PES
www.ijpes.com
International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies

Leadership and Job Satisfaction: Adjunct Faculty at a For-Profit University

Donald Barnett

Grand Canyon University, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 20.06.2017
Received in revised form 17.07.2017
Accepted 25.09.2017
Available online 30.09.2017

ABSTRACT

There is a lack of research in the for-profit sector of higher education in the United States. Likewise, there is a lack of research on the factors that affect the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty. To address these gaps in knowledge, a quantitative correlational study was performed to investigate the effect of administrative leadership on the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty who teach online classes at a for-profit university in the United States. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, which measures perceived leadership behaviors, and Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey, which measures job satisfaction, were used to anonymously collect data from a sample of 77 adjunct faculty. The Full-Range Leadership, which is composed of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors, was the theoretical model for leadership. Pearson's product moment correlational analyses were performed to investigate the bi-variate relationships between the variables. The dependent variable of total satisfaction had a statistically significant, direct and strong correlation with the independent variable of transformational leadership ($r = .536$, $p < .0005$). The strength and direction of the relationship indicated that increases in the scores of total satisfaction are associated with increases in scores in transformational leadership. Total satisfaction had a statistically significant, indirect and moderate correlation with the independent variable of laissez-faire leadership ($r = -.372$, $p = .001$). The strength and direction of the relationship indicated that lower total satisfaction scores are associated with higher laissez-faire leadership scores. There was no statistically significant relationship between transactional leadership and overall job satisfaction.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, Full-Range Leadership, Adjunct Faculty, For-profit University, Transformational Leadership, Postsecondary Education.

1. Introduction

Enrollments at for-profit universities in the United States have tripled sinced 2000, with close to 1.6 million students registered in in the year 2014 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). This increased enrollment, along with the expansion of online education, has amplified the demand for classes that are taught entirely online (Allen & Seaman, 2016), and produced a need for part time, non-tenured, adjunct, faculty to facilitate these classes (Starcher & Mandernach, 2016). Regardless of the increased use of adjunct faculty to teach online classes, few studies have investigated adjunct development, job satisfaction, or work experiences (Datray, Saxon, & Martirosyan, 2014; Rich, 2015). Likewise, research in the for-profit sector of post-secondary education is sparse when compared to the non-profit sector (Chung, 2012).

Currently, there is little research on the effects of perceived leadership behaviors in post-secondary, for-profit, education on the job satisfaction of online adjunct faculty members in the United States. This study sought to discover if there was a correlation between the perceived use of Full-Range leadership behaviors by administrators in post-secondary education and the overall job satisfaction of adjunct faculty members who teach online classes at a for-profit university in the United States. Bateh and Heyliger (2014) observed that

Corresponding author's address: Grand Canyon University,USA
e-mail: don.barnettjr@yahoo.com
http://dx.doi.org/10.17220/ijpes.2017.03.006

© 2014 International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies (IJPES) is supported by Educational Researches and Publications Association (ERPA)

research should be conducted in the for-profit sector to determine if the job satisfaction of online adjuncts is effected by the bahaviors of administrative leadership because the problems and concerns of for-profit administrators are different than their colleagues in private or public universities. The absence of research on this demographic is significant because a university's faculty is a major contributor to the accomplishment of organizational goals (Machado-Taylor et al., 2016). Likewise, Askling and Stensaker (2002) observed the significance of researching higher education leadership practices.

1.1. Background

For-profit higher education in the United States, while not new, has expanded from less than 100,000 students over 40 years ago (Wilson, 2010) to near 1.6 million by 2014 (National Center for Education Statistic, 2016). Enrollments in the for-profit sector in the United States have increased at 9% each year over the past 30 years, while enrollment in the non-profit sector only posted a 1.5% increase per year over the same time frame (Wilson, 2010). Despite controversies concerning some for-profit schools (Deming, Goldin, & Katz, 2013), the growth potential in the for-profit sector of post-secondary education remains strong, especially in career education , adult education, and online learning (Levy, 2015). Coupled with the expansion of the for-profit sector of post-secondary education is the increased use of part-time non-tenured, or adjunct, faculty members (Gilpin, Saunders, & Stoddard, 2015).

