significant relationships among these behaviors as a result of work nature in tertiary institutions where participative and collaborative leadership intermingle with inter-relational reciprocity between leaders and followers, contributing to job satisfaction among followers.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The aim of the study was to ascertain the influence of transformational leadership styles of heads of department in Cape Coast Polytechnic. However, it sought to identify the leadership styles of the heads of departments, and job satisfaction of faculty members. This chapter therefore presents the summary and conclusion in relation to the study. It also presents the recommendations which are by way of suggestions to all stakeholders of the institution.

Summary of Results

This section summarizes the results for HODs leadership styles and faculty member job satisfaction. The mean obtained with reference to transformational leadership was 3.08 and SD 0.781 (refer Table 3). The implication is that HODs exhibit transformational leadership fairly often according to the opinion of faculty members. Relatively, this is a high level of transformational leadership exhibited by the 9 heads of department who took part in the study. A comparative analysis of SD 0.781 and mean 3.08 is an indication that the SD is low implying that the mean is a typically value. It could therefore be inferred that HODs may fairly often or frequently if not always exhibit transformational leadership.

The mean transactional leadership skills of the 9 HODS was 3.16 and the SD was 0.744 (refer Table 3). This implies that faculty member held the opinion

that HODs exhibit transactional leadership fairly often. This is also a relatively high level of transactional leadership exhibited by the HODs who part took in the study. At a mean of 3.16 against SD of 0.744 the variation around the mean can be described as low. This means that the SD is low. The implication is that HODs may exhibit transactional leadership skills fairly often or frequently if not always.

With reference to laissez-faire leadership skills, the mean was 3.02 and the SD was 0.833 (refer Table 3). The implication is that faculty members held the view that HODs exhibited laissez-faire leadership skills fairly often according to the 45 faculty member who took part in the study. At 0.833 the standard deviation is low against the mean of 3.02. This implies that the variability around the mean is low. For this reason it can be inferred that typically, HODs in the polytechnic may fairly often or frequently if not always exhibit laissez-faire leadership skills.

The results above show that, averagely, the level of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership is more or less the same as HODs exhibited these leadership styles fairly often or frequently if not always. Thus transformational leadership augments transactional leadership and may also augment laissez-faire leadership with reference to the transformational-transactional-laissez faire continuum. It is however, sad to note that the level of laissez faire leadership as a sign of non-leadership is rather high and therefore negative vis-à-vis the HODs ability in successful change management.

Conclusion

Four research questions guided the research work. The study sought to establish the relationship of leadership styles among academic heads of department in Cape Coast Polytechnic as perceived by faculty members. It also sought to determine the difference in the relationship in leadership styles among academic faculties in the institution. It further sought to ascertain the relationship between leadership attributes on job satisfaction of faculty members. Lastly it sought to establish the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction among the three faculties of the institution. Results from the study showed that:

1. Heads of Departments in the institution exhibit transformational leadership, transactional leadership and Laissez-faire leadership skills.
2. Transformational leadership, transactional leadership and Laissez-faire leadership are exhibited fairly often or frequently if not always.
3. Faculty members are generally somewhat satisfied with their jobs.
4. There is a strong and positive relationship between transformational leadership style of HODs and faculty member job satisfaction

Recommendations

It is no gainsaying to suggest that the role of leadership in various organizations, including the one under study is quite significant. The result of the study has attested to the fact that leadership could influence employee job satisfaction to a large extent.

The study therefore recommends that the Human Resource Department should organize pre-service and in-service training for heads of department in the faculties with reference to leadership competencies and skills. Cautious succession plans and strategies should also be put in place by the departments as well to prepare prospective HODs for leadership positions. Such programmes should emphasize on encouragement of free expression so that opinions could be shared and collaborations on decision-making well motivated. Such endeavours reduce stress thus boosting job satisfaction and employee morale. The practice of openness also promotes positive organizational climate and therefore needs to be added to these training curriculum.

