



Open Access



Uncovering through a Mixed Method Lense: The Perceived Leadership Styles and Employees Job Satisfaction in Higher Education

Azeem Asghar¹ Khawaja Hisham-ul-Hassan² Arman Butt³Muhammad Waqas Fafooq⁴ Ijaz Latif⁵

Abstract: *The objectives of this research are to identify leadership styles and job satisfaction among non-academic employees who support the teaching faculty of the University of the Punjab. There are two variables: perceived leadership styles (PLS) and employee job satisfaction (EJS). The quantitative and qualitative methodology was used for an estimated sample size of 300 non-academic employees. Data was analyzed using descriptive analysis and thematic analysis methods. Frequency tables, percentages, means, and standard deviation were used for data presentation and analysis. The study suggested that there was a positive significant relationship between perceived leadership styles and employees' job satisfaction. The literature stresses the social exchange cycle and reciprocity rules in the relationships of leaders and their members. In this cycle, if the leaders care about their members and if members perceive that the leaders are supportive, they feel satisfied to behave positively, take voluntary extra work of colleagues in time of need, perform better, and help the higher education universities to reach their goals and objectives. If they don't perceive leaders' support, they don't care about the educational organization either.*

Key Words: Leadership Styles, Employees Job Satisfaction, Non-Academic Employees, Higher Education, Public University

Introduction

Background Information and Importance

There is no doubt that education is recognized as a basic human right in the world, with higher education imparting its part in the progress of any country. It is the reason that countries are determining its importance and introducing principles of market economies in these institutions/universities in addition to the challenges that have been generated in a modern higher education environment (Rao, 2003). He also believed that the challenges in higher education may be moral, social, political, and economic. Further, he determined that the future of higher education depends on people who handle such problems.

University administrators are key decision-makers whose quality decisions bring the organizational objectives successfully (Verma, 2002). The success of any university is determined by its institutes, colleges, and departments, which play important roles in developing, preserving and transmitting knowledge (Coats, 2000). However, the quality of departments is influenced by the heads of departments, who are the first-line leaders (Bowman, 2002). A good leader can be defined as one who dictates the employees and gets assignments on time, manages the resources effectively, and encourages their morale to make appropriate decisions for achieving the goals and objectives of the organization (Northouse, 2012). The research on the top level of management in higher education is abundant, but the study on the attributes of departmental heads/leaders is limited (Coats, 2000).

¹ PhD Scholar, Department of Management Sciences, Superior University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

² Associate Professor, Faculty of Economics and Commerce, Superior University Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

³ PhD Scholar, Department of Management Sciences, Superior University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

⁴ PhD Scholar, Department of Management Sciences, Superior University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

⁵ PhD Scholar, Department of Management Sciences, Superior University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

▪ **Corresponding Author:** Azeem Asghar (azeemasghar14@gmail.com)

▪ **To Cite:** Asghar, A., Hisham-ul-Hassan, K., Butt, A., Farooq, M. W., & Latif, I. (2024). Uncovering through a Mixed Method Lense: The Perceived Leadership Styles and Employees Job Satisfaction in Higher Education. *Qlantia Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(3), 147-158. <https://doi.org/10.55737/qjssh.739213534>



According to Jensen (2006), non-academic employees are important in today's competitive environment for the long-term survival of colleges and universities. Human beings are the sources that bring changes in technology and the services that are provided by these educational organizations (Jensen, 2006). The satisfied employees give services with commitment, do not usually remain absent from services, have less or do not take too much stress, and remain for longer periods of time to add value to their universities (Neal, 1999).

Statement of Problem

The higher education sector faces many challenges/issues that raised the demand for researchers to study the higher education segment (Mathew, 2010). Leadership is an aspect that can bring changes and manage them in higher education (Sarros & Santora, 2001) because leadership roles are important and can bring success not in higher education organizations.

