2020

Association Between Perceived Department Chair Leadership Characteristics and Faculty Job Satisfaction

Dr. Braylon Jacob Gorman
Walden University

Walden University

College of Education

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Braylon J. Gorman

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Cheryl Keen, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Beate Baltes, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Michelle Brown, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2020

Abstract

Association Between Perceived Department Chair Leadership Characteristics and Faculty Job Satisfaction

by

Braylon J. Gorman

MS, Walden University, 2012

BS, American Intercontinental University, 2008

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Education

Walden University

February 2020

Abstract

Low faculty job satisfaction observed in higher education institutions can result in high rates of turnover and lack of commitment. With limited research on department chair leadership and faculty job satisfaction, there is also a gap in research in small liberal arts college settings. Guided by Avolio and Bass's full-range leadership model, the purpose of this study was to examine the association between faculty perceptions of department chair leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction at 3 small, liberal arts institutions in the southeastern United States. For this nonexperimental study, the college's self-developed Adapted Employee Satisfaction Survey was distributed to 720 faculty of whom 526 responded for a response rate of 73%. The Pearson chi-square test for independence with Cramer's V was conducted and indicated that while 65% felt satisfied with their job, only the perceived department chair leadership characteristic of comfort with feedback by department chair was moderately to strongly associated with faculty job satisfaction (V = .44). Allowance of honest expression (V = .37*)* had a moderate association, whereas the remaining 5 characteristics had significant associations with faculty job satisfaction but with small effect sizes: being respected by their department chair (V = .24), department chairs caring about their well-being (V = .21), confidence in leadership (V = .17), adequate communication (V = .15), and openness to input from faculty (V = .15). These findings may contribute to social change by giving insight into improving faculty's job satisfaction, which may lead to better teaching, benefitting students' academic experiences, and the college's overall reputation.

Association Between Perceived Department Chair Leadership Characteristics and Faculty Job Satisfaction

by

Braylon J. Gorman

MS, Walden University, 2012

BS, American Intercontinental University, 2008

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Education

Walden University

February 2020

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to God and His mercies and grace he bestowed upon me to get me through this process.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge my mother, Ellen L. Striverson, who provided financial assistance and moral support throughout this process. My sister, Carmieshra Y. Gorman, who listened to me vent about Chapter 4. My Committee Chair, Dr. Cheryl Keen, who provided continuous guidance with countless drafts of my dissertation. My methodologist, Dr. Beate Baltes, who also provided guidance in particular for Chapter 4. And last but not least, my URR, Dr. Michelle Brown. And to all of my fellow doctoral students who have sacrificed countless hours dedicated to positive social change. Last, but not least my Aunt, Kimm E. Gorman-Cannon, for moral support.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

Factors associated with low job satisfaction in higher education include the communication between department chairs and faculty, job-related stress, pressure to do more publishing and community outreach, and a lack of building relationships with colleagues (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016; Bateh & Heyliger, 2014; Bruins, 2018; Madhuri, 2017; Nazim, 2016). The political, economic, and social landscape of higher education leadership has changed, and most institutions depend on leaders who can lead effectively. This study and its findings are vital to higher education because numerous studies on leadership and job satisfaction exist; however, there are limited studies about the possible association between department chair leadership characteristics, in particular at small, liberal arts institutions, and faculty job satisfaction. The findings of this study have implications for positive social change, including that a better understanding of faculty job satisfaction and the influence of better outcomes may lead to better student learning and retention (see Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Demaris & Kritsonis, 2008; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Stutzman, 2017; Taylor, Beck, Lahey, & Froyd, 2017).

In Chapter 1, I discuss the background of the study, the problem statement, the purpose of the study, and the research problem. Additionally, I consider the introduction to the theoretical framework, nature of the study, search terms, definitions, assumptions, scope, delimitations, limitations, and significance of the study. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Background

Faculty demographics, professional job responsibilities, and other perceived classifications of faculty have been studied extensively in higher education research (Abouserie, 2006; Albert, Davia, & Legazpe, 2018; Denson, Szelenyi, & Bresonis, 2018). Factors, such as stress, work-life balance, and the department environment, have been perceived to contribute to faculty job satisfaction or a lack thereof (Jacobs & Winslow, 2004; Milosheff, 1990; Olsen, 2016). Furthermore, the attitudes and feelings that faculty have towards their work environment are associated with their achievement levels, recognition from peers and administrators, job fulfillment, cohesiveness, productivity, and job dissatisfaction (Akroyd, Bracken, & Chambers, 2011; Devito, Brown, Bannister, Cianci, & Mujtaba, 2016; Hoeskstra, 2014; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017).

In Chapter 2, I will provide an exhaustive and extensive review of the literature related to the scope of this study. The geographical location of the study sites (i.e., southeastern United States) and the unique setting of the study sites (small, similar, nonprofit, liberal arts colleges) is where the gap in practice exists. Leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction have been studied extensively. This study was critical because in it, I expounded upon past and current studies by providing a different perspective from smaller, similar colleges of higher learning in the southeastern United States.

Problem Statement

Low job satisfaction in higher education is related to several factors, including communication challenges, stress, the pressure to perform better about publishing and

research, and interpersonal relationships (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016). These factors lead to a lack of commitment, from which high rates of turnover can occur (Aino & Verma, 2017). Researchers have noted that the political, economic, and social landscape of higher education leadership has changed, and the success or failure of an institution relies on the effectiveness of administration (Gozukara & Simsek, 2016; Hong, Youngsman, Frose, & Shin, 2016; Jackson, 2017; Jin, Seo, & Shapiro, 2016). When leadership characteristics influence faculty job satisfaction, this can also affect productivity and retention (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2012; Notgrass, 2014; Sayyadi, Claudine, & Carment, 2015). Even so, when faculty members are supported by the administration in a positive environment, , the job satisfaction of faculty is increased (Aino & Verma, 2017; Dachner & Saxton, 2015; DeLotell & Cates, 2016).

To address the gap in the research, I conducted this study in small, nonprofit, liberal arts colleges because there is limited current and past research set in smaller college settings. Additionally, a gap in the literature existed concerning the geographical location of the colleges (i.e., the southeastern United States) and the unique higher education setting (i.e., smaller, similar, nonprofit, liberal arts colleges). Perhaps this study of the previously identified leadership characteristics may encourage more conversation about the influence of these characteristics on faculty job satisfaction in higher education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative, nonexperimental study was to explore the association between faculty perceptions of department chair leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction in small, liberal arts institutions in the southeastern United

States. The identified categories of the independent variable (IV) with the following seven leadership characteristics were:

- Confidence in leadership (confidence),
- Comfortable receiving feedback from leadership (feedback),
- Adequate communication with leadership (communication),
- Leadership's respect for faculty (respect),
- Leadership's openness to receiving input from faculty (openness),
- Leadership allowing faculty to honestly express themselves (expression), and
- Belief in leadership's caring for the well-being of faculty (well-being).

Research Question and Hypotheses

In the study, I developed the following research question and corresponding hypotheses to guide this study:

RQ: What is the association between faculty members' perception of department chairs' leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction?

H_0: There is no significant association between faculty members' perception of department chair's leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction.

H_A: There is a significant association between faculty members' perception of department chair's leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework

Upon researching various theoretical frameworks appropriate for this study, I found that there are three commonly accepted leadership styles: transformative, transactional, and laissez-faire (see Basham, 2012). Duemer (2017) and Ghasabeh, Soosay, and Reaiche (2015) found that most leaders fall within one of these three types of leadership. Through exploring various leadership models, I determined the full-range leadership model (FRLM) was the most appropriate for this study. This theory encompasses transformative, transactional, laissez-faire, and other characteristics, as defined by Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016). In this study, I focused on transformative leadership categories of confidence in leadership, comfortable feedback, adequate communication, respect for faculty, open to input, allowance of honest expression, and caring about the well-being of faculty, based on departmental leadership as related to faculty job satisfaction. An exhaustive and extensive literature review of the association of the framework and the identified variables is provided in Chapter 2.

Transformative Leadership

Transformative leadership and its associated characteristics are perceived to promote more change and engagement (Basham, 2012). Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016) indicated that transformative leadership also appeals to higher education based on several factors, such as emphasizing a shared vision, values, and goals and empowering followers to produce effective change. Moreover, professional development, more collaboration, and communicating ideas to overcome departmental or institutional barriers are also factors of transformative leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Transactional Leadership

The perception of transactional leaders is that transactional leaders motivate in ways that promote a reward and punishment system (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). The reward and punishment system are based on several transactional approaches and actions, such as:

- active management (e.g., leaders monitoring employee job performance closely),
- passive management (e.g., some form of punishment is considered by the leader when the employee does not meet the goals or performance standards of the job), and
- contingent reward (e.g., rewards are given by the manager to the employee when the employee is doing their job; Duemer, 2017).

Comparing transactional leadership characteristics, such as lack of adaptability, perceived unfair treatment, and lack of accountability, to positive, transformative leadership characteristics (e.g., shared vision, collaborative efforts, and engagement) provides a much broader perspective on the type of leader that will effectively promote perceived positive or ineffective social change (Ghasabeh et al., 2015).

In this study, transformative leadership was the identified leadership characteristic with the following associated categories: confidence in leadership, comfortable receiving feedback from leadership, adequate communication with leadership, leadership's respect for faculty, leadership's openness to receiving input from faculty, leadership allowing faculty to honestly express themselves, and belief in leadership's caring for the well-

being of faculty. These categories were included in the survey used in this study because they are aligned with the theories of Duemer (2017) and Ghasabeh et al. (2015). The survey I used involved identifying similar characteristics of transformative and transactional leaders from the perspective of faculty.

Nature of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative, nonexperimental study was to examine the association between faculty perceptions of department chair leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction at three, small, liberal arts institutions within the same system of colleges in the southeastern United States. I used the eight-question Adapted Employee Satisfaction Survey (AESS) to measure the dependent variable (DV) (i.e., faculty job satisfaction) and the seven categories of the IV of leadership.

In this study, I used the AESS, which is adapted from the original 20-question Employee Satisfaction Survey (ESS). The eight survey questions were on a 5-point Likert scale with 5 being *strongly agree,* 4 being *agree,* 3 being *neutral,* 2 being *disagree,* and 1 being *strongly disagree.* For the purpose of this study, the Likert scale was converted to a 3-point Likert scale with 1 being *agree,* 2 being *neutral,* and 3 being *disagree*. The survey was accessed through the faculty portal and available to 720 full-time and adjunct faculty members at three, small, liberal arts colleges in the southeastern United States. To analyze the data from 526 responses, I conducted a Pearson chi-square test for independence with Cramer's V. The DV for this study is faculty job satisfaction, and the IV is represented by the seven categories of leadership.

Definitions

Department chair leadership: Leaders that work together with other college campus administrators in positioning their respective departments and institutions towards excellence in education, leadership, and the overall student learning experience (Gonaim, 2016). For the purpose of this study, departmental leadership is a process that includes influencing team members within a college setting to meet the clearly articulated strategies and objectives, depends on the association between the leader and the faculty member, and is based on an appropriate leadership characteristics to potentially increase the job performance of the faculty member (Gonaim, 2016; Martin, 2015; Martinez & Marinez, 2019).

Faculty: Full-time and adjunct professionals who work in a higher education setting (Kim & Rehg, 2018).

Faculty job satisfaction: How an individual is overall affected toward specific work roles that they are currently occupying (Hesli & Lee, 2013). For the purpose of this study, faculty job satisfaction was defined as the pleasure the employees feel as a result of evaluating their work and their work life. In essence, how an individual feels about his or her role in general may lead to feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction; even so, there are many factors that contribute to the level of faculty job satisfaction (Anderson & Slade, 2016; Caraquil, Ivy, Sy, & Daguplo, 2016; Kezar & Gehrkes, 2016; Kimmel & Fairchild, 2017).

Leadership characteristics: In this study, I focused on transformative or transactional characteristics as they relate to how an individual leads a department or

organization (see Bass & Riggio, 2006). For the purpose of this study, transformative leadership characteristics are evident when the leader (i.e., department chair) and followers (i.e., faculty) work together to inspire and motivate each other to achieve greater success and work through the challenges and processes of change for the entire institution (see Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987; Martin, 2015). On the other hand, transactional leadership characteristics arise when the leader (i.e., department chair) identifies the tasks for the followers (i.e., faculty) to complete based on an established structure for which the tasks are to be completed and in which the followers are rewarded or punished based on their innate ability to achieve the departmental goals (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bass, 1985; Chang, 2004).

Assumptions

I assumed that all of participants answered the AESS questions honestly and objectively without allowing personal feelings or opinions he or she may have about their leader or the institution interfere with their responses to the survey questions. Furthermore, it was assumed that the questions were clearly understood by the respondents. This study was solely restricted to faculty members from one state and region; therefore, I also assumed the generalizability of the study is limited to a small sample size, which prevents broad scale generalizability to all educators across the nation.

Scope and Delimitations

Delimitations define the boundaries and limits of a study (Butterwick, Head, & Madalinksa-Michalak, 2020). The scope of this study pertained to faculty who teach at

three, small, similar, nonprofit, liberal arts institutions in the southeastern United States. The participants had to be an adjunct or full-time faculty member who taught at one of the three participating colleges. Staff and other support, such as café workers and teaching assistants, were not included in this study because their job descriptions and job requirements did not align with the purpose of this study.

The setting of the study included a diverse group of employees from various backgrounds and ethnicities. The delimitations of this study were: (a) demographic characteristics of the participants, such as race and gender, were not a focus and (2) participants had to teach at small, similar, nonprofit, liberal arts colleges in the southeastern United States. As the data were collected from a unique setting, the results cannot be generalized to other colleges or universities but can give a general idea about the association of department chairs' leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction. Therefore, another delimitation was the generalizability of the study is limited by a small sample size, which prevents broad scale generalizability to all educators across the nation.