The concept of Transformation Leadership with its various advantages could be added to the training curriculum as well. Through seminars, workshops and updates on institutional management, the National Board for Professional and Technical Examination, the National Accreditation Board and / or the Polytechnic Council in collaboration with the Human Resource Department of the institution should organize programmes that will equip faculty heads with transformational and transactional leadership concepts emphasising both the positive and negative aspects.

Leadership training and development programs have positive effect on leaders' achievement, motivation and enhancement of individual competencies. It is therefore pertinent that HODs should be available to such programs when organized and impress upon school authorities to arrange these programs for them.

REFERENCES

- Arnold, A. J. & Feldman, D. C. (1982). A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. *Journal of Applied psychology* 67, 350 – 360.
- Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (1988). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Baffour-Awuah, E. (2010). Towards the development of a strategic transport unit for tertiary institutions in Ghana: The case of Cape Coast Polytechnic. *The Engineer*, 6(1), 15-23.
- Bass, B. M. & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd edn). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M. & Steidmeier, P. (1998). Ethics, character and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181-212.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications*. (3rd ed) New York: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan Inc.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Becker, J., Ayman, R. & Korabik, K. (2002). Discrepancies in self/subordinates' perceptions of leadership behavior: Leader's gender, organizational context, and leader's self-monitoring *Group & Organization Management*, 27(2), 226-244.
- Benjamin, B. & O'Reilly, C. (2011). Becoming a leader: Early career challenges faced by MBA graduates. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(3), 452-472.
- Bennis W. & Nanus, B (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking change*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bolger, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 37, 662-683.
- Boon, O. K., Arumugan, N., Vellepan, Y. & Wei, H (2006). A quantitative analysis of the link between organizational culture and job satisfaction. Evidence form some Malasian health carorg. *Malaysian Management Review*, 41(1), 68-90.
- Bouton, M. E. (2007). *Learning and Behavior: A Contemporary Synthesis*, Sunderland, MA: Sinauer.
- Boyer, E., Altbach, P. & Whitelaw, M.J. (1994). *The academic profession: An international perspective*. Princeton, New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bratton, J., Callinar, M., Foroshaw, C., & Sawchuk, P. (2007). *Work and Organization Behavior*. New York, NY: Patgrave Macmillan.

- Breaugh, J. A. (1981). Predicting absenteeism from prior absenteeism and work attitude. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 415 – 422.
- Bryman A. & Bell, E. (2015). *Business Research Methods*, 4th edition, Oxford University Press, p.27.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: sage
- Burns, B. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cape Coast Polytechnic (2007). *Cape Coast Polytechnic Strategic Plan: 2007 – 2011*.
- Carsten, J. & Spector, P. (1957). Unemployment, job satisfaction and employment turnover: A meta-analytic test of the Muchinsky model. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 72, 374-381.
- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1993). *Applied multiple regressions for the behavioural sciences*, Hillsdale, N.J: Elrbaum.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16,197-334.
- Delaney, J. (1991). *Teacher perceptions of the effect of administrative practices on teacher morals in New Foundland and Labrador schools*. Unpublished master's thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada.
- Dinham, S. & Scott, C. (2000). Moving into the third outer domain of teacher satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(4), 379-396.
- Drysdale, L., Ford, P., Gurr, D. & Swann, R. (2003). *Successful school leadership: An Australian perspective*. Retrieved from www.acer.org.au.

- Dubrin, A.J. (2001). *Leadership*. (3rded) New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avoho, & Sharmir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735-744.
- Ejimofor, F. (2007). *Principal transformational leadership skills and their teacher job satisfaction in Nigeria*. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Cleveland State University, Ohio.
- Emery, C. R. & Barker, K. J. (2007). *The effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel*.
- Evans, L. (1998). *Teacher morale, job satisfaction and motivation*. London: Paul Chapman publishing Ltd.
- Eyles, J. & Smith, D. M. (Eds) (1988). *Qualitative methods in human geography*. Cambridge, Polity.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1994). Leading diverse followers. *The Journal of Leadership studies*, 4, 82 – 93.
- Gay, L. R. (1992). *Educational Research: Competences for analysis and Application*. Merrill.
- Ghazi, S. R. (2004). *Job satisfaction of elementary school teachers' (Toba Tek Singh) in the Punjab*. Unpublished PhD thesis. NUML Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnelly, J. H. (2000). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes*. 10th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