Another issue of great concern in recent times is satisfaction and its factors. For instance, Yuliarini (2012) conducted research in Malaysian higher education and explored the factors, while Hamidifar (2009) explored the relationship between leadership styles and employee satisfaction related to their job and concluded that transformational and transactional leadership style at the Islamic Azad University of Iran were dominant. He further concluded that due to these leadership styles, the employees were satisfied. Edward (2009) recognized the factors that measure the job satisfaction of employees. An exploratory study was also conducted by George (2008) to explain the extrinsic and intrinsic factors of employees' job satisfaction.

Resulted in the study by Bass (1990) that, factors that influence the progress of any organization are 45% to 65% related to the behaviour of leaders. These behaviours have a strong relation with employee work performance and organizational outcomes (Erhart, 2004). Therefore, the particular leadership style used by leaders, which is called behavioural patterns, affects employee performance (Shirzad-Kebria & Zanganeh, 2011).

In different studies, as some discussed above, various roles of leaders have different effects on the satisfaction level of employees working in an organization (Hamidifar, 2009). There are many factors that affect employees' job satisfaction (George, 2008). It is also studied that the achievement or breakdown in any organization heavily relies on the style of leadership which they perform and influences the performance of employees Bass (1990).

Past studies influenced researchers to study leadership styles (authoritative, laissez-faire) that influence non-academic employees' satisfaction, especially in the higher education sector. Therefore, this study motivated the researcher to address issues related to leader's role perception and explore the satisfaction level of non-academic employees in educational settings at Punjab University, Lahore.

Significance of Study

Danish (2015) stated that the Government sector provides different opportunities like bonuses, pensions, etc.; therefore, employees in public sector organizations do fairly in the interest of the organization. However, their loyalty is problematic due to the absence of proper leadership styles Danish, (2015). The past studies have indicated that different researchers conducted studies on leadership styles. However, few studies have been done on leadership styles and job satisfaction with employee job performance in higher education, especially on nonacademic employees. Similar studies have been conducted in different organizations, but they possess particular cultures, beliefs, and leadership styles that may not apply to the Pakistani context.

To study the problem of what leadership styles (authoritative, laissez-faire) were used and how high levels of employee job satisfaction were exhibited in higher education public universities (the Punjab University, Lahore). So, the findings of the study will help in analyzing the perception of non-academic employees about the role of their leaders and the job satisfaction of employees in a public university in Lahore, Pakistan, which is taking part in the development and maintaining the education level throughout Pakistan.

Different studies have suggested that the styles of transformational leadership have far greater influence than transactional leadership (Rasool et al., 2015), but styles of leadership such as authoritative and laissez-fair have not been studied and understood much, particularly in the sector of higher education on non-academic employees.

Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives will be as follows:

1. Examine employees' perceptions of the nature of leadership styles that exist in higher education public universities.
2. Explore the factors of employee job satisfaction that exist in higher education public universities.

Questions Related to Study

- What are employees' perceptions of the nature of leadership styles (authoritative leadership style and Laissez-faire leadership style) that exist in higher education public universities?
- Explore the factors of employee job satisfaction that exist in higher education public universities.

Literature Review

According to Taylor (2012), the success of any organization depends on leaders because they set the strategies and objectives of the organization. Therefore, the behaviour of leaders with their employees is considered an important factor that affects the behaviour and performance of the employees.

Constructive leadership behaviour builds the trust of employees and motivates them, while destructive leadership behaviour loses the trust of employees and disengages from their work (Prooijen & Vries, 2016). The understanding of employee behaviour is important in any organization, and the analysis of the behaviour of a leader and their leadership style (Sarti, 2014) is also important in every field of life. To understand the leadership styles in the context of higher education, the discussion began with different leadership definitions, theories, and the effectiveness of leadership on employees and organizations.

In addition, numerous leadership experiments in various environments have been carried out, demonstrating that leadership's position is complicated and multifaceted. Therefore, for guidance in this review, multiple hypotheses will be objectively assessed and evaluated. The results provided bookish proof for stakeholder decisions and ultimately filled the gap between academic research and practices.

Definition of Leadership

It is a challenging attempt for scholars and practitioners to provide a universal definition of "leadership" as it has a multidimensional nature. Many people have identified different meanings of leaders' positions. From these, leadership is characterized by the relationships of individuals that are designed to accomplish those goals. Leadership may, therefore, be described as the conduct of a person whose followers are aimed at achieving certain goals (Prentice, 2004).