Limitations

The specificity of the study population may present a limitation in the lack of potential generalizability to other communities and experiences. As with any review, the research design may have caused potential bias because of the way the AESS questions were formatted or worded; however, the survey questions did not appear to trigger any intentional bias, and the items were all answered without any questions being left blank

by the participants. Because the data had to be compiled from the previous 5-point Likert scale and transferred to a 3-point Likert scale, the results may be slightly construed.

External Validity

Threats to external validity can be found by asking what traits are commonly expressed or may be endemic to the research population (Brinkley-Etzkorn & Lane, 2019). Many researchers have found that it is widely held that most leaders are respected by faculty members for their ability to lead and are known to demonstrate various leadership characteristics, such as being agents of academic cultural change, having confidence in their ability to lead, caring for the well-being of faculty, possessing the ability to effectively communicate with faculty, and providing other professional development opportunities for faculty to enhance the academic environment (Brinkley-Etzkorn & Lane, 2019; Bystydzienski, Thomas, Howe & Desai, 2017; Kezar, Bertram-Gallant, & Lester, 2011). These perceived leadership characteristics of department chairs may have influenced how faculty viewed the survey and how they answered the survey questions related to their leader.

Additionally, I only used one instrument to measure leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction in this study. The instrument used by the participating colleges has no established reliability and validity but was used for years as part of the accreditation process. Results from a single measure related to such complex constructs as the leadership characteristics of department chairs and job satisfaction of faculty may not be generalizable to circumstances where or when different measurement constructs are used.

Internal Validity

At the individual level, the participants in this study may have had positive or negative leadership experiences recently with their department chair and responded through the lens of recency rather than an overall, general experience with that particular leader. Seminal work on faculty relationships with department chairs provided more insight on the relationship between leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction (Gonzales & Terosky, 2018; Hendrickson & Francis, 2018; Kuntz, 2012).

Construct Validity

There were many typical considerations that support construct validity in this study. The survey items were communicated clearly and in a common language that everyone could understand. It is unclear if some of the participants were reluctant to participate for various reasons; however, I did not collect identifying demographic information, such as age, sex, and ethnicity, or of department chairs being rated at any time through the survey instrument. Different demographic groups might have interpreted the survey items differently, but I had no way of determining that.

One potential bias that could have influenced the study outcomes was the collection of data based on the demographic variables of age, gender, race, and culture. Because these variables were not considered in this study, I took reasonable measures to address these concerns by not asking the participants to provide their age, gender, race, and culture. There are reasonable measures to address limitations by clearly identifying the targeted population, understanding what data are reliable and available, conducting

thorough research to ensure there are studies on the topic, and identifying an appropriate measure to collect the data (DeSimone, Harms, & DeSimone, 2015).

Significance of the Study

Within many college and university settings in the United States, the perception is that more teamwork, positive delegation, faculty empowerment to find solutions to departmental challenges, and inspirational leadership encourage more open and transparent communication, which can support more effective communication between the leader and his/her team members (Rocca-DelGazio, Frymier, & Mottet, 2013; Turkkahraman, 2014). Such effective communication could result in more job satisfaction, which, in turn, might increase the faculty's enthusiasm for the profession and improve teaching and faculty outcomes, such as job satisfaction (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Stutzman, 2017; Taylor et al., 2017). Faculty who are satisfied in their job might lead to better learning, the higher retention of students, and create more socially responsible global agents of positive change (Demaris & Kritsonis, 2008; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Roberts, 2018; Whitley & Yoder, 2015). Change involves everyone working together. When collaboration between the leader and the follower is evident, more encouragement from the leader to enhance the followers' work performance and the behaviors of the leader become more apparent (Deinert, Homan, Boer, Voepel, & Gutermann, 2015; Ferren, Dolinksy, & McCambly, 2014).

The findings of this study may contribute to social change by providing insight into leadership characteristics that may improve the job satisfaction of faculty, which

may lead to better teaching, benefitting students' academic experience and the college's overall reputation.

Summary

In this chapter, I identified some of the overall factors that contribute to the low job satisfaction of faculty in higher education, such as a lack of communication, stress, pressure of faculty to perform better, and building professional relationships with colleagues. Although the aforementioned factors and faculty job satisfaction have been studied extensively, within the scope of this study, similar problems have been identified from a different perspective and in a different setting.

The perception in U.S. higher education is that more teamwork, positive delegation, faculty empowerment to find solutions to departmental challenges, and inspirational leadership encourage more open and transparent communication, which can support more effective communication between the leader and his/her team members, whether interpersonally or in small groups (Rocca-DelGazio et al., 2013; Turkkahraman, 2014). Although the specificity of the study population may have presented a limitation in the lack of potential generalizability to other communities and experiences, the study was still important to conduct to have a better understanding of how addressing these challenges may lead to improved faculty outcomes and create more agents of positive social change (see Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Demaris & Kritsonis, 2008; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Roberts, 2018; Stutzman, 2017; Taylor et al., 2017; Whitley & Yoder, 2015). In the next chapter, I present an exhaustive review of the literature related to the scope and purpose of the study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Low job satisfaction in higher education is related to several factors, including communication challenges, stress, the pressure to perform better about publishing and research, and interpersonal relationships (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016). These factors lead to a lack of commitment, from which high rates of turnover can occur (Aino & Verma, 2017). Researchers have noted that the political, economic, and social landscape of higher education leadership has changed, and the success or failure of an institution relies on the effectiveness of administration (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016). When leadership characteristics influence faculty job satisfaction, this can also affect productivity and retention (Dvir et al., 2012; Notgrass, 2014).

The gap in practice, in the available research suggests that the study of leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction is limited in smaller, nonprofit, liberal arts colleges in the southeastern United States. The problem remains that a negative association exists between the perceived factors of leadership characteristics by faculty of department chairs and faculty job satisfaction in many colleges and universities in the United States (Dvir et al., 2012; Notgrass, 2014).

In this literature review, I discuss the extant research about the perceived transformative leadership characteristics, as an aspect of understanding the perceived leadership characteristics of department chairs, and how the associated categories of transformative leadership (i.e., confidence in leadership, comfortable feedback, adequate communication, respect for faculty, open to input, allowance of honest expression, and

caring about well-being) can influence faculty job satisfaction. The possible predictors of faculty perspectives on leader effectiveness based on age, diversity among leaders, pedagogical effectiveness of faculty, and leaders' ratings of effectiveness by faculty are also explored.

Effective leadership support of faculty, regardless of status (e.g., adjunct or full-time), is a challenge in higher education towards the aim of increasing student outcomes (Aino & Verma, 2017). Some researchers investigated the relationship between leadership characteristics and college faculty members' job satisfaction (Gozukara & Simsek, 2016; Hong et al., 2016; Jackson, 2017; Jin et al., 2016); however, relatively little empirical research has been conducted on the association between faculty members' job satisfaction and leadership characteristics in small, similar, liberal arts institutions in the southeastern United States.

Even so, it is generally agreed that when faculty members are provided with a supportive work environment by administrators, they have higher job satisfaction (Aino & Verma, 2017; Dachner & Saxton, 2015; DeLotell & Cates, 2016). The gap in the literature that I attempted to fill with this study was based on the geographical location of the colleges (i.e., the southeastern United States) and the unique higher education setting (i.e., smaller, similar, nonprofit, liberal arts colleges). Perhaps this study of the previously identified leadership characteristics may encourage more conversation about the influence of these characteristics on faculty job satisfaction in higher education.

The purpose of this quantitative, nonexperimental study was to explore the association between faculty perceptions of department chair leadership characteristics

and faculty job satisfaction at three, small, liberal arts institutions in the same system of colleges in the southeastern United States. The identified categories of the IV for this study are:

- Confidence in leadership (confidence),
- Comfortable receiving feedback from leadership (feedback),
- Adequate communication with leadership (communication),
- Leadership's respect for faculty (respect),
- Leadership's openness to receiving input from faculty (openness),
- Leadership allowing faculty to honestly express themselves (expression), and
- Belief in leadership's caring for the well-being of faculty (well-being).

In an effort to better understand higher education faculty job satisfaction as related to perceived department chair leadership characteristics, I explored several key areas in this literature review. Additionally, the identified variables and the associated categories of the IV in this study are an important consideration for their association to faculty job satisfaction in three, small, liberal arts institutions in the same system of colleges in the southeastern United States.

In this chapter, I reintroduce the theoretical framework and present a review of empirical literature related to the variables of leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction. The research question is also further discussed.

Literature Search Strategy

During the developmental stage of this study, I accessed the following library databases and search engines to locate literature related to the topic: Google Scholar,

ERIC, SAGE, and Education Research Complete. The following key search terms were used: *leadership, leadership characteristics, transformative, transactional, department chair, faculty commitment, gender, job satisfaction, minorities, rank,* and *experience.* The literature reviewed was published between 2015 and 2020.

Theoretical Framework

As previously discussed, the framework of transformative leadership, based on the full-range leadership model (FRLM) guided this research. In this study, I specifically focused on transformative leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction.

Transformational leadership was first introduced by Burns (1978) and further researched by Bass (1985) and more recently by Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016). Leaders who employ transformational leadership characteristics can redesign perceptions and values based on changed expectations, aspirations, articulated vision, sensitivity to the surroundings and followers' needs, personal risk-taking, and unconventional behavior in performance (Owen, 2014). Additionally, transformative leadership allows leaders to engage with others in ways that encourage employees to promote more effective fundamental change (Owen, 2014). Transformative leadership characteristics also allow for the practice of more ethical conduct in the workplace and support the practice of strong values and goals (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016; Zhu, Riggio, Avolio, & Sosik, 2011).

I chose the FRLM to guide this study, which encompasses transformative, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership characteristics, but focused on transformative and transactional leadership characteristics and not laissez-faire leadership characteristics

because these two characteristics are more related to the variables, research question, findings from the literature review, and data collection survey.

Literature Review Related to Variables

In this section, I discuss transformational leadership characteristics, the faculty experience, organizational commitment of faculty, gender, faculty job satisfaction, minority faculty, and faculty rank. I also review the work of other researchers that have approached the problem from various methods, perspective, and instruments used to collect the data.

Leadership Characteristics and Faculty Experience

Leadership is a continual transformation that requires leaders to positively inspire and motivate their employees (Gozukara & Simsek, 2016). Using two instruments (i.e., the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-Short Form and the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire) and the participation of 252 faculty members, Guzulara and Simsek (2016) sought to explore a possible association between faculty job satisfaction, leadership style, trust, and self-efficacy. Their findings indicated that a positive relationship existed between faculty job satisfaction and the leadership characteristics of style, confidence, and self-efficacy.

In a self-reported data study involving 357 part-time working graduate students, Jin et al. (2016) explored a possible association between job skills, job experiences, leadership characteristics, and overall job satisfaction with management and found that workplace happiness was one of the determining factors of overall satisfaction. Their findings indicated that leadership style was a major influence in workplace happiness of

leaders, commitment was influenced by the engagement trait of transformational leadership, and pleasant work environments positively contributed to the development of positive outlooks towards organizations (Jin et al., 2016).

Transformative and transactional leadership was the focus of a study conducted by Mathieu and Babiak (2015) who suggested that leaders who are perceived as more transformative by their employees experience more positive emotions and are less likely to experience job dissatisfaction compared to non-transformative leaders. In their study involving 423 employees, Mathieu and Babiak sought to determine the influence of supervisor leadership styles on employee job satisfaction, turnover intention, motivation, and job neglect. Their findings suggested that transformative leadership characteristics were positively related to work motivation, and negative characteristics, such as a hostile work environment and leadership dissatisfaction, contributed to whether an employee would remain or depart an organization.

With the assistance of 278 managers and the use of a transformative style self-reporting instrument, Menci, Wefald, and Vanittersum (2016) attempted to determine the possible emotional leadership attributes of transformational leadership and their outcomes. Building interpersonal relationships, leadership characteristics, and personal job satisfaction were the key factors Menci et al. focused on in their study. Their findings indicated that positive leadership characteristics contributed to the building of relationships between leaders and followers, employee satisfaction, and satisfaction of leadership.

The studies I reviewed in this section suggest that leadership characteristics play a significant role in job satisfaction, administrative trust, building relationships, and the intention for leaders to engage more with their employees. Other researchers have suggested that leadership characteristics have been found to impact faculty organizational commitment in many ways, and skilled employees who provide quality service to the organization are perceived to be more beneficial than those employees who are not committed and do not provide quality service (Aino & Verma, 2017; Dachner & Saxton, 2015; DeLotell & Cates, 2016; Hong et al., 2016; Jackson, 2017).

Leadership Characteristics and Organizational Commitment

Acceptance, effort, commitment, and support of managers was the focus of a study involving 166 managers conducted by Aino and Verma (2017). Unlike many previous studies that used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to collect data, Aino and Verma used the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, and their findings indicated a significant relationship between perceived leadership style of the managers (i.e., acceptance and effort) and their perception of the organizational commitment of their subordinates (commitment and support).

In addition to understanding what increases the commitment of managers, motivation was the focus in a study conducted by Dachner and Saxton (2015) involving 291 faculty and students and the use of several survey instruments. The purpose of their study was to explore possible relationships between the job attitude of faculty and commitment to students. Dachner and Saxton found that instructors could be committed to the organization and not necessarily be committed to students or vice versa. They

concluded that within many colleges and universities, the mantra is often “publish or perish,” which suggests that because of the demands of publishing more work, many faculty members may not be fully committed to the organization, teaching, or their students.

In another study of commitment, conducted by DeLotell and Cates (2016) involving 561 adjunct faculty, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-5 and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire were used to examine a possible correlation between an obligation to leave, cost of leaving, emotional attachment and leadership styles of department chairs, as perceived by faculty members. Findings indicated a significant relationship between the perceived transformational leadership styles of department chairs and faculty organizational commitment (DeLotell & Cates, 2016).