- Graham, J. (1988). Transformational leadership: Fostering follower autonomy, not automatic leadership. In: Hunt, J.G., Baliga, R.B., Dachler, P. H and Schriesheim, C.A. (Eds) *Emerging leadership Vistas* (73-79). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Greenberg, J. & Baron, R. A. (1995). *Behaviour in organizations: understanding and managing the human side of work*, 5th edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall.
- Griffin, R. W. & Bateman, T. S. (1996). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In: C. L. Cooper and Robertson, I. (Eds), *Int. Review of Ind. and Organizational Psychology*, 157-188, New York: Wiley.
- Hackman, R. and Oldham, G. R. (1975). Motivation through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16 (2), 250-279.
- Haimann, T. & Scott, W. G.(1974). *Management in the modern organization*.California, US, Houghton Mifflin.
- Hall, B. W., Pearson, L. C. & Carol, D. (1992). Teachers long range teaching plans: discriminatory analysis. *Journal of Educational Research*, 85(4), 221-225.
- Harrari, O. (2002). *The leadership secretes of Collin Powel*. New York: McGraw – Hill, p. 13.
- Hatter, J. J. & Bass, B. M. (1988).Superior’s evaluations and subordinates perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership.*Applied Psychology*, 73, 695-702.

- Herzberg, F., Mouser, B. & Syderman, B. (1959). *The motivation work*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hetland, H. & Sandal, G. M. (2003). Transformational leadership in Norway: outcomes and personality correlates. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12(2), 140-170.
- Hukpati, C. A. (2009). *Transformational leadership and teacher job satisfactions: A comparative study of private and public tertiary institutions in Ghana*. Master's Thesis, Faculty of Behavioral Science, University of Twente.
- Ihrke, D. (2003). Leadership in organizations. *Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy*, 7, 10-723.
- Jain, N. C. & Saakshi, M. S. (2005). *Management – theory and practice*. Delhi, India: AIBS Publishers and Distributors.
- Javidan, M. & Waldman, D. A. (2003). Exploring charismatic leadership in the public sector: measurement and consequences. *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 229-242.
- Jewel, L. N. & Reitz, H. J. (1981). *Group Effectiveness in Organizations*. Glenview: Illinois: Scott Foresman.
- Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 751-765.
- Judge, T. A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768.

- 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 Organizational Behavior*, 16, 319-333.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). What leaders really do? *Harvard Business Review*, 68(3), 103-111.
- Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A. (2001). *Organizational behaviour: Key concepts, skills and best practices (2nd ed)* Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Kumar, R. (2005). *Research methodology, a step by step guide for beginners. 2nd ed.* Sage Publications, 196-780.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G. & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385-425.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Medley, F. & Larochelle, D. R. (1995). Transformational leadership and job Satisfaction, 26(9). Retrieved from http://journals.lww.com/nursingmanagement/1995/09000/Transformational_Leadership_and_Job_Satisfaction.17.aspx.
- Mine, S. (2008). *Leadership behaviours of school principals in relation to teacher job satisfaction in north Cyprus*. A paper presented at the world conference on educational sciences, 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.Science direct.com>.