Adjunct faculty typically are part-time employees who serve in a non-permanent capacity. They are non-tenured, temporary, employees of a university who work as independent contractors. Post-secondary institutions pay per course that the adjunct teaches, or sometimes retain their services by yearly appointment (Bradley, 2013). In 2010, adjunct faculty accounted for 50% of all faculty in post-secondary schools in the United States. The use of adjunct faculty has flourished because of economic concerns associated with maintaining faculty (Dailey-Hebert, Mandernach, Donnelli-Sallee, & Norris, 2014; Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015) and the flexibility provided by adjuncts, which is required in online programs (Starcher & Mandernach, 2016). Regardless of the importance of adjunct faculty, many universities do not adequately support their adjunct faculty members (Kezar, 2013a). Generally, adjunct faculty members do not receive raises, and have limited chances for advancement. Health insurance and retirement benefits are scarce, and adjuncts seldom have a voice in university governance (Halcrow & Olson, 2011; Kezar, 2013b; Morton, 2012). Adjunct faculty who teach online classes are especially disconnected from their full-time counterparts (Benton & Li, 2015), and usually rely on other adjunct faculty members for support (Rich, 2015). Despite their importance to academia, adjunct faculty are an overlooked population (Ott & Cisneros, 2015), and little research has been conducted into factors that lead to adjunct faculty job satisfaction (Rich, 2015).

Asking and Stensaker (2002) advocated studying leadership behaviors in higher education. Moreover, Al-Smadi and Oblan (2015) stated that depending on the type of school investigated, there are statistically significant differences in faculty job satisfaction. Despite this, little research examining the correlation between administrative leadership and job satisfaction in higher education has been performed (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016; Kalargyrou, Pescosolido, & Kalagrios, 2012). This research was important because of the need for research on the effect of leadership behaviors on faculty in for-profit universities (Bateh & Heyliger, 2014).

1.2. Literature Review

1.2.1. Full Range Leadership Model. The theoretical foundation for this study was the Full-Range Leadership Model (FRLM), which is composed of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors. Moynihan, Pandey, and Write (2012) observed that the FRLM is one of the best-formulated leadership models. This is true because the three leadership styles examined by the model encompass almost all leadership behaviors exhibited by leaders (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The framework of the FRLM allows researchers to examine the advantages and disadvantages of varying leadership behaviors when investigating administrative leadership in post-secondary education (Asmawi, Zakaria, & Wei, 2013).

Burns (1978) coined the phrases transactional and transformational leadership while investigating the biographies of great political and historical leaders. Bass and Avolio (1993) expanded on Burns' work and developed the FLRM in order to find leadership behaviors that would be effective in non-political organizations. Bass (1985) professed that leaders do not use one exclusive style of leadership. Instead, leaders

could use aspects of transactional and transformational leadership to effectively lead their followers. Recent research indicates a mixture of transactional and transformational leadership displays a positive predictive relationship with faculty job satisfaction (Bateh & Heyliger, 2014).

The FRLM is composed of five facets of transformational leadership, three elements of transactional leadership, and one aspect of laissez-faire leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

1.2.1.1 ***Transformational Leadership.*** The theory of transformational leadership was introduced in a political context by Burns (1978). Critical revisions to the theory were made by Bass (1985) and Avolio and Bass (2004). Since then, the theory of transformational leadership has gone through significant meta-analytic and theoretical examinations (Banks, McCauley, Gardner, & Guler, 2016; van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013. Today, it is one of the most recognizable theories on leadership behavior.

Transformational leadership represents how a leader motivates and inspires their followers to achieve their higher potential (Burns, 1978). This style of leadership is based on encouragement, commendation, acknowledgement, and trust (Mujkić, Šehić, Rahimić, & Jusić, 2014). Transformational leadership addresses the needs of the followers, facilitates follower empowerment, and increases follower effort, efficiency, and satisfaction (Bass, 2000). It is separated into four dimensions that can be distinguished theoretically and empirically Hobman, Jackson, Jimmieson, & Martin (2012). These dimensions include individualized consideration, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation (Northouse, 2013).