Transformative and transactional leadership styles were the focus of a study conducted by Hong et al. (2016), involving 195 U.S. and 296 Korean graduate students and corporate employees. Hong et al. used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was used to explore the possible relationship of the perceptions of transformational leadership style attributes (i.e. friendly, sociable, and engaging) of managers by the participants, commitment, rank, and initiating structure, one of the traits of a transactional leader. Findings of the study indicated positive relationships were prevalent between leaders who were more transformational and committed, compared to those leadership styles that were more transactional, in both regions where the study was conducted (Hong et al., 2016).

In another study using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Jackson (2017) examined the possible associations between perceptions of their supervisors' leadership style and leadership success, based on idealized attributes, behaviors, motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. The study involved 88 full-time faculty and non-management staff at a southeastern U.S. community college. Jackson found a relationship between leadership characteristics and leadership success, based on faculty commitment, faculty job satisfaction, and leadership effectiveness.

The influence of leadership characteristics on commitment is significant to higher education and techniques adopted by leaders may vary. Because of the variance, more research may be useful to draw conclusions about leadership style and its impact on commitment in a variety of settings. The degree of influence of gender on commitment is an ongoing concern in many colleges and universities and some faculty members find it challenging to adjust to different styles of leadership because of gender differences (Alexander, 2016; Martin, 2015; Meghna, Helisse, & D'Agostino, 2017; Miller & Murry, 2015; Walker & Aritz, 2015; Wheat & Hill, 2016).

Alexander (2016) suggested that gender bias occurs in the workplace when the perception is that men are better leaders than women. Alexander conducted a study to explore the perceptions of preferred leadership characteristics of female and male administrators. Alexander used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Self-Rater Form to survey 338 chief financial officers employed at 2 and 4-year institutions located in the southeastern United States. Alexander found no significant differences in

preference of leadership styles by male and female chief financial officers, and transformational leadership style was the favorite style among the leaders.

However, Martin (2015) found women leaders are more likely to be perceived as more effective if they employed transformative leadership characteristics, compared to men. Furthermore, women have been seen to exhibit less leadership potential compared to their male counterparts, and the indication of transformative leadership characteristics such as nurturing and attentive, have been found to be more prevalent among women leaders, compared to men (Martin, 2015; Meghna et al., 2017). In a study involving 50 academic library leaders, Martin used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to explore the self-perceived leadership styles of the leaders and found that compared to women, men are more likely to be hired for administrative positions, have more job security, and in some cases, experience less job-related stress.

In a study involving 84 educational leaders in the Midwest, southern, and western United States, Meghna et al. (2017) used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to explore any possible self-perceived differences in leadership characteristics of academic leaders. Women were described more as being someone who leads by example for faculty and students. Men were more likely to be perceived to be more strategic thinkers and communicate the vision of the institution more effectively to stakeholders. Women were viewed as more informal, collaborative, and nurturing in their leadership style (i.e., transformational), and men were more administrative and consultative (i.e., transactional). Meghna et al. also claimed that transformational style was characterized

by men as more feminine because of the socialized characteristics (nurturing, informal, collaborative) are integral elements associated with transformational leadership styles.

Related to the focus by Meghna et al. (2017) on men's characterizations of feminine characteristics, Walker and Aritz (2015) found that the term *submissive* to be a perceived aspect of being feminine. They explored discourse as an important aspect of leadership and found men were perceived to be more direct as leaders in a study involving 22 mixed-gender Master of Business Administration students at a private university in southern California, Walker and Aritz examined how leadership discourse within a male-dominated program was observed by participants. Walker and Aritz identified feminine socialized characteristics as a form of nurturing and the characteristics of nurturing were determined to be more prevalent in foreign countries, compared to a more assertive, competitive nature, and more respect for authority as characteristic of U.S. women leaders. Findings also indicated that in the two mixed-gender teams, no women emerged as the chosen leader by the groups (Walker & Aritz, 2015).

Walker and Aritz (2015) used interactive data analysis to analyze their results. Based on the results, several dynamics emerged which included: decisive and task-oriented communication, involving others in the decision-making process, and the following styles: modest, compassionate, and supportive, independent, self-reliant, status-conscious, and procedural. Walker and Aritz concluded that to gain more understanding about the perceptions of gender discourse in leadership; one must use a discursive lens to analyze different communication patterns between men and women better.

Expanding upon the possibility of gender-specific leadership characteristics, Wheat and Hill (2016) found that the perception of women's leadership characteristics (e.g., collaborative, democratic, etc.) contributed to stereotypical and exaggerated views of leadership. In a study involving 14 university women presidents and senior administrators, Wheat and Hill explored how women in leadership defined their roles and found two themes emerged from the study: the salience of gender in shaping the participants' perceptions and experiences and the influence of women's intersecting identities in developing their leadership.

The studies reviewed in this section are similar in the tools used and the findings. While Alexander (2016), Martin (2015), and Meghna et al. (2017) shared similar findings regarding gender and leadership style, other researchers found that gender is a factor considered in the appointment of leadership roles, which suggests that men are chosen more as leaders (Walker & Aritz, 2015; Wheat & Hill, 2016). Although the application of leadership styles has been found to be perceived differently by men and women, more research may be useful in a variety of settings to determine more about why women are perceived to be more transformational in their leadership approach and why men are perceived as more transactional in their leadership approach.

Leadership characteristics may be considered a driver for creating a more welcoming environment and improved employee job satisfaction for faculty and staff (Anderson & Slade, 2016). Leaders who were perceived as possessing specific leadership characteristics and abilities, better facilitated the work responsibilities of faculty, which resulted in faculty conducting more outside research (Miller & Murry, 2015). In a study

involving 11 senior faculty at a university in the United States, Miller and Murry (2015) used a Delphi instrument to examine the strategies of faculty members regarding their perceptions of unsatisfactory leadership of departmental leaders.

Those strategies were: build a coalition of faculty to address the matter directly with the department leader, go to the dean in hopes of making a change in leadership, confront the chair directly about his/her behavior, hire a consultant to review the department chair, and get a group of senior faculties to confront the chair. Miller and Murry (2015) concluded that there are some agreeable and acceptable strategies for confronting and challenging an ineffective departmental leader, and identifying these strategies is the first step in exploring how faculty can be more engaged with university administration and satisfied with their jobs.

Faculty Job Satisfaction

Although transformative leadership is suggested to be the most successful, as it relates to faculty job satisfaction, research has found that the academic experience can be perceived differently by tenure and nontenured faculty. On many college and university campuses, the involvement in campus decisions and access to resources for nontenured faculty is limited, and on many campuses of higher learning, nontenured faculty are not treated the same as their tenured colleagues (Bakely & Broderson, 2017; Caraquil, Ivy, Sy, & Daguplo, 2016; Kezar & Gehrkes, 2016; Leck, 2016; Kimmel & Fairchild, 2017; Pelletier, Kottke, & Reza, 2015; Prottas, Fossen, Cleaver, & Andreassi, 2017; Seipel & Larson, 2016; Starcher & Mandernach, 2016; Terosky & Heasley, 2015).

On many college campuses, adjunct faculty are often offered classes at the last minute, with no adequate time to prepare and have limited access to professional development opportunities to enhance their skill set, compared to their full-time constituents (Bakely & Broderson, 2017). In Bakely and Broderson's (2017) study, adjunct faculty members were interviewed about their experiences working at one of two multicampus community colleges, and how their experiences affected them professionally and personally. Findings indicated that the faculty members loved teaching; however, they did not feel respected or supported by their colleagues and felt that campus administrators took advantage of them and, for many adjunct faculty. Caraquil et al. (2016) also found 773 adjunct faculty at a college in the southern United States were doubtful about their goals of acquiring a full-time position within 5 years of service, expressing that the goal may be unachievable because of a lack of support from campus administrators.

In an effort to broaden the understanding of conditions that shape faculty job satisfaction in higher education, Kezar and Gehrke (2016) surveyed 262 college deans to evaluate their views on the professoriate, values, pressures, and practices about the use of non-tenure-track faculty. It was suggested that although the hiring of nontenured faculty was perceived to contribute to the mission of many colleges and universities, many deans felt pressured by administrators to strategize more in their hiring practices, the hiring of more non-tenure-track faculty may not always be beneficial for the institution (Kezar & Gehrke, 2016).

Kimmel and Fairchild (2017) presented an argument that in many 4-year institutions, there is a perception that little is known about the experiences of nontenured faculty. Kimmel and Fairchild suggested that the adjunct experience is not always positive. In interviews involving seven nontenured faculty employed at a public institution in the southern United States, Kimmel and Fairchild found that faculty did not feel connected to the institution and felt that the university relied too much on student evaluations as a primary factor in job performance.

Leck (2016) also focused on the satisfaction of adjunct faculty and suggesting that some changes in higher education faculty populations present a challenge among adjunct faculty. Through an online survey involving 354 faculty members at a university in the Southeastern United States, Leck sought to gain a better understanding of adjunct faculty job satisfaction by focusing on the job itself, salary, advancement, administration, and collegial relationships. Leck reported that administration and collegial relationships ranked highest among the faculty participants. Leck further argued that there is a need to reevaluate what the elements of job satisfaction are for this new adjunct faculty population, given that their experience base may resemble that of the faculty at for-profit universities. Leck defined the "new faculty population “as the influx of more part-time faculty, which increased over 20 years by 162%, compared to full-time faculty, which only increased by 42% (p.16).

The key predictors of employee turnover were perceived by faculty, in a study by Pelletier et al. (2015), to be professional priorities and rewards, quality of work-life, and administrative relations and support. Pelletier et al.’s review of the literature indicated

that the most significant source of satisfaction included the degree of autonomy associated with their profession. In their study, 5,138 faculty and staff who worked at various campuses across the western United States were surveyed. Findings indicated that probationary adjunct faculty were less satisfied with their pay. Pelletier et al. concluded that because of a lack of job security, adjuncts are not as connected to their institution, compared to their tenured counterparts.

Expanding the study of the adjunct faculty experience, Prottas et al. (2017) suggested that although most adjunct faculty may experience job insecurity, on many college and university campuses, non-tenured faculty continue to play a significant role in the continued growth of higher education. A survey of 410 full-time and pretenured faculty employed at three universities in the northwestern United States, indicated that a lack of clarity concerning job criteria, a lack of procedures regarding the appointment of tenure, and gender bias regarding tenure were primary concerns of tenure-track faculty (Prottas et al., 2017). Prottas et al. concluded that there are differences among faculty based on demographics and full-time faculty experience, and tenure-track faculty were less satisfied with technical support, strategic alignment, self-efficacy, and contextual suitability, compared to adjunct and less-experienced faculty.

While Prottas et al. (2017) argued that adjunct faculty contribute to the growth of an institution, Seipel and Larson (2016) suggested that although differences occur regarding the acceptance or lack thereof of nontenured faculty by tenured faculty, institutions have a vested interest in supporting the well-being of all faculty. In a study involving 104 nontenure track faculty at a large university in the Midwestern United

States, the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education Survey instrument was used by Seipel and Larson to determine the association of faculty satisfaction with overall institutional improvement, based on environmental support, autonomy on the well-being of faculty, and perceived relatedness. Seipel and Larson found that perceived relatedness mediates the relationship between environmental support and faculty well-being. Seipel and Larson concluded that for an optimal level of institutional performance, faculty must be satisfied with their jobs. More research may be useful to draw more conclusions about faculty rank and job satisfaction in a variety of settings.

The influence of outside offers to faculty from other institutions, the merging of colleges and universities, struggles to retain faculty, and work-life balance of faculty, and other predictors as previously discussed, all contribute to the perception of job dissatisfaction of faculty members (Kleinhans, Chakradhar, Muller, & Waddill, 2015; Miller & Murry, 2015; OMeara, 2015).

Faculty Job Dissatisfaction

A substantial body of research examining faculty job dissatisfaction in U.S. higher education has demonstrated an increased imbalance of faculty workload and personal life, professional barriers, and pressure from administration to perform better (Anderson & Slade, 2016; Campbell-Whatley, Wang, & Ozalle, 2015; Heffernan & Heffernan, 2019; Kleinhans et al., 2015; Martinez & Martinez, 2019; May, 2017; Welch, Bolin, Reardon, & Stenger, 2019).

Anderson and Slade (2016) found the pressure from administrators for research faculty to pursue more outside grants and contracts was perceived to be increasing. In a

study involving 1,429 faculty, faculty researching outside uninteresting research grants was a significant cause of faculty dissatisfaction. Anderson and Slade found a significant relationship between the time spent searching for outside grants and job dissatisfaction. Also, within the past two decades, the number of faculty with disability challenges and gender, racial, and religious differences have been found increased, and members of all these groups were found to be dissatisfied (Campbell-Whatley et al., 2015).

In a study involving 323 faculty members at a mid-sized urban university in the southeastern United States, Campbell-Whatley et al. (2015) used the Campus Climate Diversity Survey to examine gender and culturally and linguistically diverse majority and nonmajority groups of faculty members. Findings indicated discrepancies in the perceptions and attitudes of the views between faculty members and the need for increased awareness of campus issues (Campbell-Whatley et al., 2015).

In a study involving 100 faculty members at three universities in the regions of Australia, North America, and the United Kingdom, using a 20-question survey, Heffernan and Heffernan (2019) sought to determine the participants' aspirations for remaining within or leaving, the institution. Findings indicated that of those faculty members who felt not supported, over 85% hoped to move on because of the lack of support from the institution. Additionally, participants had varying ideas about what defines worth and personal gain based on the different types of job support and faculty professional development (Heffernan & Heffernan, 2019).

In another study of the workplace environment, Kleinhans et al. (2015) surveyed 484 faculty and staff at a university in the United States to understand how employees

perceive their work environment based on perceptions of the demographic composition of the institution, and whether workplace perceptions vary among faculty. Findings indicated that leaders didn't respect how the job demands were affecting workers. Kleinhans et al. also found that the survey participants indicated that job inequality was defined by higher time demands of faculty, work-life conflicts, lower recognition of faculty contributions to the college, and lack of fairness.