- Montana, P. J. & Charnov, B. H (1993). *Management*. Hauppauge, NY: Barron's Educational Series.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R. & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 14, 224-227.
- Mullins, L. J. (2010). *Management & organizational behavior* 9th (ed.) Pearson Education Limited. Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, England.
- Nguni, S. Slegers, P. & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour in primary schools: The Tanzanian Case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 145-177.
- Niesche, R. (2011). Foucault and educational leadership: Disciplining the principal, New York, Francis and Taylor.
- Nnadi, P. O. (1997). *Job satisfaction and motivation*. Lagos, Nigeria: Macmillan Nigerian Publishers Ltd.
- Normally, J.C. & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd Ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6), 963-974.
- Osuala, E. C. (1993). *Introduction to research methodology*. Onitsha, Nigeria: Africana-Fep Publishers Limited.
- Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using the SPSS program*. Crows Nest, Australia, Allen & Unwin.

- Parry, K. & Proctor-Thompson, S. (2003). Leadership, culture and performance: the case of the New Zealand public sector. *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4), 376-399.
- Pavlov, I. P. (1960). *Conditional Reflexes*. New York: Dover Publications, Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Pavlov/>).
- Planning Unit (2015). Cape Coast Polytechnic, Planning Unit, Cape Coast.
- PNDC law 217 (1987). *The Polytechnic Law 1987*.
- PNDC Law 321 (1992). *The Polytechnic Law 1992*.
- Podsakoff P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H. & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leadership behaviours and their effects on followers' trust in leader satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Pollice, G. (2009). *Worcester Polytechnic Institute*. Retrieved from <http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/rational/library/edge.09/mar06/pollice/>.
- Poulin, J. E. & Walter, C.A. (1992). Retention plans and job satisfaction of gerontological social workers. *Journal of Geological Social Work*, 19(1), 99-114.
- Reyes, P. (Ed) (1989). *Teachers and their workplace: commitment, performance and productivity*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ryan, R. L. (1980). An analysis of some of the relationships between management style of junior and senior high school principals and teacher job satisfaction and productivity. Unpublished.

- Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social Research*.(3rd edn.) Melbourne, Macmillan Education.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research Methods for Business Students*, 6th edition, Pearson Education Limited.
- Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinin, E. & Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charismatic leader behavior in military units: subordinates attitudes, unit of characteristics, and superiors, appraisals of leadership performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(4), 387-401.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Sproul, N. L. (1988). *Handbook of Research Methods: A Guide for Practitioners and Students in the Social Sciences*. New Jersey: Scarecrow Press Inc.
- Ssenga, K. & Garret, R. M. (2005). Job satisfaction of university academics: Perspectives from Uganda: *Higher Education*, 50(1), 33-56.
- Steers, R. M. & Black, J. S. (1994). *Organizational behaviour*. New York: Harper Collins College.
- Steers, R. M. & Rhodes, S. R (1978). Major influences on employee attendance: A process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(4), 391- 407
- Suarva, J. H. (2002). Executive leadership in local government. *Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy*, 474-479.
- Tosi, H. L. Rizzo, J. R. & Carroll, S. J. (1994). *Managing Organizational Behaviour*, 3rd edition. USA, Pitman Publishing Inc.

- Trevino, K. & Bart, V. (1992). In Jain, N. C. and Saakshi. M. S. (2005). *Management – Theory and practice*. Delhi, India: AIIBS Publishers and Distributors.
- Vroom, V. H. & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The New leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice- Hall.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Orwa, B., Wang, P. & Lawler, J. J. (2005). Transformational leadership, organizational commitment and job satisfaction: A comparative study of Kenyan and US financial firms. *Human Resource Quarterly*, 16(2), 235-256.
- Webb, K.S. (2009). Creating satisfied employees in Christian Higher education: Research on leadership competencies. *Christian Higher Education*, 8(1), 18-31.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: MN: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Winston B. E. and Patterson, K. (2006). An integrative definition of leadership, *International Journal of Leadership*, 1(2), 6-66.
- Wofford, J. C., Whittington, J. & Goodwin, V. (2001). Follower motive patterns as situational moderators for transformational leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Management Issues*, 13(2), 196-207.
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis*, 2nd Edition, New York: Harper and Row.
- Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. (8th.Ed.) Pearson.