J. M. Bums said leadership is a practised concept in this world, but not a comprehensive one (Zenger & Folkman 2002). Researchers clarified that leadership emerged at the outset of social or civilization developments.

One common thing that exists in all definitions is that leadership has the ability to influence the actions of individuals (Wang et al., 2011). The Researchers claimed that leaders have varying personalities, which they prefer to favourably or adversely impact the accomplishment of organizational goals. The importance of leadership discussed by De Merville (2007) said if any organization want to be successful in the present or future, then there leadership is necessary. This created a reason to understand leadership, which pushes the organization and employees to the highest potential to achieve objectives (Grant & Wrzesniewski, 2010). The above literature review showed that the role of leadership comprises structuring the team and enhancing the personal duties to complete work in such a way that helps the leader to complete the goals of the organization.



In terms of multiple contexts, the literature on identifying the word leadership is massive. Hamidifar (2010) said that more than 350 scholars asserted the significance of the word leadership. For example, another researcher, Boseman (2008), said that leadership requires steps to start collaborating with supporters to create a common goal for the organization. Daft (2010) regarded leadership, on the other hand, as the power of individuals that affects people. For example, "the action is of managers who do various roles" (Bowditch & Bueno, 2001). Some scholars see leadership as the management of an organization. Further, Bedeian and Hunt (2006) described it as the Management Partition. So, the definitions of leadership have been defined by different researchers and scholars from time to time, and their scholarly articles and research on leadership topics also provide a range of different theories to explain leadership.

Autocratic (Authoritative) Leadership

Lewin, Lippit and White (1939) defined this theory: In autocratic leadership, the leader retains authority and makes decisions by himself, and the followers will implement it. The focus of power and all interactions move towards the leader. This style is seen as task-oriented. In emergency situations, it is more appropriate as followers provide a supportive and mature climate.

Laissez-Faire (Delegated) Leadership

Lewin, Lippit and White (1939) also identified this leadership style: there is no person's authority, and the leader delegates his authority and control to their subordinate. Leaders do not set goals and objectives using this style, but it could lead to failure when subordinates are deceptive, unreliable, and untrustworthy. The probability of this type of leadership is rare, but no one has denied it.

There is a need to consider these particular leadership styles in Pakistan's higher education sector. The probability of this type of leadership is rare, but no one has denied it. Today, it is important to know what non-academic workers believe about their leaders and whether or not they are promising freedom. Kiazad et al. (2010) note that workers employed under an autocratic leader are aware of the insensitivity of their leader, who would not at all have independence for their employees. However, leaders of laissez-faire tend to offer more independence and make choices for workers (Yao et al., 2017). So, this study examined these two styles of leadership: authoritative and laissez-faire leadership.

Employee Job Satisfaction

The term "happy or optimistic emotional state arising from your own employment and work experience" describes job satisfaction in Locke (1976, p. 1300). The happiness of jobs can be described as people with job-related feelings and attitudes. He clarified that if you have a good attitude toward your work, you will name this happiness as job dissatisfaction.

"Internally, the enjoyment of work poses in the minds of a person that only one person can show the degree to which one feels fulfilled" (p. 286), the words of Shibru & Darshan (2011). These definitions are linked to the individual perspective, but they can be defined from the organization's perspective because, from the point of view of management, it is "an emotion derived from the climate, culture and the identification of management that is bound to fair conduct of managers" (Çelik, 2011, p. 13).

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction

According to Kalleberg (1977), two aspects of work satisfaction (in relation to the job itself and other external job satisfaction (including facets that are external to the task). The reasons that are inherent to job satisfaction and the factors that are linked to the employment situation or the workplace atmosphere that people believe are external to job satisfaction (Harrington, 1996). This then tends to be essential for employees' high motivation for intrinsic and extrinsic reasons in every organization. These are valuable for leaders to build respect, enhance their employment outcomes, increase the retention of workers in organizations, and function in an engaging and constructive manner that effectively increases employee satisfaction.