Welch et al. (2019) argued that there are some barriers to promotion, specifically among faculty who are within their midcareer of employment in higher education. For instance, in a mixed-methods study, Welch et al. surveyed 2,941 faculty who were in their mid-careers as professors, from 583 institutions in the United States. Findings indicated three distinct areas which midcareer faculty viewed as barriers to promotion: increased work demands, limited time, and teaching. Additionally, midcareer faculty who had been tenured for 5 years or more found it challenging to keep up with current changes within their respective fields and regarding teaching strategies. Faculty reported becoming frustrated, angry, anxious, or stagnant because of feelings of uncertainty and isolation. These feelings of uncertainty and isolation they claimed were a result of a lack of attention and support from the institution.

In addition, certain leadership characteristics of academic leaders may sometimes create a negative environment for faculty regarding internal race relations and added faculty stress (Dugas, Summers, Harris, & Stich, 2018; Martinez & Martinez, 2019; May, 2017). In a study involving 156 faculty members at a university in the midwestern United States, Dugas et al. (2018) used the Job Satisfaction Survey and the Satisfaction with Life

Scale, to examine to determine the relationship between alignment of identity with perceived departmental expectations and the outcome variables of life satisfaction and job satisfaction. Findings suggested that participants who identified as researchers had less overall well-being and were not satisfied with their jobs, compared to faculty members who identified as teachers. Greater satisfaction was associated with alignment between identity and how time was spent (Dugas et al., 2018).

In another study of faculty job dissatisfaction involving 64 participants at a university in the southern United States, May (2017) used the Demographic and Work Experiences Questionnaire, the Occupational Satisfaction in Higher Education Scale-Revised, and a Work/Life Balance Scale to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and work/life balance among faculty in counselor education programs compared to racial minority faculty across disciplines. Findings suggested that minority faculty reported higher levels of work overload, compared to one group, which increased the level of work interference on their personal lives. Work overload, intrinsic rewards, perceived power, and feelings of being supported, presented significant predictors of work/life balance, for which these factors need to be positive to lead to balance within the department (May, 2017).

A study conducted by Martinez and Martinez (2019) involving 866 adjunct faculty at a large, nontraditional, nonprofit institution in the United States used the Department Culture Questionnaire to examine adjunct faculty perceptions about how four job factors (communication, institutional practices, tools to do the job, and utilization of expertise) influenced their attitudes about respect, commitment, and willingness to

recommend the institution. Findings indicated that utilization of expertise was the most influential job factor on outcomes and had the most impact on respect and commitment of adjunct faculty to the department and institution.

Although research has found that gender diversity, retention of faculty and student, and college and university mergers to be possible predictors of faculty job dissatisfaction, it has also been found that minority faculty make significant contributions to higher education; however, they are more dissatisfied than their white counterparts (Decuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016; Eagan & Garvey, 2015; Edwards & Ross, 2018; Levin, Jackson-Boothby, Haberler, & Walker, 2015).

Additionally, leadership style may be considered a driver for creating a more welcoming environment and improved employee job satisfaction for faculty and staff (Anderson & Slade, 2016). However, certain leadership styles of academic leaders may sometimes create a negative environment for minority faculty regarding internal race relations, faculty stress, and increased job demands (Decuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016; Eagan & Garvey, 2015; Gozukara & Simsek, 2016). Women and minority faculty job dissatisfaction is discussed in the next section.

Faculty job dissatisfaction and gender and race. Gender bias has the tendency to impact job satisfaction amongst tenured faculty, and the persistent racial and gender disparities place extra burdens of labor of women, trans individuals, nonbinary people, and faculty of color, which can adversely affect their research productivity, teaching, and career advancement. Researchers have concluded that racial and gender disparities could

also incur emotional labor costs, foster feelings of professional burnout, and increase faculty members' likelihood to leave their institution (Hanasono et al., 2019).

A study conducted by Hanasono et al. (2019) involving 27 faculty participants (15 men and 12 women), who worked at a single university in the midwestern United States, explored how institutional gender biases impacted the visibility and evaluation of faculty service across the tenure-track career trajectory. Findings of the study indicated that women and faculty of color tend to perform more service work than men, especially relational-oriented activities (Hanasono et al., 2019).

Providing a different perspective and approach, O'Meara et al. (2015) conducted a two-part study that used the modified time diary approach, which involved 143 full and associate faculty members, from 111 research-focused universities throughout the United States. Participants were asked to record their daily work activities in 5-minute increments and complete a survey regarding tenure status, discipline, marital status, number of courses taught, and the number of chaired committees, and workload fairness. Findings indicated that women faculty spent more time on campus service, student advising, and teaching-related activities, and men spent more time on research. It was also found that women received more new work requests than men and that men and women received different kinds of work requests (O'Meara et al., 2015).

In another study, Lisnic, Zajicek, and Morimoto (2019) examined whether there are differences in faculty assessment of tenure clarity along with gender and race/ethnicity, which involved 2,438 diverse assistant professors at 27 research-based universities in the United States. Findings indicated that compared with White men,

underrepresented minority women were less satisfied with relationships with their counterparts and with fairness in the evaluation of their work. Moreover, they were also less likely to agree that mentoring is effective, that tenure decisions are fair, and that messages about tenure are consistent (Lisnic et al., 2019).

More research may be useful to draw more conclusions about what colleges and universities can do more to improve the faculty job experience, particularly job satisfaction, including efforts by university leaders, and the research may be applicable in a variety of settings.

Faculty job dissatisfaction and leadership feedback. Quality of faculty work/life balance is essential to faculty members' job performance and their perceptions of quality of life. Additionally, administrative support of faculty, professional job priorities and rewards, and overall morale of faculty influence the quality of faculty work and life that influences job satisfaction (Eaton, Osgood, & Cigrand, 2015; Stupnisky, Hall, Daniels, & Mensah, 2017). A survey was conducted by Eaton et al. (2015), involving 104 faculty members based on the concerns of work/home life balance and faculty mentoring provided by leadership. Findings reported that 42% of the participants perceived that they were satisfied with the support provided to them by the college, and only 35% perceived that they were supported by the institution to do all aspects of their job. Furthermore, one-quarter of the participants suggested that there was moderate college support for mentoring opportunities and support of work/life balance.

In another study, Stupinsky et al. (2017) examined three commonly reported factors that support or hinder the development and success of faculty: work/life balance, clear job

expectations, and collegiality among co-workers. In their study involving 105 faculty members in midwestern U.S. universities, the participants were surveyed based on four social-environmental constructs: personal balance, professional balance, clear job expectations, and collegiality. Findings indicated collegiality and teaching-related motivation (feedback) had a strong relationship with faculty job satisfaction, and their roles and faculty members.

Furthermore, dissatisfaction with assessment continues to remain a challenge in higher education, as by Elliott (2019) and Henderson, Ryan, and Phillips (2019). Elliott (2019) suggested that assessment in higher education is used as a tool to respond to the demands of accountability from the public to streamline the quality of higher education when serving diverse student populations with limited budgets. In a study involving full and part-time faculty members, the purpose was to identify the factors that affect faculty members' beliefs and attitudes toward assessment. Findings suggested that faculty beliefs, attitudes toward assessment, and assessment practices varied; however, the major finding indicated that faculty members' belief in assessment improved the quality of teaching and learning in the institution where the study was conducted.

Faculty job dissatisfaction and shared governance. In many institutions of higher learning, campus and institutional climate is key for measuring success of the institution and bridging the faculty-administration gap in association of trust in shared governance (Campbell & Bray, 2017; Kater, 2017; McDaniel, 2017; Vican, Friedman, & Andreasen, 2019). In a study conducted by Campbell and Bray (2017), the researchers explored the perspectives of 150 faculty and 50 administrators on one community college

campus, with regard to shared governance on the community college level. Findings indicated significant differences between faculty and administrator perceptions with regard to shared governance, with 57% of the administrators agreeing that there was a positive perception of institutional structure, in relation to shared governance, and 26% of the faculty agreeing that there was a positive perception of institutional structure. Furthermore, there was no significant difference between the perceptions of faculty and administrators with regard to faculty-administrator relationships.

In another study involving 27 faculty members, Kater (2017) suggested that a broader understanding of faculty leaders' perceptions of the concept of shared governance was needed within the community college setting. Kater reported three emerging themes: the importance of having the professional expertise of the faculty voice heard, trust and transparency, and apathy and disengagement were all important in the understanding of shared governance.

In study involving fulltime faculty, department chairs, and deans, McDaniel (2017), sought a better understanding of factors that contribute to the gap between the perception of shared governance of fulltime faculty and campus administrators. Findings indicated that the faculty participants felt devalued, overworked, and underpaid. Additionally, it was indicated that improvement is needed with regard to increased trust of faculty by administrators; which can lead to increased faculty morale and better faculty-administrator communication.

In a study conducted by Vican et al. (2019), involving 30 faculty, for which interviews were conducted, the researchers sought to understand the consequences of the

competing logic of academic professionalism and prominent corporate logic. Findings indicated a misalignment between the professional values of faculty and the corporate logic implemented by campus administrators. The incompatibility contributed to faculty dissatisfaction centered around increased managerial control, how faculty performance is measured, and the financial climate of the institution.

Summary

The review of literature highlighted how faculty in higher education face challenges because it is continuously changing and evolving. U.S. colleges and universities face an array of challenges that may threaten the culture of higher education (Gigliotti & Ruben, 2017). College faculty face challenges that continuously change the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and ways that faculty members must adapt in order to remain committed to the organization and enhance the leader-faculty relationship regardless of perceived gender bias (Hanasono et al., 2019). Department chairs and faculty alike are challenged with expanding their knowledge within their respective fields, meeting the academic, social, and developmental needs of students who come from diverse backgrounds and have various learning approaches. Therefore, college faculty encounter many different variables that may contribute to their overall satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Faculty who are dissatisfied with their jobs may not perform well because of stress from the pressure to perform better, continuous changes in policies, and adapting more responsibilities because of the demands placed on department chairs by higher administration, and the perceived leadership characteristics of the department chair.

Transformative leadership characteristics are perceived to be associated with continual transformations in higher education, and leaders who are more positive, are known to inspire and motivate employees (Gozukara & Simsek, 2016). One of the major concerns is faculty job satisfaction (Peters, 2016). Expectations are growing for academic department leaders, and one of those expectations is to have a better understanding of the needs, goals, and perceptions of the internal stakeholders (e.g., students, faculty, and staff), who have a vested interest in higher education (Gonaim, 2016). Additionally, lack of support for beginning faculty and mid-career faculty is a growing concern, as indicated by Heffernan and Heffernan (2019). Welch et al. (2019) suggested that growing support is needed for all faculty. The communication of administrators in outlining clearer departmental expectations to increase productivity was explored by Dugas et al. (2018). Furthermore, work-like balance and minority faculty concerns were discussed by several researchers (Decuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016; Eagan & Garvey, 2015; Levin et al., 2015; Martinez & Martinez, 2019; May, 2017).

The literature review explored many variables that have been considered by other researchers in relation to job satisfaction. Variables such as commitment, gender, rank, and faculty experience were each found to have a level of association with overall faculty job satisfaction. This study will hopefully fill gaps in the available research and theoretical understanding of leadership characteristics as they relate to faculty job satisfaction. In Chapter 3, I will discuss the research design approach and rationale of the chose research design, the methodology, sampling and sampling procedures, recruitment

procedures, instrumentation, data analysis plan, threats to validity ethical concerns, and I conclude summarizing the chapter.

Chapter 3: Research Design and Rationale

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative, nonexperimental study was to examine the association between faculty perceptions of department chair leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction at three, small, liberal arts institutions in the same system of colleges in the southeastern United States. In this chapter, I discuss the identified variables and the associated categories of the IV. The research design and rationale of the study, the identified population of faculty participants, the sampling and sampling procedures, the procedures followed to recruit the participants, the instrumentation and operationalization of constructs, and the research question and hypotheses are also discussed. The chapter also includes a presentation of the data analysis plan, the threats to validity, ethical procedures, and issues of trustworthiness. The chapter is concluded with a summary.

Research Design and Rationale

In this nonexperimental study, I used a Pearson chi-square test for independence with Cramer's V to determine the possible associations between faculty members' perception of leadership characteristics of department chairs (i.e., the categories of the IV of leadership characteristics) and faculty job satisfaction (i.e., the DV). The seven associated categories of the IV of leadership characteristics were:

- Confidence in leadership (confidence),
- Comfortable receiving feedback from leadership (feedback),

- Adequate communication with leadership (communication),
- Leadership's respect for faculty (respect),
- Leadership's openness to receiving input from faculty (openness),
- Leadership allowing faculty to honestly express themselves (expression), and
- Belief in leadership's caring for the well-being of faculty (well-being).

I measured the variables with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree.*

In seeking studies that utilized a similar measurement and analysis, I found few related to higher education leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction. However, being that the field frequently focuses on studying business management in the use of the same measures, Chang (2004), Powers (2014), and Freeman (2018) were three researchers that used Cramer's V and chi-square in studies related to leadership in education.

Both qualitative and mixed-method research approaches were possibilities for this study; however, I determined that a quantitative, nonexperimental approach was most appropriate. The purpose of this study was to get an initial idea about the association of two work-related variables and not an in-depth investigation of a particular concept or variable (see Creswell & Creswell, 2017). The design of the data analysis suggested a chi-square test of the research question and hypotheses outlined in Chapter 1 because it can be used to establish whether there is statistical significance of the association of two or more variables (see Dou, Devos, & Valcke, 2017; Lakens, Scheel, & Isager, 2018;

Trafimow & Earp, 2017). My design choice was consistent with the research design needed to advance knowledge in the discipline.

There have been many studies conducted on leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction; however, there are limited studies on leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction in small, liberal arts colleges (see Bakely & Broderson, 2017; Gozukara & Simsek, 2016; Harris & Stich, 2018; Martinez & Martinez, 2019).