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

APPENDIX A
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

As part of a study on the topic ‘Leadership skills among Heads of Department in Cape Coast Polytechnic,’ this questionnaire has been designed to solicit information from Faculty Members in Cape Coast Polytechnic. The study is being conducted towards a partial fulfilment for the award of Master of Business Administration degree in General Management. Kindly read it carefully and provide the information required as correctly as possible. All information shall be treated private and confidential. They shall be strictly used for academic purposes only.

Thank you very much.

A. PERSONAL DATA

Kindly tick the appropriate answer and provide details as much as possible.

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: (a) Male [] (b) Female []
3. Years in position: _____
4. Work experience (years in polytechnic): _____
5. Qualification: _____

6. Rank: _____
7. Department: _____
8. School: _____
9. Marital status: (a) Married [] (b) Single
(c) Single (Divorced) [] (d) In a relationship []
10. No. of children: _____

B. LEADER CHARACTERISTICS

Kindly grade your head by ticking the appropriate answer based on the stated characteristics.

11. I feel good around my head of department (Tf)
- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
- (c) Sometimes []
- (d) Fairly often [] (e) Frequently, if not always []
12. He expresses few simple words what others could/should do (Tf)
- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
- (c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
- (e) Frequently, if not always []
13. He enables others think about old problems in new ways (Tf)
- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
- (c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
- (e) Frequently, if not always []
14. He helps others develop themselves (Tf)

- (a) Not at all []
- (b) Once in a while []
- (c) Sometimes []
- (d) Fairly often []
- (e) Frequently, if not always []

15. He tells others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work (Ts)

- (a) Not at all []
- (b) Once in a while []
- (c) Sometimes []
- (d) Fairly often []
- (e) Frequently, if not always []

16. He is satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards (Ts)

- (a) Not at all []
- (b) Once in a while []
- (c) Sometimes []
- (d) Fairly often []
- (e) Frequently, if not always []

17. He is content when continue working in the same way as always (Lf)

- (a) Not at all []
- (b) Once in a while []
- (c) Sometimes []
- (d) Fairly often []
- (e) Frequently, if not always []

18. Others have complete faith in him (Tf)

- (a) Not at all []
- (b) Once in a while []
- (c) Sometimes []
- (d) Fairly often []
- (e) Frequently, if not always []

19. He provides appealing images about what we can do (Tf)

- (a) Not at all []
- (b) Once in a while []

- (c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

20. He provides others with new ways of looking at puzzling things

(Tf)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

21. He lets others know how he thinks they are doing (Tf)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

22. He provides recognition/rewards when others reach their goals (Ts)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

23. As long as things are working he does not change anything (Ts)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

24. Whatever others want to do is Okay with him (Lf)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

25. Others are proud to be associated with him (Tf)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

26. He helps others find meaning to their work (Tf)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

27. He gets others rethink ideas that they had never questioned before
(Tf)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

28. He gives personal attention to others who seem rejected (Tf

29.)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

30. He calls attention to what others can get for what they accomplish

(Ts)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

31. He tells others the standards they have to know to carry out their work (Ts)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

32. He asks no more of others than what is absolutely essential (Lf)

- (a) Not at all [] (b) Once in a while []
(c) Sometimes [] (d) Fairly often []
(e) Frequently, if not always []

C. JOB SATISFACTION OF FOLLOWERS

Kindly grade yourself by ticking the appropriate answer based on the stated characteristics as to how satisfied you are with your job.

33. Being able to keep busy on the job all the time

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

34. The chance to work alone on the job

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

35. The chance to do different things from time to time

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []

- (c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
- (e) Extremely Satisfied []

36. The chance to be 'somebody' in the community

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
- (c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
- (e) Extremely Satisfied []

37. The way my boss handles his/her workers

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
- (c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
- (e) Extremely Satisfied []

38. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
- (c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
- (e) Extremely Satisfied []

39. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
- (c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
- (e) Extremely Satisfied []

40. The way my job provides for steady employment

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
- (c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
- (e) Extremely Satisfied []