In this research, the satisfaction of non-academic employees is explored in these two facets of career fulfilment, which are intrinsic job satisfaction, indicating that employees feel like their jobs and extrinsic job satisfaction, that employees feel like they are concerned with the environment.

Methodology

The population of this study were non-academic employees of a higher education public university, the University of the Punjab, who facilitate heads of departments/leaders and students.

In quantitative research, it is believed that if the sample is carefully obtained, it is then possible to generalize the results to the whole population, as suggested by Amin (2004). The simple random sampling technique was used. The sample size for this study was 300 employees for the quantitative study, and ten employee interviews were conducted for the qualitative study to explore the themes of job satisfaction of employees.

The sample was selected in consultation with Amin's (2004) suggested sample table to determine an equivalent sample for representation.

Table 1

Frequency and per cent distribution of demographics of respondents

Personal Information Level of Variables		f	%
Employment Status	Permanent	211	70.3%
	Contract	89	29.7%
Gender	Male	271	90.3%
	Female	29	9.7%
Age	<25	9	3.0%
	26-30	30	10.0%
	31-35	43	14.3%
	36-40	150	50.0%
	41-45	49	16.3%
	>45	19	6.3%
Work Experience	<5	10	3.3%
	6-10	26	8.7%
	11-15	62	20.7%
	16-20	141	47.0%
	21-25	47	15.7%
	>25	14	4.7%
Education Level	Matriculation	12	4.0%
	Intermediate	28	9.3%
	Graduation	98	32.7%
	Master Other	162	54.0%

The table above shows that out of 300 employees, the majority, 70.3%, were permanent, and the remaining 29.7% were contract. In the question asked about gender, 90.3% were male, while 9.7% were female. The other demography variable was age, which further categories showed that 3.0% were below 25 years age limit, 10.0% were within the age limit of 26-30 years, 14.3% were in the age limit of 31-35 years, 50.0% were in age limit 36-40 years, 16.3% were in age limit 41-45 years, 6.3% were greater than 25 years so the majority of the employees 50.0% were in age limit 36-40 years. The year of working experience question asked which further subdivided into six classes as 1= less than five years, 2=6-10, 3=11-15, 4=16-20, 5=21-25, and 6= above than 25 Years, the result showed that 3.3% lies below five years, 8.7% 6-10 years, 20.7% 11-15 years, 47.0% 16-20 years, 15.7% 21-25 years and 4.7% above 25 years, thus majority 47.5% lied 16-20 years of working experience. In order to know about the education level of the employees, the question of education level was subdivided into four categories: 1=matriculation, 2=intermediate, 3=graduation, and 4=master plus others. The result showed that there were employees 4.0%=matriculation, 9.3% = intermediate, 32.7% = graduation, 54.0% = master plus others, so the majority of employees were master plus others, that is 54%.



Research Instrument (Questionnaire)

The questionnaire used in this study has 30 questions, and this was designed on a Likert scale type from 1 to 5, such as strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree.

The author's name and scale items used were as follows,

- a) Lewin, Lippit and White(1939) describe three dimensions of leadership, from which two dimensions were selected for this study. Namely, one had authoritative leadership, and the other had a laissez-faire leadership style.
- b) Kalleberg (1977) describes two dimensions of employee job satisfaction: intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction.

A five-point Likert scale was used to analyse the data. Personal information was also collected, and items were included in the pilot study.

Validity and Reliability Test

To test the reliability of the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted that showed the following results of the reliability test,

Table 2

Reliability statistics of subscales

Variables	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Authoritative Leadership Style	5	.731
Laissez-Fair Leadership Style	5	.739
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	5	.732
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	5	.785

Table 2 above reports that the reliability statistics of all the above subscales were found to be higher than acceptable Cronbach's alpha 0.70. So, the questionnaire is considered to be very reliable.