1.2.1.1.1. *Idealized Influence*. Omar and Hussin (2013) observed that idealized influence is associated with how a leader is viewed by their subordinates in terms of charisma, confidence, trust, power, consistency, and ideals. Leaders who exhibit idealized influence consider the needs of others before their own, and demonstrate high ethical standards. They are not motivated by personal gain and set challenging, but reasonable, goals for their followers (Northouse, 2013). In order to more accurately describe and measure this dimension, idealized influence has been divided into two different dimensions: Idealized influence (behavioral) and idealized influence (attributed), with the former denoting how the leader behaves and the latter reflecting how the leader is perceived by their followers (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

1.2.1.1.2. *Inspirational Motivation.* Sometimes referred to as inspirational leadership, inspirational motivation entails inspiring and motivating subordinates. Inspirational leaders promote eagerness and confidence in their followers by exhibiting dedication to the organization's goals, communicating high expectations, and making the employee an active part of achieving the vision of the organization (Northouse, 2013). Effective communication of an inspiring and motivating vision is the primary component of inspirational motivation (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999), which inspires subordinates to share in, and be committed to, the organization's vision (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Inspirational leaders foster a climate of trust, which in turn encourages follower loyalty to the organization, even during downturns or crisis situations (Nisar, Rehman, Shah, & Rehman, 2013).

1.2.1.1.3. *Individualized Consideration*. In simple terms, individualized consideration denotes the leader's ability to make their followers feel special (Balyer, 2012). Leaders who display individualized consideration act as advisor and teacher, and strive to nurture their subordinates so they reach their greatest potential (Northouse, 2013). Bass and Avolio (1993) stressed the encouraging facet of individualized consideration and the significance of developing followers. Northouse (2013) emphasized that individualized consideration involves teaching, mentoring, reinforcement, active listening, and offering emotional and social benefaction to the follower.

1.2.1.1.4. *Intellectual Stimulation*. Avolio et al. (1999) stated intellectual stimulation encourages independent and critical thinking by subordinates. Leaders that exhibit intellectual stimulation encourage innovative thinking and the discovery of new ways to complete jobs (Anjali & Anand, 2015). Intellectually stimulating leaders never criticize the ideas of their followers when they are different from their own, and encourage problem solving by providing assignments that are intellectually challenging (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass, 1990).

1.2.1.2. ***Transactional Leadership.*** Burns (1978) devised the expression transactional leadership, which he based on the 1947 work of Max Weber. Transactional leadership can be viewed as an agreement, or exchange. Subordinates are rewarded, with pay or something else that is desired, in exchange for satisfactory performance. Conversely, punishments are denoted for unsatisfactory performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The

basis for transactional leadership is the adage that everything has a price, and leaders define all benefits, codes of discipline, and job duties (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Transactional leadership is composed of two individual facets: management-by-exception and contingent reward.

1.2.1.2.1. *Contingent Reward.* The basis for contingent reward is self-interest. Management motivates employees by offering a set price for their work. Contingent reward ensues when an agreement is made between leader and follower as to the rewards for successful job completion and punishment for sub-standard performance (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Managers understand the needs of the organization, establish clear expectations and goals, and effectively communicate organizational expectations (Bass, 1997).

1.2.1.2.2. *Management-by-exception.* Management-by-exception is separated into two separate facets: active management-by-exception and passive management-by-exception. Management-by-exception (active) occurs when management actively monitors an employee's work performance, taking action before work declines, and intervening if there is a violation of policy (Bass, 1997). This differs from management-by-exception (passive) in that the passive dimension involves the leader taking action only after work deteriorates or a problem occurs. Management-by-exception (passive) often involves negative feedback, correction, criticism, or punishments issued by management (Northouse, 2013). During the refinement of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, which measures the dimensions of the FRLM, management-by-exception (passive) was moved from a transactional dimension to a dimension of laissez-faire, or passive-avoidant, leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

1.2.1.3. ***Laissez-Faire Leadership.*** Laissez-faire leadership is, in essence, the lack of leadership. Laissez-faire leaders do not take action when a correction is needed. They do not offer any assistance to their subordinates and do not provide followers with feedback that could help them reach their full potential (Northouse, 2013). Laissez-faire leaders usually avoid taking any actions, shun responsibility, and are absent when needed (Bass, 1990). Even though laissez-faire leadership is not usually found in entire organizations, it is still seen in the inaction of some members of management (Bateh & Heyliger, 2014).