41. The chance to do things for other people

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

42. The chance to tell people what to do

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

43. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

44. The way company policies are put into practice

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

45. My pay and the amount of work I do

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

46. The chances of advancement on this job

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

47. The freedom to try my own methods of doing my job

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

48. The chance to try my own methods of doing my job

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

49. The working conditions

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

50. The way my co-workers get along with each other

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

51. The praise I get for doing a good job

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []
(e) Extremely Satisfied []

52. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job

- (a) Not Satisfied [] (b) Somewhat Satisfied []
(c) Satisfied [] (d) Very Satisfied []

(e) Extremely Satisfied []

Thank you once again.

APPENDIX B

Demographic Distribution of Respondents

Parameter	Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender		
Male	44	97.8
Female	1	2.2
Age (years)		
Less than 31	1	2.2
31 – 40	28	62.2
41 – 50	11	24.4
More than 50	5	11.2
Tenure in position (years)		
1 – 3	20	44.4
4 – 6	23	51.2
7 – 9	2	4.4
Work experience in Polytechnic (years)		
Less than 6	8	17.8
6 – 10	19	42.2
11 – 15	14	31.1
16 – 20	3	6.7
More than 20	1	2.2
Qualifications		
Bachelor	6	13.3
Master	38	84.5
Doctorate	1	2.2
Rank		
Assistant lecturer	5	8.9
Lecturer	38	84.5
Senior lecturer		6.6
Department		
Accountancy	5	11.1
Building Technology	5	11.1
Electrical Engineering	5	11.1
Liberal Studies	5	11.1
Marketing	6	13.3
Mechanical Engineering	5	11.1
Secretaryship and Management Studies	4	8.9
Statistics	5	11.1
Tourism	5	11.1
School		
Business Studies	15	33.3
Engineering	15	33.3
School of Arts and Applied Science	15	33.4
Marital status		
Married	32	71.1
Single (Unmarried/Divorced)	3	6.7
In a relationship	10	22.2

APPENDIX C

Faculty Members' Perception of HODs Leadership Behavior

		Not at all	Once in a while	Some time	Fairly often	Frequently if not always	Total
1.	He makes others feel good to be around me	Count 5 % 1.1	10 22.2	16 35.6	8 17.6	6 13.3	45 100
2.	He expresses with a few words that we could and should do	Count 2 % 4.4	13 28.9	18 40.0	6 13.3	6 13.3	45 100
3.	He enables others to think about grant old problems in a new way	Count 3 % 6.7	9 20.0	22 48.9	9 20.9	2 44.4	45 100
4.	He helps others develop themselves	Count 3 % 6.7	10 22.2	18 40	8 17.6	6 13.3	45 100
5.	He tells others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work	Count 3 % 6.7	12 26.6	14 31.1	10 22.2	6 13.3	45 100
6.	He is satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards	Count 2 % 4.4	5 11.1	18 40.0	10 22.2	10 22.2	45 100
7.	He is content to let others continue working in the same way as always	Count 3 % 6.7	12 26.7	17 37.8	10 22.2	3 6.7	45 100
8.	Others have complete faith in him	Count 2 % 4.4	12 26.7	10 22.2	12 26.7	9 20.2	45 100
9.	He provides appealing images about we can do	Count 9 % 20.0	15 33.3	17 37.8		4 8.9	45 100
10.	He provides others with new count was of looking puzzling things	Count 2 % 4.4	10 22.2	13 28.9	19 42.2	1 2.2	45 100
11.	He lets others know how/think they are doing	Count 3 % 6.7	13 28.9	15 33.3	12 26.7	2 4.4	45 100
12.	He provides recognition/records when others reach their goals	Count 6 % 13.3	8 17.8	15 33.3	12 26.7	4 8.9	45 100
13.	As long as things are working, he does not try to change anything	Count 4 % 8.9	9 20.0	18 40.0	9 20.0	5 11.1	45 100
14.	Whatever others want to do is ok	Count 7 % 15.6	6 13.3	15 33.3	14 31.1	3 6.7	45 100
15.	Others are proud to be associated with him	Count 6 % 13.3	7 15.6	15 33.3	12 26.7	5 11.1	45 100

Appendix C Cont'd.