Methodology

Population

The three, small, similar, nonprofit, liberal arts colleges where I collected data are located in the southeastern United States. Overall, the combined population for this study included 720 faculty members. Based on the population of 720 faculty, 446 or 62% were adjuncts and 274 or 38% were full time at the time of data collection. Among the 720 faculty, there is greater diversity with regard to ethnicity in comparison with most traditional, nonprofit, liberal arts colleges, as cited by the National Center for Education Statistics (2019; see Table 1). Overall, the faculty at the institution are more likely to be adjunct faculty and African American faculty than other U.S. nonprofit institutions. It is unclear the percentage of faculty members who had a year or more or less than a year of teaching experience because the demographic data were not provided by the institution. Furthermore, because I did not collect data on participants' race, the number of Black, White, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic faculty who responded to the survey is unclear.

Table 1

Comparison of Faculty Demographics at Study Sites with National Sample of Faculty

Faculty Status and Race	Participating Institutions	U.S. Nonprofit Institutions*
Fulltime	(38%)	53%
Adjunct	(62%)	47%
White	40%	76%
Black	50%	6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5%	10%
Hispanic	5%	13%

Note. * National Center for Education Statistics. (2019, September 22). NCES.ed.gov. Retrieved from nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61.

Sampling and Sampling Procedure

An introduction of the study and a link to the survey study was posted on the faculty portal that faculty from all three colleges use, allowing the entire population to see the invitation and to volunteer to participate (i.e., census sampling). As there was no risk or minimal risk to the participants, there was no need to exclude any faculty from participation. The target population represented in the sample was not narrowed or identified by age, ethnicity, and/or gender because those data were not collected. The responses to the survey were anonymous.

To determine if the study would provide enough power for the data analysis, I used the standard educational settings of a medium effect size, the power set at .80, and the alpha level of .05. To determine a relationship with the IV and the associated categories, I would have needed 102 per group (see Cohen, 1992). Because I did not have

such a large number of responses, I decided to use the nonparametric chi-square, which does not have normality as one of the assumptions for the data analysis.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

The three participating institutions are in the same system of colleges and are overseen by one Associate Vice President of Accreditation, who placed an introduction of the study with an embedded link to the survey on the faculty portal. Based on success in the timing of previous distributed surveys on the campuses, the winter term (i.e., January–March) was the ideal time to administer the AESS. The survey was administered during the month of February 2019, and participants had 2 weeks to complete the survey. No reminders were needed in an effort to garner adequate participation.

In the introduction, I invited participants to click on the link to the survey. The first page of the survey described the study and the anonymous data collection followed by an implied consent form, explaining that if faculty would continue on to the survey, it was implied that their consent was given. To help avoid faculty from feeling pressured to take the survey, participants were notified that participation was optional and anonymous, and for their time, a complimentary $5 coupon was provided as a link at the end of the invitation. The coupon could be used in the campus café and was accessible to all faculty members. I assumed that faculty would not print the coupon more than once in the 5 days it could be used. The coupon was a token of appreciation from the college leadership in recognition of faculty actively participating in the accreditation process. The survey was housed on the software Survey Monkey. I placed a “thank you” message at the end of the survey, which served as an exit for the participants.

Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs

The original ESS used by the college had 20 questions; however, for this study, I used only 8 of these 20 questions from the original ESS (see Appendix A). Neither the AESS nor ESS have established reliability and validity; however, because a pilot study would have reduced the number of potential participants, it was prudent to use the AESS even without established reliability and validity because the ESS has been used by the college as part of their accreditation process for several years. In this study, I only asked one question about job satisfaction on the survey, which was defined as how an individual is overall affected toward specific work roles that they are currently occupying (see Hesli & Lee, 2013).

In this study, I focused on transformative or transactional characteristics as they relate to how an individual leads a department or organization (see Bass & Riggio, 2006; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). The IV was leadership, and there was one question for each of the seven characteristics of the IV. The DV was faculty job satisfaction. For each variable, I conducted a Pearson chi-square test for independence and calculated Cramer's V to determine the association between faculty members' perception of the seven characteristics of leadership and faculty job satisfaction.

Data Analysis Plan

I used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software, Version 25 to analyze the data. A Pearson chi-square test for independence with Cramer's V to determine the effect size was used. Cramer's V is considered a common strength test to analyze the data when the chi-square is significant (Bass & Rigio, 2006). An advantage

of using this software was the ease of distribution of the data and its flexibility. In my analysis, I examined the association between the DV (i.e., faculty satisfaction) and the IV (i.e., transformational leadership characteristics). The AESS had a 5-point Likert scale with 1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *agree*, and 5 = *strongly agree*. Based on the results of the Cramer's V analysis in association with the DV, 2 of the 7 categories of the IV had a cell count less than 5. Because of the low cell count, the data set was converted to a 3-point Likert scale with 1 = *agree*, 2 = *neutral*, and 3 = *disagree.*

This study was guided by the following research question and hypotheses:

RQ: What is the association between faculty members' perception of department chairs' leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction?

H_0: There is no significant association between faculty members' perception of department chair's leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction.

H_A: There is a significant association between faculty members' perception of department chair's leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction.

Threats to Validity

When conducting a study, a variety of potential threats to external, internal, and construct validity can occur (Wells & Stage, 2015). The threats to external validity reduce the generalizability of the results (Wells & Stage, 2015).

Internal Validity

Instrumentation can be a possible threat to internal validity because of the possibility of instrumental bias (Laerd, 2019). The threat occurs when the measurement instrument used changes over time, which can reduce the differences in the results on the DV (i.e., faculty job satisfaction (Laerd, 2019). In conducting my study, the same instrument had been used by the study site for several years, and no previous or current indication of instrumental bias was determined. For this study, all faculty were provided with a $5 campus café coupon, whether they participated or not. However, because general compensation was offered, the issuance of the coupon could have possibly reduced the internal validity of this study because of the threat of selection bias (i.e., external validity).

External Validity

According to Showalter and Mullet (2017), selection bias occurs when survey participants who are less likely to enter the study are underrepresented (i.e., adjunct faculty in most colleges), and those survey participants who are more likely to enter the study will be overrepresented (i.e., full-time faculty in most colleges) compared to other subjects in the general population (e.g., staff and administration) to which conclusions of the study may be applied. In an effort to avoid possible bias, I did not ask questions related to gender or the reasons why the subjects participated in the survey.

Additionally, I only used one instrument to measure leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction. The instrument has no established reliability and validity but was used for years as part of the accreditation process. Results from a single measure related

to such complex constructs as leadership characteristics of department chairs and job satisfaction of faculty may not be generalizable to circumstances where or when different measurement constructs are used.

Construct Validity

Construct validity is present when the survey questions measure the actual variables that should be measured in the study (Laerd, 2019). The ESS had not been pilot tested but had been reviewed by content experts and used for several years at the college as part of the accreditation process. As the construct validity could be reasonably assumed, it could also be assumed that the association among the variables based on the data is reasonable.

Ethical Procedures and Issues of Trustworthiness

Before the study could be conducted, I received approval from Walden University's Institutional Review Board (Approval No. 02-13-19-0253148) as well as from the campus's provosts as well as the institution's Associate Vice President for Accreditation (AVPOA). The provosts and the AVPOA oversee research and accreditation for all of the three participating colleges.

The introduction and the link to the survey were accessible via the faculty portal to which all faculty from the population had access. Faculty were already used to the process as the original ESS had been administered in previous years as part of the accreditation process. Participation was voluntary and anonymous.

The drafted invitation letter and consent form complied with the guidelines of the Walden University Institutional Review Board. The participating colleges have a policy

in place for the treatment of proprietary information. The data are stored anonymously with access only granted by the AVPOA of the participating colleges. At the time of the collection and analysis of the data, no other ethical concerns arose.

Summary

The purpose of this quantitative, nonexperimental study was to examine the association between faculty perceptions of department chair leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction at three, similar, small, liberal arts institutions in the southeastern United States. In this chapter, I described the nonexperimental design, including the 526 responses to a survey measuring faculty's job satisfaction as well as their perceptions of their department chair's leadership characteristics. The selection of the instrument was an eight-question AESS, adapted from the original 20-question ESS that was designed and previously used by the institution. In Chapter 4, I discuss the data collection process, results of the study, statistical analysis, and I conclude with a summary of the chapter.

Chapter 4: Data Collection and Analysis

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to examine the association between faculty perceptions of department chair leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction at three, small, liberal arts institutions in the same system of colleges in the southeastern United States. The following research question was investigated:

RQ: What is the association between faculty members' perception of department chairs' leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction?

Based on this stated research question, I tested the following hypotheses using Pearson's chi-square with Cramer's V:

H_0: There is no significant association between the perceived leadership characteristics of department chairs by faculty and faculty job satisfaction.

H_A: There is a significant association between the observed leadership characteristics of department chairs by faculty and faculty job satisfaction.

I employed a quantitative, nonexperimental research design to collect the data and examine the relationships among the variables of the study. In this chapter, the data collection process, results of the study, and the ethical procedures are discussed.

Data Collection

For this study, the AVPOA for the study site placed a link to the introduction of the study on the faculty portal that faculty from the three participating colleges in the southeastern United States could access. The link was available for 2 weeks in February

2019. The introduction included a link to the actual survey as well as to a $5 coupon for the college dining facility as a token of appreciation from the AVPOA.

After 2 weeks, 526 of the 720 possible participants completed the survey for an overall response rate of 73%. There were 230 responses from Site A, 320 responses from Site B, and 170 responses from Site C. Full-time faculty responded to the survey at a higher rate than their adjunct constituents who are less closely connected to the college (see Table 2). While 38% of the faculty at the three institutions are full time, 65% of the survey responses were from full-time faculty; therefore, the results may not fully reflect the entire faculty.

Table 2

Comparison of Faculty Population and Sample Population

Faculty Status	Population	Sample
Full time	274 (38%)	112 (65%)
Adjunct	446 (62%)	414 (35%)
Total	720 (100%)	526 (100%)

Results

After presenting the descriptive statistics regarding the survey responses, I share the data analysis of the association between the seven characteristics of the IV and the DV of faculty job satisfaction.

Descriptive Statistics

The chi-Square test using the responses from the 5-point AESS scale showed an expected count of less than 5 for two of the variables. Consequently, I converted the scale

from a 5-point Likert scale with 1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *agree*, and 5 = *strongly agree* to a 3-point Likert scale with 1 = *agree*, 2 = *neutral*, and 3 = *disagree*. Table 3 shows the frequency results based on the 3-point Likert scale.

Table 3

Frequency Results of Variables Based on a 3-point Likert Scale

Variables	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Job satisfaction	344 (65.3%)	43 (8.2%)	139 (26.5%)
Respect	424 (80.6%)	18 (3.4%)	84 (16.0%)
Openness	380 (72.3%)	39 (7.4%)	107 (20.3%)
Feedback	354 (67.3%)	44 (8.4%)	128 (24.3%)
Communication	319 (60.6%)	58 (11.0%)	149 (28.4%)
Confidence	228 (43.4%)	27 (5.1%)	271 (51.5%)
Well-being	162 (31.0%)	167 (31.6%)	197 (37.4%)
Expression	124 (23.6%)	90 (17.1%)	312 (59.3%)

Of the 526 faculty who participated in the study, 65% of the faculty surveyed agreed that they were satisfied with their job and 8% were neutral. With two thirds of the faculty expressing satisfaction with their job, the overall atmosphere at the college is most likely acceptable to a majority of the faculty and it is of particular interest to what extent each of the individual leadership characteristics differ in their association to the variable of job satisfaction. The majority of faculty agreed that they are treated fairly and

respectfully by their manager (80.6%), their manager is open to input (72.3%), and were comfortable with the feedback and coaching they receive from their manager (67.3%). In addition, 60% agreed that they had adequate communication with leadership.

There were three variables that indicated that the majority of faculty were not satisfied with their leadership. The first regarded leadership's concern for their well-being; 37.4% of the participants disagreed and 31.6% were neutral concerning this variable. Confidence in leadership garnered 51.1% of the participants disagreeing, while leadership allowing faculty to honestly express themselves resulted in 59.3% of participants disagreeing and 17.1% neutral. Of the 65% of faculty who were satisfied with their job, it was not surprising that full-time faculty were more likely to be satisfied with their job than their adjunct counterparts. Adjuncts, in general, are less satisfied with their employment in higher education (Bakely & Broderson, 2017).

Inferential Statistics

To calculate the association between leadership characteristics (see the following list) and faculty job satisfaction, I ran a contingency table for all five Likert scale response options in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

- Confidence in leadership (confidence),
- Comfortable receiving feedback from leadership (feedback),
- Adequate communication with leadership (communication),
- Leadership's respect for faculty (respect),
- Leadership's openness to receiving input from faculty (openness),

- Leadership allowing faculty to honestly express themselves (expression), and
- Belief in leadership's caring for the well-being of faculty (well-being).

Consequently, I recoded the data were recoded (as explained previously in the chapter) to reflect a three-point range (i.e., *agree*, *disagree*, and *neutral*) to analyze and interpret the data more effectively (see Table 3). The significance level was set to an alpha level of .05 to avoid Type I and Type II errors and because this is the most common alpha level used in educational research (see Lakens et al., 2018; Trafimow & Earp, 2017).

McHugh (2013) pointed to two statistical assumptions for the use of chi-square. The first is that every participant contributes data to only one cell for each research question. I set up the electronic survey in a way that participants could only select 1 out of the 5 choices. The assumption was met that the groups are independent. The second assumption was that the variables should be measured at an ordinal or nominal level. As the Likert scale has naturally ordered categories, this assumption was met for the data used in this study. That the data were recoded from a 5-point Likert scale to a 3-point Likert scale does not influence the ordinal data because the distance between the categories is not known and was not assumed to be equal.

Because chi-square does not require equality of variances among the study groups or homoscedasticity, no further statistical test was needed to be conducted in order to conclude that the chi-square, a nonparametric test, was an acceptable method of analysis for this study (see Cohen, 1992; McHugh, 2013).