Table 3

Authoritative leadership style

Statements	M	SD
My leader awards me for my work.	3.83	.989
My leader believes that employees do not like work.	3.53	1.095
There is an official communication system in the university.	3.85	.961
My leader is the only authority that makes decisions.	3.87	.951
My leader has direct control procedures for applying to university.	3.59	1.134

Overall mean score = 3.73

Table 3 indicates the mean of the statements related to Authoritative Leadership Style ranged from M (3.53 to 3.87) and total (M = 3.73), which includes the mean of the scale. All the statements fall under the agreed-upon scale.

It is concluded that the majority of the employees agreed about the factor "Authoritative Leadership Style".

Table 4

Laissez-fair leadership style

Statements	M	SD
My leader gives me the freedom to do work.	3.86	1.010
I feel free to discuss this with my leader.	3.77	1.081
My leader has no control over explaining the work.	3.69	1.100
My leader delays when I discuss any problem with him/her.	3.77	1.060
My leader is absent when I need to do work.	3.70	1.158

Overall mean score = 3.76

Table 4 indicates the mean of the statements related to the Laissez-Fair Leadership Style ranged from M (3.69 to 3.86) and total (M = 3.76), which includes the mean of the scale. All the statements fall under the agreed-upon scale.

It is concluded that the majority of the employees agreed about the factor “Laissez-Fair Leadership Style”.

Table 5

Intrinsic job satisfaction

Statements	M	SD
I have a promotion opportunity in my organization.	3.91	1.087
I am satisfied with my job position.	3.81	1.033
My leader praises me for my work.	3.69	1.045
My salary is reasonable for my doing work.	3.77	.994
My leader has good expectations of my work.	3.86	.942

Overall mean score = 3.81

Table 5 indicates the mean of the statements related to Intrinsic Job Satisfaction, ranging from M (3.69 to 3.91) and total (M = 3.81), which includes the mean of the scale. All the statements fall under the agreed-upon scale.

It is concluded that the majority of the employees agreed about the factor “Intrinsic Job Satisfaction”.

Table 6

Extrinsic job satisfaction

Statements	M	SD
I have a good relationship with my leader.	3.90	.974
The rules and procedures of the university facilitate the work.	3.77	.987
My leader encourages me to take part in decisions.	3.63	.981
I am satisfied with the university's working environment.	3.84	.932
The employees' relations with each other are best.	3.84	.965

Overall mean score = 3.80

Table 6 indicates the mean of the statements related to Extrinsic Job Satisfaction ranged from M (3.63 to 3.90) and total (M = 3.80), which includes the mean of the scale. All the statements fall under the agreed-upon scale.

It is concluded that the majority of the employees agreed about the factor “Extrinsic Job Satisfaction”.

Qualitative Results

Participants Responses

The researcher asked different semi-structured questions related to the job satisfaction of employees. The participants gave different answers/views upon which the researcher was able to formulate/generate different themes. Such questions and some important answers given by participants are laid down for illustration purposes as,

Emergent Theme: Satisfying Financial Needs and Personality Growth

Yes, My Head of Department is not putting stress on me, so my satisfaction level is high. (Participant # 1)

I have also improved my education here during this job. I am looking forward to a better future here. (Participant # 2)

I am satisfied because we complete our assigned work honestly, that makes us satisfied. Otherwise we remain unsatisfied, (Participant # 6)



Our department has teamwork, and they want to resolve them if someone has problems. (Participant # 8)

Why not? I am satisfied with my job. Some benefits we are drawing here are that we have an official residence, and we are near the school and workplace, which definitely are facilities here. (Participant # 10)

Emergent Theme: Recognition of Work and Giving Feedback

Yes, she admires us. For example, if someone has completed a good job, then she appreciates us. (Participant # 2)

The head of the department is never happy with our work at any cost. If there is any person who completes his task, then further assigned work is granted to him. On the other hand, who does not work well? Then it is said that he is not able to do work. This is not a good attitude. (Participant # 4)

He appreciated the persons who obeyed the timing (coming in time and remaining present during office timing) of the university. (Participant # 5)

He definitely appreciated the work, which motivated us to work hard. (Participant #7)

He praises very openly. (Participant # 9)

Usually, he never praises, but sometimes he does it. I work daily, but he is appreciated often, which depends only on her mind. (Participant # 10)