1.2.2. Job Satisfaction. Locke (1976) viewed job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience" (p. 1300). Job satisfaction is often seen as a multifaceted combination of emotions, values, and the perceptions an individual has about the tasks associated with their job (Chamberlain, Hoben, Squires, & Estabrooks, 2016). Spector (1985) observed that job satisfaction may be viewed as the degree an individual is dissatisfied or satisfied with their job. Moradi, Almutairi, Idrus, and Emami (2013) stated that job satisfaction is a mixture of job characteristics, environment, and personal traits and feelings that are dynamic and, contingent on elements such as a changing of co-workers, supervision, or the structure of the organization, may change over time.

1.3. Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions and Hypotheses. Research on the perceived effect of leadership on the job satisfaction of non-tenured, adjunct faculty members who teach online classes is lacking in the for-profit segment of post-secondary education. Research concerning the effect of leadership on job satisfaction in public and private post-secondary institutions has yielded conflicting results. Bateh and Heyliger (2014) found transformational and transactional leadership behaviors displayed a positive predictive relationship to faculty job satisfaction at a public university in Florida, United States, but laissez-faire leadership produced negative results. Amin, Shah, and Tatlah (2013) found transformational leadership had a positive relationship with job satisfaction. Conversely transactional behaviors yielded a negative relationship to the job satisfaction of lecturers at a university in Pakistan. Masum, Azad, and Beh (2015), in their research on faculty job satisfaction at a private university in Bangladesh, found transactional behaviors yielded a positive relationship with the job satisfaction of lecturers, while transformational leadership had no significant relationship. Given the conflicting findings, the researcher proposes these research questions and null hypotheses:

RQ_1: Does the transformational leadership style of a higher education administrator have a correlation with the overall job satisfaction of online adjunct faculty at a for-profit university in the United States?

$H1_0$: There is no statistically significant correlation between the administrators' transformational leadership style and the job satisfaction of online adjunct faculty at a for-profit university in the United States.

RQ_2: Does the transactional leadership style of a higher education administrator have a correlation with the overall job satisfaction of online adjunct faculty at a for-profit university in the United States?

$H2_0$: There is no statistically significant correlation between the administrators' transactional leadership style and the job satisfaction of online adjunct faculty in a for-profit university in the United States.

RQ_3: Does the laissez-faire leadership style of a higher education administrator have a correlation with the overall job satisfaction of online adjunct faculty at a for-profit university in the United States?

$H3_0$: There is no statistically significant correlation between the administrators' laissez-faire leadership style and the job satisfaction of online adjunct faculty at a for-profit university in the United States.

2. Method

This quantitative study used a correlational design to investigate the relationship, if any, between the leadership style of administrators in a private, for-profit university, as perceived by the adjunct faculty who teach online classes at the same university, and the overall job satisfaction of the same faculty. An examination of the bi-variate relationships between the four variables was performed with a Pearson's product moment correlational analyses. The independent variables were overall transformational leadership, overall transactional leadership, and overall laissez-faire leadership. The dependent variable was overall job satisfaction.

2.1. Sample

The study population consisted of online, non-tenured, adjunct faculty at a private, for-profit, post-secondary school in the United States. After IRB approval, the research site invited 600 prospective participants via email to participate in an online survey. After accepting the invitation, 85 individuals who met the criteria for the study took the survey. Eight individuals did not complete the survey, and their responses were removed. A total of $N = 77$ respondents composed the sample.

2.2. Instruments

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5x (MLQ) and Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) were the instruments used in this study. The MLQ quantifies the nine different dimensions of the FRLM, using 36 total questions that are assessed on a 5-point Likert-type scale. (Avolio & Bass, 2004). George and Mallery (2016) stated a Cronbach's alpha value of .90 or more is deemed excellent, .80-.89 is seen as good, .70-.79 is judged acceptable, .60-.69 is viewed as questionable, .50-.59 is viewed as poor, and less than .50 is deemed unacceptable. Tests performed by Avolio and Bass(2004) found reliabilities of (α = .63) to (α = .92) accross the scales of the MLQ. Garg and Ramjee (2013) discovered the MLQ yielded an average Cronbach's alpha coefficient of (α = .97). For this study, the overall Cronbach alpha values were as follows: transformational leadership (α = .95), transactional leadership (α = .69), and laissez-faire leadership (α = .79). The slightly low Cronbach alpha value for overall transactional leadership was allowed because both dimensions of transactional leadership displayed high Cronbach values, contingent reward (α = .73) and management-by-exception (active) (α = .77). Moreover, the instrumentation has been used extensively and has shown acceptable reliability in similar research and in literature; therefore, all constructs were considered acceptable for use during inferential analysis.

Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) measures nine work factors, using 4 questions for each factor, on a 6-point Likert type scale, for a total of 36 questions. Van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, and Frings-Dresen (2003), in their assessment of 29 different instruments that measured job satisfaction, found the JSS met all reliability and validity criteria, and produced Cronbach alpha values of (α = .60) to (α = .80) across the scales, and an overall Cronbach alpha of (α = .91). For this study, the Cronbach alpha value for overall job satisfaction was (α = .90).

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive data concerning the respondents and other demographic data was not collected for this study. The descriptive analysis for the MLQ and JSS (Table 1) are as follows. The sample rated transactional leadership as the highest perceived overall style of leadership (M = 2.87), followed by transformational leadership (M = 2.85), and laissez-faire leadership (M = 2.79). The respondents perceived the three styles of leadership being used at almost the same frequency, which indicates all three styles were used by administrators. To measure overall job satisfaction, Spector (1997) stated the 36-item scale, which ranges from 36 to 216, should be interpreted as follows: ranges from 36 to 108 indicate dissatisfaction, 109 to 144 indicate ambivalence, and 145 to 216 indicate satisfaction. The overall job satisfaction for this study (M = 116.34) indicates the respondents are ambivalent about their overall job satisfaction, expressing neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction.

Table 1. Measures of Central Tendency for Study Instrumentation Scores (N = 77)

Instrument/Factor	*M*	*SD*	*Mdn*	Sample Range
Transformational leadership	2.85	0.84	2.75	1.00 – 4.75
Transactional leadership	2.87	0.65	3.00	1.25 – 4.00
Laissez-faire leadership	2.79	0.77	2.88	1.38 – 4.63
Total satisfaction	116.34	19.92	115.00	69.00 – 154.00

Note. *M* = Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation; *Mdn* = Median; MLQ = Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; JSS = Job Satisfaction Survey.

3.2. Correlational analysis.

The researcher used Pearson's product moment correlational analyses to examine the bi-variate relationships between the four variables (Table 2). The dependent variable of total satisfaction had a statistically significant, direct and strong correlation with the independent variable of transformational leadership (r = .536, p < .0005). The strength and direction of the relationship indicated increases in the scores of total satisfaction are associated with increases in scores in transformational leadership, and conversely, lower total satisfaction scores were associated with lower transformational leadership scores. Total satisfaction had a statistically significant, indirect and moderate correlation with the independent variable of laissez-faire leadership (r = -.372, p = .001). The strength and direction of the relationship indicated that increases in the scores of total satisfaction were associated with decreases in scores of laissez-faire leadership, and conversely, lower total satisfaction scores are associated with higher laissez-faire leadership scores. There was not a statistically significant correlation between total satisfaction and transactional leadership.

The independent variable of transactional leadership had a statistically significant, direct and moderate correlation with the independent variable of transformational leadership (r = .41, p < .0005). The strength and direction of the relationship indicated that increases in the scores of transactional leadership are associated with increases in scores in transformational leadership, and conversely, lower transactional leadership scores were associated with lower transformational leadership scores. Transactional leadership had a statistically significant, indirect and weak correlation with the independent variable of laissez-faire leadership (r = -.23, p = .043). The strength and direction of the relationship indicated that increases in the scores of transactional leadership were associated with decreases in scores of laissez-faire leadership, and conversely, lower transactional leadership scores were associated with higher laissez-faire leadership scores. There was also a statistically significant indirect and strong correlation between the independent variables of transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership (r = -.65, p < .0005). The strength and direction of the relationship indicated that increases in the scores of transformational leadership were associated with decreases in scores of laissez-faire leadership, and conversely, lower transformational leadership scores were associated with

higher laissez-faire leadership scores. Table 2 presents the correlation coefficients for the Pearson's product moment correlations.