All seven associations of the characteristics were significant; hence, I conducted the Cramer's V to measure the strengths of the associations. Cohen (1992) suggested that the value of chi-square means that when there is a low value present, there is a high correlation between the two sets of data and the calculated chi-square value could be compared to a critical value from a chi-square table, meaning if the chi-square value is more than the critical value, a significant difference exists. The chi-square values ranged from 24–207 (see Table 4), which describes the association of categories of the IV with the DV of faculty job satisfaction and is organized by the highest to the lowest association using Cramer's V, which ranged from .15 to .44. The association of categories of the IV with faculty job satisfaction is indicated in Table 4.

Table 4

Association of Categories of Independent Variable with Dependent Variable

IV	*N*	chi-square	*p* value	Cramer's V	*p* value
Feedback	526	207.2	.000	.44	.000
Expression	526	147.5	.000	.37	.000
Respect	526	62.5	.000	.24	.000
Well-being	526	46.3	.000	.21	.000
Confidence	526	26.1	.000	.17	.000
Communication	526	31.1	.000	.15	.000
Openness	526	24.1	.000	.15	.000

Note. Leadership characteristics = IV. Faculty job satisfaction = DV.

All seven categories of the IV of leadership characteristics had at least a small association with job satisfaction. According to Cohen (1988) and Green and Salkind (2010), the strength of association can be categorized as follows: .10 = small, .30 = moderate, and .50 = strong. The one moderate to strong association with faculty job satisfaction was with feedback (.44), captured by the survey question: "I am comfortable with the feedback and coaching I receive from my manager." The category of the IV with a moderate association to faculty job satisfaction was expression (.37), captured by the survey question: "I feel I can express my honest opinions with my manager without fear of negative consequences or retaliation." The five remaining categories of the IV had small associations: respect (.24), captured by the survey question: "I am treated fairly and respectfully by my manager;" well-being (.21), captured by the survey question: "My manager cares about their employees' well-being;" confidence (.17), captured by the survey question: "I have confidence in the leadership of this team;" communication (.15), captured by the survey question: "There is enough communication between my manager and me;" and leadership's openness (.15), captured by the survey question: "My manager is open to input from employees." All associations were significant at $p = .000$.

Summary

The purpose of this quantitative, nonexperimental study was to explore the association between faculty perceptions of department chair leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction in small, liberal arts institutions in the southeastern United

States. The research question that guided this study addressed the association between perceived leadership characteristics of department chairs and faculty job satisfaction.

I adapted a previously used survey for the purpose of this study. In this chapter, I described the demographic composition of the 526 faculty survey responses as well as the inferential results of the chi-square test and Cramer's V for the seven associations of department chair leadership related to faculty job satisfaction. The data indicated a moderate to strong relationship between one category of the IV (i.e., leadership characteristics), which was comfort receiving feedback from leadership, and the DV (i.e., faculty job satisfaction). The overall findings were statistically significant.

In Chapter 5, I provide an interpretation of the findings of the study and recommend where future research is needed on the topic.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative, nonexperimental study was to examine the association between faculty perceptions of department chair leadership characteristics and faculty job satisfaction at three, small, liberal arts institutions in the same system of colleges in the southeastern United States. I used the AESS, an eight-question survey, to measure the DV of faculty job satisfaction and the IV of the seven categories of the perceived department chair leadership. I distributed the AESS to 720 full-time and adjunct faculty members at the three participating colleges of whom 526 responded. I conducted a Pearson chi-square test for independence with Cramer's V, and the data analysis revealed association with each of the seven categories of leadership qualities (see Table 5). Comfortable receiving feedback from leadership had the strongest association (.44) and leadership allowing faculty to honestly express themselves had a moderate association (.34). The other five categories of leadership had small associations with the DV of job satisfaction.

Interpretation of the Findings

Theoretical Framework Interpretation

In exploring various leadership models, I chose the full-range leadership model as appropriate to guide this study. The FRLM encompasses transformative, transactional, laissez-faire, and other characteristics, as identified by Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016). The survey questions from the AESS reflect assumptions about types of leadership identified by the FRLM.

Moderate to strong association. Comfort receiving feedback from leadership is moderately to strong associated with job satisfaction (.44) and relates to the FRLM, which would suggest that a more transformative leadership would include leaders providing positive and constructive feedback. When faculty members are provided with a supportive work environment from administrators, they have higher job satisfaction and a transformative environment can be created (Aino & Verma, 2017; Dachner & Saxton, 2015; DeLotell & Cates, 2016). In particular, this feedback might be contextualized by what transformational leadership theorist, Owen (2014) suggested would include the leader's effort to redesign perceptions and values based on changed expectations, aspirations, articulated vision, sensitivity to the surroundings and followers' needs, personal risk-taking, and unconventional behavior in performance. Additionally, transformative leadership allows leaders to engage with others in ways that encourage employees to promote more effective fundamental change (Aino & Verma, 2017). Transformative leadership characteristics, possibly in the form of feedback to faculty, also support the practice of more ethical conduct in the workplace as well as strong values and goals (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016; Zhu et al., 2011).

Moderate association. The category of leadership of allowing faculty to honestly express themselves had a moderate association to job satisfaction (.34). Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016) indicated that transformative leadership also appeals to higher education based on several factors, such as emphasizing a shared vision, shared values, and shared goals and empowering followers to produce effective change. Such transformative

leadership may require a conversation to go both ways (i.e., leaders both giving feedback and listening to faculty's honest expressions), which might better lead to shared goals.

Small association. The categories of respect, well-being, confidence, communication, and openness (in that ranked order; see Table 5) had small associations to job satisfaction. Some of these smaller associations are reflected in the frequencies of survey responses. This suggests that job satisfaction may be more strongly related to variables aside from leadership characteristics as described by the FRLM.

The findings regarding these five leadership characteristics weakly support the theoretical framework. There may be other leadership characteristics than those captured in the seven questions of the AESS that would have had a stronger association with job satisfaction in this particular setting. Another set of factors besides leadership characteristics, as discussed in Chapter 2, might be more strongly associated with job satisfaction, such as opportunities for promotion or full-time status, working conditions, faculty peer collaboration, or increased pay.

This outcome resulted in a limitation because full-time faculty members were overrepresented in the sample compared to adjunct faculty who are more heavily populated on campus but underrepresented in the sample, so the results may not fully reflect the entire faculty.

Interpretation of Results in Light of the Literature Review

The focus of this study was on identifying perceived leadership characteristics of department chairs as they relate to faculty job satisfaction. The broader purpose of this study was to identify certain perceived characteristics of department chairs, by faculty,

and determine if an association between these perceived leadership characteristics of department chairs and faculty job satisfaction existed. The identified characteristics in this study were:

- Confidence in leadership (confidence),
- Comfortable receiving feedback from leadership (feedback),
- Adequate communication with leadership (communication),
- Leadership's respect for faculty (respect),
- Leadership's openness to receiving input from faculty (openness),
- Leadership allowing faculty to honestly express themselves (expression), and
- Belief in leadership's caring for the well-being of faculty (well-being).

Researchers have suggested that the political, economic, and social landscape of higher education leadership has changed, and the success or failure of an institution relies on the effectiveness of administration (Elliott, 2019; Henderson et al., 2019; Kater, 2017; Vican et al., 2019). When leadership characteristics influence faculty job satisfaction, this can also affect productivity and retention (Dvir et al., 2012; Notgrass, 2014).

Strongest association: Receiving feedback from leadership. The characteristic of comfort receiving feedback from leadership, as represented by the AESS question: "I am comfortable with the feedback and coaching I receive from my manager," had the strongest association with the DV of job satisfaction. This moderate to strong association to the DV is reflected in other studies in the sector of higher education, where the administrative support of faculty, professional job priorities and rewards, and overall

morale of faculty have been found to define the quality of faculty work and life that influence job satisfaction (Eaton et al., 2015; Stupnisky et al., 2017). However, in one study, White male faculty were more likely to agree that mentoring is effective and that messages about tenure are consistent than were women or faculty of color (Lisnic et al., 2019). On the three campuses where I collected data, the administrators may have found a way to give effective feedback that enhanced job satisfaction across the uniquely diverse makeup of the faculty.

Moderate association: Faculty expression. The second strongest association with job satisfaction was moderate, based on the AESS survey question: "I feel I can express my honest opinions with my manager without fear of negative consequences or retaliation." Other researchers have found importance in shared governance as a part of job satisfaction. For instance, on many college and university campuses of higher learning, the campus and institutional climate was found to be an effective measure of the success of the institution and bridging the faculty-administration gap regarding trust in shared governance, as Campbell and Bray (2017) found on one community college campus. Lisnic et al. (2019) found that faculty job satisfaction was a key challenge in relation to the tenure processes. Tenure processes and other challenges that faculty and administrators face together require good communication, and on the three campuses in this study, I have found that the two components of leadership that were most strongly associated with leadership were about communication: receiving feedback from the academic leaders and sharing opinions with the leader without fear of retaliation. Two more of the components of leadership had to do with communication but had smaller

associations, one of which suggests that faculty did not feel there was enough communication.

Small associations: Other leadership characteristics. The other five characteristics of leadership had a small association with job satisfaction: respect, well-being, confidence, communication, and openness. Previous researchers also proposed that effective support of by leadership, regardless of status (i.e., adjunct and full time), is a challenge in higher education towards the aim of increasing student outcomes (Aino & Verma, 2017) as well as college faculty members' job satisfaction (Gozukara & Simsek, 2016; Hong et al., 2016; Jackson, 2017; Jin et al., 2016).

The positive influence of administrators on faculty job satisfaction has been found to be reflected in how well faculty members are respected, management caring about the well-being of faculty, and the way faculty are treated by their leader, which aligned with the findings of the current study (see Mathieu & Babiak, 2015). In addition, Menci et al. (2016) found that adequate communication by leadership and faculty having confidence in leadership increased the overall job satisfaction among faculty.

The emotional state of employees towards their job and overall job satisfaction has been found to be influenced by job success and acknowledgment by the department chair of a faculty member's contribution to the department (Gozukara & Simsek, 2016), which, in turn, is related to productivity, which influences faculty retention (Sahl, 2017). In the current study, acknowledgement by administrators may be associated with faculty job satisfaction as represented by 3 of the 7 AESS questions I used: (a) "Overall, to what extent do agree that you are satisfied with your job," (b) "I am treated fairly and

respectfully by my manager," and (c) "My manager cares about their employees' well-being."

The perception that administrators care about the well-being of employees may increase not only commitment to the leader, department, and students, but it also influences the job satisfaction of both men and women (Martin, 2015); Meghna et al., 2017). Leaders who communicated with their employees effectively were also found to influence the communication and well-being of men and women in the workplace (Walker & Aritz, 2015; Wheat & Hill, 2016). Of the characteristics I used regarding leadership, allowing faculty to honestly express themselves did have a moderate association with job satisfaction, while feedback had a small association. Perhaps there was less transparency and communication at these three institutions during the year the data were collected than in the studies cited here.

In the higher education environment, lack of respect for faculty and lack of confidence in faculty by leadership were found to contribute to the dissatisfaction of minority faculty (i.e., women and faculty of color) and faculty with extensive years of service (Campbell-Whatley et al., 2015; Heffernan & Heffernan, 2019; Kleinhans et al., 2015; Martinez & Martinez, 2019; Welch et al., 2019). Additionally, confidence, feedback, communication, respect, openness, expression, and well-being also influenced job satisfaction among minority faculty (Decuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016; Eagan & Garvey, 2015; Edwards & Ross, 2018; Hanasono et al., 2019; Lisnic et al., 2019; Martinez & Martinez, 2019; May, 2017; O'Meara et al., 2015). At the three participating colleges in the current study, which have higher than average representation of minority

faculty, the perceptions of respect for faculty and confidence in leadership had small associations to faculty job satisfaction. However, to maintain anonymity, the data collection did not include ethnicity or race. I also do not know if minority faculty completed the survey in proportion to their representation on the campuses.

Limitations of the Study

Conclusions from the study results are limited by the results being faculty perceptions, not something I, as a researcher, observed in practice. Also, the climate of the campus during data collection, as a result of budget discussions and other ongoing structural challenges, may have influenced faculty responses. And the unique character of the three non-profit liberal arts colleges that are connected with a single administrative structure may cause the results to not be widely applicable. In addition, the ESS, from which the AESS was drawn, was not validated, but had been successfully used on the campuses for a few years. However, the large sample size of 526 indicates that the results may be generalizable across the faculty population at the three colleges which has a larger percentage of adjunct faculty than fulltime faculty, also a common occurrence in higher education. Because no demographic data was used (i.e. sex, age, race, or gender) to analyze the results, it is unknown which cohorts' perceptions of leadership may have had stronger associations with job satisfaction. Lastly, since many other factors associated with job satisfaction are dependent upon budgetary flexibility, I focused on leadership characteristics as something that may be more attainable without additional fiscal burden.

Implications for Theory and Further Research

Of the seven categories of the IV, the perceived department chair leadership characteristics addressed in this study, one had a moderate to strong association with faculty satisfaction - the leaders' comfortable feedback - and one had a moderate association - the category of allowance of honest expression of opinions. Further research and theory development might study the potential of leaders further prioritizing offering comfortable feedback and allowing honest expression of opinion as means to enhance job satisfaction.

Because this study was unique in its focus on department chairs rather than those in higher levels of administration in colleges and universities, it may be productive to do further research regarding faculty/department chair relationships determine if the focus on transformative leadership characteristics adequately describes effective leadership at this level, to the extent that it correlates with faculty job satisfaction. This might be particularly relevant to situations in which faculty perceive the department chair is ineffective. Miller and Murry (2015) explored ways to build strategies to address challenges that faculty experienced with an ineffective department chair. Findings in their study concluded that one of the strategies was to address the matter directly with the department leader. We may need to understand better how faculty can effectively express honest opinions with or receive feedback from a department chair who is perceived as ineffective, which may then have a greater impact on faculty satisfaction.