Emergent Theme: Flexible Working Environment

There may be some drawbacks and issues, and there are also some budget limitations under which he tries to provide us with a good working environment. (Participant # 1)

Alhamdulillah, our colleagues are supportive that we work together with each other (Participant # 3)

We have a friendly and teamwork environment. The head of the department only guides us in work; otherwise, he orders us to do work and not too much influence upon us. (Participant # 5)

Our working environment is flexible, and no timing rigidity occurs. Every person has a job description and is responsible for his work to tell no time-bound (Participant # 8)

He works friendly, not put pressure. When he gives suggestions, we work on them, and if he takes from our understanding, he considers that it is the best way to work in order to implement it. (Participant # 9)

We have a good working environment. We employees sit together and eat together, and our environment is good. Our head of department has changed the way of doing work which we think is best. But we have to do it because he has the responsibility of the head of a department. (Participant # 10)

Emergent Theme: Working Relations with HOD and Colleagues

They are concerned about their work. Only if he is done early will he become happy; otherwise, he remains angry and thinks that his work is not done. (Participant # 1)

By the way, the senior people have been called, and their work is distributed. They told us that we have to deliver the work in two days, so we will do it together. (Participant # 3)

Obviously, we spend a lot of time in offices with our fellows, so we have domestic relations. But with our head of department who has to come for 12 months, a year, or six months, then there are no such type of relations. (Participant # 4)

Our relations are good. We take one and other work easily if one wants to leave, the other work for him/his place. As I said, we do not directly communicate with the head of a department. We discuss our problems with our seniors, who talk with the head of the department. (Participant # 6)

My relationship with the head of the department is good, but there is also some gap that definitely exists

between us and the head of the department. We employees have a friendly environment. If we are not clear about some issues, then our head of department guides us. (Participant # 7)

We have a good working environment. We employees sit together and eat together, and our environment is good. Our head of department has changed the way of doing work which we think is best. (Participant # 10)

Emergent Theme: Leadership Style and Satisfaction

I have already told you that she is personally honest and has a soft attitude, but due to his soft attitude, some employees benefit from her, and they do not perform their duties well. I am satisfied. (Participant # 2)

Look, the pressure of work does not matter, but the zone in which you have work should be comfortable. (Participant # 3)

If the head of the department appreciates the work, then they will work hard to do a good job, and they will do their work with more commitment. (Participant # 4)

I am satisfied with the work assigned to me. If I do our work in another way, then I and my head of department will never satisfied. (Participant # 6)

If you have not discussed this with your lower staff, then their issues will never be understood by a good leader. (Participant # 8)

I am very satisfied. As I said earlier, if there is no pressure without any reason, then you work happily and in a friendly manner. Due to this, you will remain fresh from 8.00 AM to 4.00 PM. Alhamdulillah, God has given you the best way to earn money. (Participant # 9)

We are satisfied that there are some reasons for doing work. We are aware that after the year our salary will increase, and also there are other benefits of doing work here. (Participant # 10)

Themes and Subthemes

Themes	Subthemes
Satisfying financial Needs and Personality Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Personal Growth ▪ Institutional Satisfaction ▪ Career Achievements ▪ Financial Security ▪ Friendly and Teamwork Environment ▪ Honest Completion of Work ▪ Team collaboration ▪ Stress-Free Environment
Recognition of Work and Giving Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Occasional Praise ▪ Appreciation for Achievement ▪ Non Verbal Feedback ▪ Appreciation of Punctuality ▪ Open Praise
Flexible Working Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good Working Environment ▪ Impact of Management Decisions ▪ Small Department ▪ Supportive Colleges ▪ Friendly Caring Environment ▪ Financial Crises ▪ Flexible Work Environment ▪ Job Responsibility ▪ Impact of Pressure ▪ Islamic Values ▪ Collaborative Environment



Themes	Subthemes
Working Relations with HOD and Colleagues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transactional Work Relationship ▪ Collaborative Work ▪ Lack of Consultation ▪ Employee Autonomy ▪ Work Align with Expectation ▪ Positive Interpersonal Relations
Leadership Style and satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kind and Polite Personality ▪ Soft Attitude ▪ Negative Interactions ▪ Contentment ▪ Supportive Behavior ▪ Supportive Authority ▪ Collaboration in Decision Making ▪ Verbal Praise

Discussions Qualitative Study

On asking the first question regarding the employees' satisfaction, the respondents said that there are some issues, such as salary and other financial benefits not being received in time, but they are overall satisfied with their job. They do their work honestly as a team member, and they do not observe too much stress level. They are trying to improve their education, obtaining official residence, and other facilities like children's schools and medical facilities are also provided there.