16. He helps others find meaning in their work	Count	3	8	17	12	5	45
	%	6.7	17.8	37.8	26.7	11.1	100
17. He gets others rethink ideas that they had never questioned before	Count	3	12	14	14	2	45
	%	6.7	26.7	31.1	31.1	4.4	100
18. He gives personal attention to others who seem rejected	Count	6	7	13	14	5	45
	%	13.3	15.6	28.9	31.1	11.1	100
19. He calls attention to what others can get for what they accomplish	Count	7	6	13	14	5	45
	%	15.6	13.5	28.9	31.1	11.1	100
20. He tells others the standards they have to know to carry out their work	Count	4	6	11	18	6	45
	%	8.9	13.3	24.4	40.0	13.3	100
21. He asks no more of others than what is absolutely essential	Count	8	5	6	24	2	45
	%	17.8	11.1	13.3	53.3	4.4	100

Source: Field data, 2015.

APPENDIX D

Faculty Members' Job Satisfaction Levels

		Not satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Extremely satisfied	Total
1.	The chance of being able to keep busy on the job all the time	Count 1 2.2	22 48.9	15 33.3	6 13.3	1 2.2	45 100
2.	The chance to work alone on the job	Count — —	20 44.4	15 33.3	8 17.8	2 4.4	45 100
3.	The chance to do different things from time to time	Count - -	12 26.7	22 48.8	10 22.2	1 2.2	45 100
4.	The chance to be somebody in the community	Count 21 46.7	15 33.3	5 11.1	3 6.7	1 2.2	45 100
5.	The way my boss handles his/her workers	Count 4 8.9	16 35.6	10 22.2	11 24.4	4 8.9	45 100
6.	The competence of my HOD in making decisions	Count 5 11.1	11 24.4	13 28.9	10 22.2	6 13.3	45 100
7.	Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	Count 4 8.9	10 22.2	11 24.4	16 35.6	4 8.9	45 100

Appendix D Cont'd.

8.	The way my job provides for steady employment	Count %	2 4.4	14 31.1	14 31.1	12 26.7	3 6.7	45 100
9.	The chance to do things for other people	Count %	6 13.1	13 28.9	13 28.9	10 22.2	3 6.7	45 100
10.	The chance to tell people what to do	Count %	4 8.9	12 26.7	16 35.6	7 15.6	6 13.3	45 100
11.	The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	Count %	6 13.3	10 22.2	15 33.3	11 24.4	3 6.7	45 100
12.	The way institution policies are put into practice	Count %	4 8.9	10 22.2	13 28.9	11 24.4	6 13.3	45 100
13.	My pay and the amount of work I do	Count %	3 6.7	20 44.4	12 26.7	6 13.3	4 8.9	45 100
14.	The chance for job enhancement	Count %	8 17.8	18 40.0	11 24.4	7 15.6	1 2.2	45 100
15.	The freedom to try own methods of doing the job	Count %	4 8.9	18 40	9 20	9 20	5 11.1	45 100
16.	The chance to try own methods of doing my job	Count %	7 15.6	12 26.7	13 28.7	10 22.2	3 6.7	45 100
17.	The conditions	Count %	6 13.3	12 26.7	13 37.8	6 13.3	- -	45 100

Appendix D Cont'd.

18. The way co-workers get along with each other	Count	11	10	9	12	3	45
	%	24.4	22.2	20.0	26.7	6.7	100
19. The praise co-workers get for doing a good job	Count	4	6	11	18	6	45
	%	8.9	13.3	24.4	40.0	13.3	100
20. The feeling of accomplishing co-workers get from the job	Count	8	5	6	24	2	45
	%	17.8	11.1	13.3	53.3	4.4	100

Source: Field data, 2014.