As previously discussed, this study was guided by the FRLM. First introduced by Bass and Avolio (1985), the foundation of the FRLM was based upon seven transactional

and transformative leadership factors: charisma, inspirational, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire leadership. Since then, there have been several comprehensive analyses conducted on leadership style and its associated characteristics. For instance, Basham (2012) and Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016) indicated that the FRLM encompasses transformative, transactional, and passive leadership characteristics that promote environmental effective change and better leader-employee engagement. Further research might compare the variables of charisma, inspirational, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire leadership from the model with the leadership characteristics captured in the AESS, as related to department chair leadership in particular.

And from the perspective of the department chair, since comfortable feedback and allowance of honest expression had the strongest, albeit modest, associations with faculty job satisfaction, further research could be conducted to determine in more detail how department chairs can provide feedback that is more conducive to the responsibilities of faculty by focusing on how well faculty is performing and the areas of improvement, while allowing faculty to honestly express their concerns about leadership and the department, without patronizing their integrity and contributions to the department. Caring for well-being, respect for faculty, adequate communication, confidence in leadership, and open to input, can also be researched to determine how these characteristics can enhance the department chair-faculty relationship and faculty job satisfaction.

Given that the population used for the survey in this study was limited to only three campuses, the study can be extended to include more institutions and hence, more faculty and department chairs in higher education. Lastly, given that much attention in the field of higher education has been given to the impact of leadership on faculty based on gender and race, a larger sample might be beneficial in understanding more the impact of gender and race on work-life balance, promotion, and overall job satisfaction in higher education.

Lastly, if indeed a moderate or moderate to strong association of two of these leadership characteristics exists with faculty job satisfaction, then it would make sense to invest resources in a qualitative study and explore the faculty's perceptions more in-depth by interviewing faculty about the factors influencing their job satisfaction, including their perceptions of these particular department chair leadership characteristics, as well as others that might emerge in an interview.

Implications for Positive Social Change

Overall, conducting the study was intriguing because prior to the development of this study and after observing many of the department chairs' interaction with faculty at these three institutions, I found learning more about the perceptions of leadership characteristics and their association with faculty job satisfaction was one of the interesting steps in the developmental process of the study. The results have helped me understand better what I might suggest regarding enhancement of the department chair and faculty relationship for the betterment of the leader, faculty performance, which ultimately may lead to better student outcomes.

The study's results may contribute to positive social change by providing insight on how changes in leadership behavior may lead to more satisfaction on the part of faculty, which may lead to better teaching, thus benefitting students' academic experience and a college's overall reputation (Dorenkamp & Ruhle, 2019; O'Meara et al., 2019; Victorino et al., 2013).

Conclusion

Higher education can be a challenging environment and there are pressures on faculty, particularly adjunct faculty, to balance their personal and professional lives. This research makes a contribution to further understand what may matter most to faculty, such as comfortable feedback from department chairs and the allowance of honest expression of concerns without fear of negative consequences or retaliation. Furthermore, this study's provision of further understanding of caring for well-being and respect for faculty, adequate communication, confidence in leadership, and openness to input will hopefully allow the continuance of building professional relationships between department chairs and faculty. Doing so may hopefully contribute to positive social change by providing insight on how changes in leadership behavior may lead to more satisfaction on the part of faculty, which may lead to better teaching, thus benefitting students' academic experience and a college's overall reputation. Lastly, the high return rate of responses suggests that faculty want to take steps to improve their relationship with department chairs and their own job satisfaction.

References

Abouserie, R. (2006). Stress, coping strategies and job satisfaction in university academic staff. *International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology, 16*(1), 49-56. doi:10.80/0144341960160104

Aino, O. A., & Verma, K. K. (2017). Effect of leadership style on organizational commitment. In *Pan Pacific Microelectronics Symposium (Pan Pacific)*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of IEEE, Kuai, HI.

Akroyd, D., Bracken, S., & Chambers, C. (2011). A comparison factors that predict the satisfaction of community college faculty by gender. *Journal of the Professoriate, 4*(1), 74-95. Retrieved from https://caarpweb.org/publications/journal-of-the-professoriate

Albert, C., Davia, M. A., & Legazpe, N. (2018). Job satisfaction amongst academics: The role of research productivity. *Studies in Higher Education, 43*(8), 1362-1377. doi:10.1080/03075079.2016.1255937

Alexander, J. J. (2016). *Leadership styles in higher education of male and female chief financial officers in the southeast* (Doctoral dissertation).

Alonderiene, R., & Majauskaite, M. (2016). Leadership style and job satisfaction in higher education institutions. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 30*(1), 140-164. doi:10.1108/IJEM-08-2014-0106

Anderson, D., & Slade, C. (2016). Managing institutional research advancement: Implications from a university faculty time allocation study. *Research in Higher Education, 57*(1), 99-121. doi:10.1007/s/1162-015-9376-9

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Reexamining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 1999*(72), 441-461. doi:10.1348/096317999166789

Bakely, A. L., & Broderson, L. A. (2017). Waiting to become: Adjunct faculty experiences at multi-campus community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *42*(2), 1-17. doi:10.1080/10668926.207.1279090

Barnett, D. E. (2019). Full-range leadership as a predictor of extra effort in online higher education: The mediating effect on job satisfaction. *Journal of Leadership Education, 18*(1), 86-101. doi:10.12806/V18/I1/R6

Basham, L. M. (2012). Transformational leadership characteristics necessary for today's leaders in higher education. *Journal of International Education Research, 8*(4), 343-348. doi:10.19030/jier.v8i4.7280

Bass, B. M. (1985). Model of transformational leadership. In T. F. Mech & G. B. McCabe (Eds.), *Leadership and academic librarians* (pp. 66–82). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Psychology Press.

Bateh, J., & Heyliger, W. (2014). Academic administrator leadership styles and the impact on faculty job satisfaction. *Journal of Leadership Education, 13*(3), 34-49. doi:10.12806/V13/13/R3

Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *Journal of Higher Education, 82*(2), 154-186. doi:10.1080/00221546.2011.11779090

Bruns, J. W. (2018). Presidential job satisfaction: Variables that impact satisfaction in public and private higher education institutions. *Planning for Higher Education Journal, 46*(2), 81-96. Retrieved from https://www.scup.org/learning-resources/planning-for-higher-education-journal/

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Butterwick, S., Head. G., & Madalinska-Michalak, J. (2020). Introduction. *Ethical Issues in Educational Research, 19*(1), 3-9. doi:10.1177/1474904119896506

Campbell-Whatley, G. D., Wang, C., & Ozalle, T., (2015). Factors affecting campus climate: Creating a welcoming environment. *New Waves Educational Research & Development,18*(2), 40-52. Retrieved from http://www.viethconsulting.com/members/publication/new_waves_home.php

Campbell, E., & Bray, N. (2017). Two sides of the same coining? Analysis of faculty and administrators' perspectives on governance. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 42*(12), 893-907.

Caraquil, J. A., Sy, R., & Daguplo, M. S. (2016). Simulation modeling of intention to leave among faculty in higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational and Human Resource Development,4*, 26.37.

Chang, T. (2004). *Leadership styles of department chairs and faculty utilization of instructional technology* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from

http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=9AF7EA72A82EA052137A7E2EDCD66C44?doi=10.1.1.477.3163&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology: A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155-159. doi:10.11613/BM.2013.018

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dachner, A. M., & Saxton, B. M. (2015). If you don't care, then why should I? The influence of instructor commitment on student satisfaction and commitment. *Journal of Management Education, 39*(5), 549-571. doi:10.1177/1052562914555550

Decuir-Gunby, J. T., & Gunby, N. W. (2016). Racial microaggressions in the workplace: A critical race analysis of the experiences of African American educators. *Urban Education, 51*(4), 390-414. doi:10.1177/00420859166283610

Deinert, A., Homan, A. C., Boer, D., Voepel, S. C., & Gutermann, D. (2015). Transformational leadership sub-dimensions and their link to leader's personality and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly, 26*(5), 1095-1120. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.08.001

DeLotell, P., & Cates, S. (2016). The department chair influence on institutional affective commitment of online adjuncts. *International Journal of Business & Public Administration, 13*(1), 61-75. Retrieved from

http://www.iabpad.com/journals/international-journal-of-business-and-public-administration-2/

Demaris, M. C., & Kritsonis, W. A. (2008). The classroom: Exploring its effects on student persistence and satisfaction. *Focus on Colleges, Universities, and Schools, 2*(1), 2-9. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED501268)

Denson, N., Szelenyi, K., & Bresonis, K. (2018). Correlates of work-life balance for faculty across racial/ethnic groups. *Research in Higher Education, 59*(2), 226-247. doi:10.107/s11162-017-9464-0

DeSimone, J. A., Harms, P. D., & DeSimone, A. J. (2015). Best practice recommendations for data screening. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36*(2), 171-181. doi:10.1002/job.1962

Devito, L., Brown, A., Bannister, B., Cianci, M., & Mujtaba, B. (2016). Employee motivation based on the hierarchy of needs, expectancy and the two-factor theories applied with higher education employees. *International Journal of Advances in Management, Economics, and Entrepreneurship, 3*(1), 20-32. Retrieved from http://www.ijamee.info/index.php/IJAMEE/index

Dolinksy-Graham, R., Ferren, A., & McCambly, H. (2014). Collaborative, faculty-led efforts for sustainable change. *Peer Review, 16*(4), 30-32. Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/peerreview/2014-2015/fall-winter/research

Dorenkamp, I., & Ruhle, S. (2019). Work-life conflict, professional commitment, and job satisfaction among academics. *The Journal of Higher Education, 90*(1), 56-84. doi:10.1080/00221546.2018.1484644

Dou, D., Devos, G., & Valcke, M. (2017). The relationship between school autonomy gap, principal leadership, teacher's job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 45*(6), 959-977. doi:10.1177/1741143216653975

Duemer, L. S. (2017). A history of transactional leadership in academe: A cautionary tale. *Journal of Philosophy: History in Education, 67*, 1-67. Retrieved from http://www.journalofphilosophyandhistoryofeducation.com/

Dugas, D., Summers, K. H., Harris, L. N., & Stich, A. E. (2018). Shrinking budgets, growing demands: Neoliberalism and academic identity tension at regional public universities. *American Educational Research Association, 4*(1), 1-14. doi:10.1177/2332858418757736

Dvir, E. D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2012). Extractors for varieties. *Computational Complexity, 21*(4), 515-572. doi: 10.1007/s00037-011-0023-3

Eagan, M. K., & Garvey, J. C. (2015). Stressing out: Connecting race, gender, and stress with faculty productivity. *Journal of Higher Education, 86*(6), 923-954. doi:10.1080/00221546.2015.11777389.

Eaton, C. K., Osgood, A. K., & Cigrand, D. L. (2015). Faculty perception of support to do their job well. *A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 10*, 35-42.

Edwards, J. W., & Ross, H. H. (2018). What are they saying? Black faculty at predominantly White institutions of higher education. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 28*(2), 142-161. doi:10.1080/10911359.2017.1391731

Elliott, R. .W. (2019). Understanding faculty engagement in assessment through feedback and dialogues: A mixed methods approach. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 7*(3), 167-175. Doi:10.11591/ijerev7.i.3.13346

Ewell, J. (2018). Revitalizing a student organization by applying transformational leadership. *Journal of Leadership Education, 17*(3), 208-218. doi:10.12806/v17/13/AZ

Germain, J. (2017). Reflections on leadership: Theory, experience, and practice. *Quest, 69*(2), 169-176. doi:10.1080/0036297.2017.1302347

Ghasabeh, S. M., Soosay, C., & Reaiche, C. (2015). The emerging role of transformational leadership. *The Journal of Developing Areas 49*(6), 459-467. doi:10.1353/jda.2015.0090

Gigliotti, R. A., & Ruben, B. D. (2017). Preparing higher education leaders: A conceptual, strategic, and operational approach. *Journal of Leadership Education,16*(1), 96-114. doi:10.12806/V16/I1/T1

Goertzen, M. J. (2017). *Applying quantitative methods to e-book collections: Library technology reports*. Retrieved from alatechsource.org

Gonaim, F. (2016). A department chair: a lifeguard without a jacket. *Higher Education, 29*(2), 272-286. doi:10.1057/hep.2015.26

Gonzales, L. D. , & Terosky, A. (2018). Colleagueship in different types of post-secondary institutions: A lever for faculty vitality. *Studies in Higher Education, 43*(8), 1378-1391. doi:10.1080/03075079.2016.1255938

Gozukara, Y. I., & Simsek, O. F. (2016). Different pathways from transformational leadership to job satisfaction. *Non-Profit Management & Leadership, 27*(1), 57-77. doi:10.1002/NML.21229

Gralka, S., Wohlrabe, K., & Bornmann, L. (2019). How to measure research efficiency in higher education? Research grants vs publication output. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management, 41*(3), 322-341. doi:10.1080/1360080x.2019.1588492

Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2016). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data* (8th ed.). Princeton, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hanasono, L. K., Broido, E. M., Yacobucci, M. M., Root, K. V., Pena, S., & O'Neil, D. A. (2019). Secret service: Revealing gender biases in the visibility and value of faculty service. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 12*(1), 85-98. doi:10.1037/dhe0000081

Hendrickson, K. A., & Francis, K. A. (2018). Finding professional true to self-authenticity in public university faculty experience. *Studies in Higher Education, 43(*12), 2398-2411. doi:10.1080/03075079.2017.1333492

Heffernan, T. A., & Heffernan, A. (2019). The academic exodus: The role of institutional support in academics leaving universities and the academy. *Professional Development in Education, 45*(1), 102-113. doi:10.1080/19415257.2018.1474491

Henderson, M., Ryan, T., & Phillips, M. (2019). The challenges of feedback in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(8), 1237-1252. doi:10.1080/02602938.2019.1599815.