On asking questions about their head of department praising/admiring their work, they said that their head of department seldom praised them on coming early or doing work and guiding the employees on how to do work. When they were asked about the working environment and relations with colleagues and the head of the department, they said about their high satisfaction level as there are supportive colleagues, a flexible work environment, job responsibility assigned, and not facing too much pressure from superior authority.

Conclusion/Discussion

Conclusion of the Study

This research explained how non-academic employees in higher education universities have perceived leadership styles (authoritative leadership style) and employees' job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic factors). Lastly, the report has made a considerable contribution to higher education literature from which scholars, leaders and all other stakeholders will gain information on the relationship between the three variables involved in this study.

Limitation of the Study

The possible limitations are the phenomena of almost every research. These limitations provide the base for future research and should be acknowledged by the researchers. This research has some limitations, which are discussed below.

The population used in this study consisted only of the new campus of Punjab University, which had 300 employees for a closed-ended questionnaire survey and ten interviews for thematic analysis, which is limited to the new campus only. By considering the time limitation, this study is limited to authoritative and laissez-faire leadership styles and intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. Other intervening variables are not considered in this study due to time constraints. Some data was collected by handing over the questionnaire to the higher authority instead of contacting the individuals personally one by one. The number of females is limited, so it is not fully explored.

Implication

The present research provides some practical implications. The leaders, employees and universities can get further help by understanding and maintaining these factors. The leaders of the universities, after

getting knowledge and understanding of these factors (leadership styles and employees' jobs), will be in a position to realize the importance of these factors to get loyalty, enthusiasm, contribution, and praise from their subordinates. The leaders will perform in the organization in a loving manner. The non-academic employees understand the importance of satisfaction with their organizations/universities and also realize the level of their performance. Ultimately, there will come a stage in which the universities will progress at a high speed.

Future Recommendations

The suggestions for future research may be recommended in this area of study as follows,

- To find valid and authentic findings, limitations must be seriously attended to so the hidden dimensions can be uncovered.
- This study could also be conducted in other university campuses and other universities in Pakistan for comparison and contrasting purposes.
- For generalization of the results, the sample size can be extended to get more valid and reliable results.
- The scales should be used in a more regulated environment.

References

- Amin, M. E. (2004). Statistical inference for social science research. Kampala. Makerer University.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19–31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-s](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-s)
- Bedeian, A. G., & Hunt, J. G. (2006). Academic amnesia and vestigial assumptions of our forefathers. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(2), 190–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.12.006>
- Bowditch, J. L., & Buono, A. F. (2001). *A primer on organizational behavior*. 5th ed. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bowman, R. F. (2002). The real work of department chair. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 75(3), 158–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098650209599258>
- Çelik, M. (2011). A theoretical approach to the job satisfaction. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 4(1), 7–172.
- Coats, L. T. (2000). Interpersonal behavior and the community college department chairperson. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 24(10), 773–783. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920050179790>
- Daft, R. L. (2010). *Management*. 9th ed. Mason: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Danish, R., Humayon, A., Shahid, A. U., Ahmad, H. W., & Murtaza, G. (2015). Relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior; a study of employees in national highway authority of Pakistan. *American Journal of Economics*, 1(3), 195–199. <http://www.aiscience.org/journal/paperInfo/ajefm?paperId=736>
- De Merville, B. (2007). Enterprise leadership. *Organization Development Journal*, 25(4), 83–87.
- Erhart, M. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 61–94. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02484.x>
- George, E., Louw, D., & Badenhorst, G. (2008). Job satisfaction among urban secondary-school teachers in Namibia. *South African Journal of Education*, 28(2), 135–154. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v28n2a127>
- Grant, A. M., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). I won't let you down .or will I? Core self-evaluations, other-orientation, anticipated guilt and gratitude, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 108–121. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017974>
- Hamidifar, F. (2014). A study of the relationship between leadership styles and employee job satisfaction at IAU in Tehran, Iran. *AU-GSB e-JOURNAL*, 3(1), 45–58. <http://www.assumptionjournal.au.edu/index.php/AU-GSB/article/view/406>.
- Harrington, C. A. (1996). Nursing facility quality, staffing, and economic issues. *Nursing staff in hospitals and nursing homes: Is it adequate*, 453–502.