Hesli, V. L., & Lee, J. M. (2013). Job satisfaction in academia: Why are some faculty members happier than others? *PS, Political Science & Politics, 46*(2), 339-354. doi:10.1017/s1049096513000048

Hong, G., Youngsam, C., Froese, F. J., & Shin, M. (2016). The effect of leadership styles, rank, and seniority on affective organizational commitment: A comparative study of U.S. and Korean employees. *Cross Culture & Strategic Management, 23*(2), 340-362. doi:10.1108/CCSM-03-2014-0034

Jackson, T. (2017). *The relationship between transformational leadership style and employee's perception of leadership success in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/1421

Jacobs, J., & Winslow, S. E. (2004). Overworked faculty: Job stresses and family demands. *Journal of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 596*(1), 104-129. doi:10.1177/0002716204268185

Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, R. A., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education, 80*(5), 538-563. doi:10.1080/00221546.2009.11779031

Jin, S., Seo, M., & Shapiro, D. L. (2016). Do happy leaders lead better? Affective and attitudinal antecedents of transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(1), 64-84. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.09.002

Kater, S. T. (2017). Community college faculty conceptualizations of shared governance: Shared understandings of a sociopolitical reality. *Community College Review, 45*(3), 234-257. doi:10.1177/0091552117700490

Kezar, A., & Gehrkes, S. (2016). Faculty composition in four-year institutions: The role of pressures, values, and organizational processes in academic decision-making. *Journal of Higher Education, 83*(3), 390-419. doi:10.1080/00221546.2016.11777407

Kim, H., & Rehg, M. (2018). Faculty performance and morale in higher education: A systems approach. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science, 35*, 308-328. doi:10.1002/sres.2495

Kimmel, K., & Fairchild, J. L. (2017). A full-time dilemma: Examining the experiences of part-time faculty. *Journal of Effective Teaching, 17*(1), 52-65.

Kleinhans, K. A., Chakradhar, K., Muller, S., & Waddill, P. (2015). Multigenerational perceptions of the academic work environment in higher education in the United States. *Higher Education, 70*(1), 89-103. doi:10.1077/s107340-014-9825-y

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management, 12*(4), 648-657. doi:10.5465/AMR.1987.4306.717

Kuntz, A. M. (2012). Reconsidering the workplace: Faculty perceptions of their work and working environments. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*(7), 769-782. doi:10.1080/03075079.2010.541556

Lakens, D., Scheel, A. M., & Isager, P. M. (2018). Equivalence testing for psychological research: A tutorial. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, 1*(2), 259-269. doi:10.1177/2515245918770963

Leck, J. (2016). *Job satisfaction of full-time faculty members at a for-profit university* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://stars.library.ucf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=6247&context=etd

Levin, J. S., Jackson-Boothby, A., Haberler, Z., & Walker, L. (2015). Dangerous work: Improving conditions for faculty of color in the community college. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 39*(9), 852-864. doi:10.1080/10668926.2014.917596

Lisnic, R., Zajicek, A., & Morimoto, S. (2019). Gender and race differences in faculty assessment of tenure clarity: The influence of departmental relationships and practices. *Sociology of Race & Ethnicity, 5*(2), 244-260. doi:10.11771232649218756137

Madhuri, J. G. (2017). The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among faculty members in select management educational opportunities. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*(3), 33-51. Retrieved from https://www.iupindia.in/405/ijob.asp

Martin, J. (2015). Transformational and transactional leadership: An exploration of gender, experience, and institutional type. *Libraries & The Academy, 15*(2), 331-351. doi:10.1353/pla.2015.0015

Martinez, M. C., & Martinez, M. (2019). Adjunct perspectives on job factors and job attitudes in non-traditional institutions. *Journal of the Professoriate, 10*(1), 1-21. Retrieved from https://caarpweb.org/publications/journal-of-the-professoriate

Mathieu, C., & Babiak, P. (2015). Tell me who you are, I'll tell you how to lead: Beyond the full-range leadership model, the role of corporate psychopathy on employee attitudes. *Personality & Individual Differences, 87,* 8-12. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2015.07.016

May, V. S. (2017). *An examination of job satisfaction and work/life balance among racial minority faculty in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https:/pdfs.semanticscholar.org/ffof/od02e28310d2cfq3d436d1db5la9e5293752.pdf

McDaniel, M. W. (2017). Institutional climate and faculty governance in higher education: A shift from capitalist to shared governance models. *A Journal for Academic Labor, 29,* 34-43.

McHugh, M. L. (2016). The chi-square test of independence. *Biochemia Medica, 23*(2), 143-149. doi:10.11613/BM.2013.018

Meghna, S., Helisse, L., & D'Agostino, M. J. (2017). Gender differences in leadership styles of MPA directors. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 23*(3), 869-884. doi:10.1080/15236803.2017.12002293

Menci, J., Wefald, A. J., & Vanittersum, K. W. (2016). Transformational leader attributes: Interpersonal skills, engagement, and well-being. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 37*(5), 635-657. doi:10.1108/LODJ-09-2014-0178

Miller, M. T., & Murry, J. W. (2015). Faculty response to department leadership: Strategies for creating more supportive academic work environments. *College Quarterly,18*(4), 1-8. Retrieved from http://collegequarterly.ca/

Milosheff, E. (1990). Factors contributing to job satisfaction at the community college. *Community College Review, 18*(1), 12-22. doi:10.1177/009155219001800102

National Center for Education Statistics. (2019, September 22). NCES.ed.gov. Retrieved from nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61.

Nazim, F. (2016). Principals' transformational and transactional leadership style and job satisfaction of college teachers. *Journal of Education and Practice, 7*(34), 18-22. Retrieved from https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/index

Nimon, K., Conley, D., Bontrager, M. Keiffer, G. L., & Hammack-Brown, B. (2019). Descriptive statistics from published research: A readily available alternative to raw data asses analytic reproducibility and robustness. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 21*(4), 421-437. doi:10.1177/1523422319869853

Notgrass, D. (2014). The relationship between follower's perceived quality of relationships and preferred leadership style. Leadership Organizational Development Journal 35(7), 605-621. doi: 10.1108/LODJ-08-2012-0096

Olsen, D. (2016). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. *The Journal of Higher Education, 64*(4), 453-471. doi:10.1080/00221546.1993.1178439

O'Meara, K. (2015). Halfway out: How requiring outside offers to raise salaries influences faculty retention and organizational commitment. *Research in Higher Education 55*(3), 279-298. doi:10.1007/s/1162-014093141-z

O'Meara, K., Lennartz, C. J., Kuvaeva, A. Jaeger, A., & Misra, J. (2019). Department chair conditions and practices associated with faculty workload satisfaction and perceptions of equity. *The Journal of Higher Education, 90*(5), 744-772. doi:10.1080/00221546.2019.1574025

Owen, C. (2014). Forget everything you have learned about art and start from the beginning: Charismatic leadership and art school teaching. *Communication in Higher Education, 13*(2), 201-214. doi:10.1386/adch.13.2.201_1

Pelletier, K. L., Kottke, J. L., & Reza, E. M. (2015). During furloughs, who is more attached to a public university? Staff? Faculty managers. *Public Personnel Management, 4*(1), 120-142. doi:10.1177/0091026014558155

Powers, L. (2014). A Quantitative Study of the Relationship Between Pell Grant Aid and Associated Variables in a Florida Public State College (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://stars.library.ucf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5613&context=etd

Prottas, D. J., Fossen, S., Cleaver, C. M., & Andreassi, J. K. (2017). Relationships among faculty perceptions of their tenure process and their commitment and engagement.

Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 9(2), 242-254. doi:10.1108/JARHE-08-2016-0054

Rocca-DelGazio, K., Frymier, A. B., & Mottet, T. P. (2013). The application of basic communication skills to higher education. *Journal of Association for Communication Administration, 32*(1/2), 87-94. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.247

Sahl, A. (2017). The importance of faculty appreciation and recognition: A case study of one institution. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 39*, 246-259.

Seipel, M. T., & Larson, L. M. (2016). Supporting non-tenure track faculty well-being. *Journal of Career Assessment, 26*(1), 1-18. doi:10.1177/1069072716680046

Simundi, C.A.M. (2013). Bias in research. *Biochemia Medica, 23*(1), 12-15. doi:10.11613/BM.2013.003

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivated for teaching? Associations with school goal structure, teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*, 152-162. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.006

Starcher, K., & Mandernach, B. J. (2016). An examination of adjunct faculty characteristics: Comparison between non-profit and for-profit institutions. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 19*(1), 1-16. Retrieved from https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/

Stupnisky, R. H., Hall, N. C., Daniels, L. M., & Mensah, E. (2017). Testing a model of pretenure faculty members' teaching and research success: Motivation as a mediator of balance, expectations, and collegiality. *The Journal of Higher Education, 88*(3), 376-400. doi:10.1080/00221546.2016.127231

Stutzman, E. A. (2017). Recent trends in faculty governance and its overall impact on work life, job satisfaction, and faculty retention. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor, 29,* 45-55. doi:10.14288/workplace.v0i29.186217

Taylor, L., Beck, M., Lahey, J., & Froyd, J. (2017). Reducing inequality in higher education: The link between faculty empowerment and climate and retention. *Innovative Higher Education, 42*(5/6), 391-405. doi:10.1007/s10755-017-9391-1

Terosky, A. L., & Heasley, C. (2015). Supporting online faculty through a sense of community and collegiality. *Online Learning, 19*(3), 147-161.

Trafimow, D., & Earp, B. D. (2017). Null hypothesis significance testing and Type 1 error: The domain problem. *In New Ideas in Psychology, 45*, 19-27. doi:10.1016/j.newideapsych.2017.01.002

Turkkahraman, M. (2014). Social change, education, and teaching training policies. *International Journal on New Trends in Education & Their Implications, 5*(2), 26-33. Retrieved from http://www.ijonte.org/

Valentin, A., Trafimow, D., & Greenland, S. (2019). Inferential statistics as descriptive statistics: There is no replication crisis if we don't expect replication. *American Statistician, 73,* 262-270. doi:10.1080/00031305.2018.1543137

Vican, S., Friedman, A., & Andreasen, R. (2019). Metrics, money, and managerialism: Faculty experiences of competing logics in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 91*(1), 139-164. doi:10.1080/00221546.2019.1615332

Victorino, C. A., Nylund-Gibson, K., & Conley, S. (2013). Campus racial climate: A litmus test for faculty satisfaction at four-year colleges and universities. The

Journal of Higher Education, 84(6), 769-805. doi:10.1080/00221546.2013.11777310

Walker, R. C., & Aritz, J. (2015). Women doing leadership: Leadership styles and Organizational culture. *International Journal of Business Communication, 52*(4),452-478. doi:10.1177/2329488415598429

Welch, A. G., Bolin, J., Reardon, D., & Stenger, R. (2019). Mid-career faculty: Trends, barriers, and possibilities. *Journal of the Professoriate, 10*(1), 22-42. Retrieved from https://caarpweb.org/publications/journal-of-the-professoriate

Wells, R. S., & Stage, F. K. (2015). Past, present, and future of critical quantitative research in higher education. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2014*(163), 103-112. doi:10.1002/ir.20089

Wheat, C. A., & Hill, L. H. (2016). Leadership identities, styles and practices of women university administrators. *Research in Schools, 23*(2), 1-16. Retrieved from http://www.msera.org/old-site/rits.htm

Whitley, C. T., & Yoder, S. D. (2015). Developing social responsibility and political engagement: Assessing the aggregate impacts of university civic engagement on associated attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Education, Citizenship, & Social Justice, 10*(3), 217-233. doi:10.1177/1746197915583941

Yahaya, R., & Ebrahim, F. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: Literature review. J*ournal of Management Development, 35*(2), 190-216. doi:10.1108/JMD-01-2015-0004

Zhu, W., Riggio, R. E., Avolio B. J., & Sosik, J. J. (2011). The effect of leadership on follower moral identity: Does transformational/transactional style make a difference? *Journal of Leadership &Organizational Studies, 18*(2), 150-163. doi:10.1177/1548051810396714

Appendix: Employee Satisfaction Survey Adapted for this Study

The original survey has 20 questions and were designed by the institution where the survey will be conducted. However, for the purpose of this study, the survey is adapted to 8 questions. The questions are in Likert scale format, with scales being formatted as 1 being “strongly disagree,” 2 and 3 being “neutral,” 4 being “agree,” and 5 being “strongly agree” based on how the question is asked. Some of the original questions were in a Yes/No format and have been adapted to scaled questions. The survey was distributed via Survey Monkey.

Initial question: Are you full time or an adjunct? Yes/No

DV survey question - job satisfaction:

Overall, to what extent do you agree that you are satisfied with your job? “Faculty job satisfaction”

IV survey questions and their short phrases - leadership characteristics:

1. I have confidence in the leadership of this team. “Confidence in leadership”
2. I am comfortable with the feedback and coaching I receive from my manager.

   “Comfortable receiving feedback from leadership (feedback)”
3. There is enough communication between me and my manager. “Adequate communication with leadership (communication)”
4. I am treated fairly and respectfully by my manager. “Leadership’s respect for faculty (respect)”

5. My manager is open to input from employees. “ Leadership’s openness to receiving input from faculty (openness)”
6. I feel I can express opinions with my manager without fear of negative consequences or retaliation. “ Leadership allowing faculty to honestly express themselves (expression)”
7. My manager cares about their employee’s well-being. “ Belief in leadership’s caring for the well-being of faculty (well-being)”

Demographic Variable: Are you full time? Adjunct?

Summary of the short phrases of the categories of the IV:

1. Confidence in leadership (confidence)
2. Comfortable receiving feedback from leadership (feedback)
3. Adequate communication with leadership (communication)
4. Leadership’s respect for faculty (respect)
5. Leadership’s openness to receiving input from faculty (openness)
6. Leadership allowing faculty to honestly express themselves (expression)
7. Belief in leadership’s caring for the well-being of faculty (well-being)