- Jensen, J. A. (2006). *Support for innovation in schools: Effects of trust, empowerment and work environment variables* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (1977). Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42(1), 124. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2117735>
- Kiazad, K., Restubog, S. L., Zagenczyk, T. J., Kiewitz, C., & Tang, R. L. (2010). In pursuit of power: The role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(4), 512–519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.06.004>
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "Social climates". *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 269–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366>
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Chicago, IL: RandMcNally.
- Mathew, V. (2010). Service delivery through knowledge management in higher education. *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, 11(3), 1–16. <http://www.tlinc.com/article234.htm>
- Neal, A., & Griffin, M. A. (1999). Developing a model of individual performance for human resource management. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 37(2), 44–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/103841199903700205>
- Northouse, P. G. (2012). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. SAGE.
- Prentice, W. C. H. (2004, January 1). Understanding Leadership. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2004/01/understanding-leadership>
- Prooijen, V. J. & de Vries, R. E. (2016). Organizational conspiracy beliefs: Implications for leadership styles and employee outcomes. *Journal of business and psychology*, 31(4), 479–491. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-015-9428-3>
- Rao, V. K. (2003). *Higher education*. New Delhi, India: A. P. H. Public Corporation.
- Rasool, H. F., Arfeen, I. U., Mothi, W., & Aslam, U. (2015). Leadership styles and its impact on employee's performance in health sector of Pakistan. *University Research Journal*, 5(1), 97–109. <https://www.cusit.edu.pk/curj/Journals/Journal/Jan%202015/Article%2008.pdf>
- Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2001). The transformational-transactional leadership model in practice. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(8), 383–394. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730110410107>
- Sarti, D. (2014). Leadership styles to engage employees: Evidence from human service organizations in Italy. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 26(3/4), 202–216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jwl-09-2013-0066>
- Shibru, B., & Darshan, G. (2011). Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate job satisfaction in leather companies in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Business Management & Economic Research*, 2(5), 284–296. <https://www.ijbmer.com/docs/volumes/vol2issue5/ijbmer2011020501.pdf>
- Shirzad-Kebria, B., & Shabani-Zanganeh, F. (2011). The relationship between leadership style of senior managers. *Educational Administration Research Quarterly*, 2(4), 105–124.
- Taylor, A. M. (2012). *Cultivating an engaged workforce: The roles of leader personality, motivation, and leadership style*. University of South Florida.
- Verma, R. (2002). *Educational administration*. New Delhi: Anmol Publication.
- Wang, H., Tsui, A. S., & Xin, K. R. (2011). CEO leadership behaviors, organizational performance, and employees' attitudes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 92–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.12.009>
- Yao, L., Woan, K. S., & Ahmad, M. H. B. (2017). The relationship between leadership styles and employee engagement: evidences from construction companies in Malaysia. *Medwell Journal, The Social Sciences*, 12(6), 984–988. <http://umpir.ump.edu.my/id/eprint/11194/7/fim-2015-liu-Relationship%20between%20Leadership.pdf>
- Yuliarini, S., Kamariah Nik Mat, N., & Kumar, P. (2012). Factors affecting employee satisfaction among non-teaching staff in higher educational institutions in Malaysia. *American Journal of Economics*, 2(4), 93–96. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.economics.20120001.21>
- Zenger, J., & Folkman, J. (2019). *The new extraordinary leader, 3rd edition: Turning good managers into great leaders* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.