Table 2. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficients (N = 77)

Variable	1	2	3
1. Total satisfaction	---		
2. Transformational leadership	.54**	---	
3. Transactional leadership	-.02	.41**	---
4. Laissez-faire leadership	-.37**	-.65**	-.23*

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

4. Discussion

4.1. Research Question 1

The first question investigated if, and to what extent, the transformational leadership style of the administrator affected the overall job satisfaction of online, non-tenured, adjunct faculty who teach at a for-profit university in the United States. It was hypothesized that overall transformational leadership behaviors would have a significant correlation with overall job satisfaction. The outcome of the Pearson's correlation showed a statistically significant, direct and strong correlation between overall job satisfaction and transformational leadership ($r = .54$, $p < .0005$). The strength and direction of the relationship indicated an increase in the score of total satisfaction is associated with an increase in the score in transformational leadership. Conversely, lower total scores in overall job satisfaction were associated with lower transformational leadership scores. The results denoted there was a significant correlation between transformational leadership style and overall job satisfaction; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The researcher concluded that transformational leadership was beneficial to the overall job satisfaction of online, non-tenured, adjunct faculty at a for-profit university in the United States. This finding is consistent with similar research that found job satisfaction displayed a positive relationship with transformational leadership (Aydin, Sarier, & Uysal, 2013; Banks et al., 2016). The results of this study suggest that administrators in post-secondary for-profit institutions should make use of transformational leadership techniques to enhance the job satisfaction of their followers, although since only one university was researched, it is difficult to generalize the results to similar institutions.

4.2. Research Question 2

The second question sought to discover if the administrators' transactional leadership style affected the overall job satisfaction of online, non-tenured, adjunct faculty who teach at a for-profit post-secondary institution in the United States. The researcher hypothesized overall transactional leadership behaviors would have a significant correlation with overall job satisfaction. The results showed transactional leadership did not have a significantly significant relationship with job satisfaction ($r = -.021$, $p = .855$). The null hypothesis, in this case, was not rejected.

There was not enough evidence to show a statistically significant correlation between the administrator's transactional leadership behaviors and overall job satisfaction. The findings agree with previous research that found transactional leadership to display a statistically insignificant relationship with employee job satisfaction (Amin et al., 2013; Tetteh & Brenyah, 2016), and contradicts previous research that found transactional leadership either advantageous (Aydin et al., 2013; Bateh & Heyliger, 2014; Sakiru et al., 2014) or disadvantageous to employee job satisfaction (Hijazi, Kasim, & Saud, 2016; Saleem, 2015).

4.3. Research Question 3

The third question investigated if the administrators' laissez-faire leadership style affected the overall job satisfaction of online, non-tenured, adjunct faculty who teach at a for-profit university in the United States. The researcher hypothesized overall laissez-faire leadership behaviors would have a significant correlation

with overall job satisfaction. Total satisfaction had a statistically significant, indirect and moderate correlation with the independent variable of laissez-faire leadership (r = -.37, p = .001). The strength and direction of the relationship indicated that higher laissez-faire leadership scores are associated with lower total satisfaction scores, and vice versa. The null hypothesis was rejected.

There was sufficient evidence to denote a statistically significant correlation between the administrator's laissez-faire leadership behaviors and overall job satisfaction. This study confirms recent research, which found job satisfaction had a significant negative relationship with laissez-faire leadership (Dussault & Frenette, 2015; Masum et al., 2015). The findings suggest that administrators should avoid using laissez-faire leadership behaviors in their organization.

5. Conclusion

The findings of this research add to the body of knowledge on leadership and job satisfaction by examining the relatively new demographic of adjunct faculty members who facilitate online classes for a private, for-profit university in the United States. Based on this research, and previous studies, administrators in higher education should make use of transformational leadership to enhance the job satisfaction of their followers. Conversely, administrators should avoid laissez-faire leadership because of its negative correlation with follower job satisfaction. Universities should also incorporate transformational leadership into their leadership development programs. It must be noted that correlation does not equal causation, or even a predictive relationship, but there is sufficient evidence that transformational leadership behaviors are beneficial to job satisfaction in this sample.

Limitations for this study include the fact that only one university was investigated, and the results are not generalizable to other institutions. In the future, it may be advantageous to investigate other, similar, institutions of for-profit higher learning to determine if these results are unique to the organization studied. Secondly, although a quantitative study provided valuable insight into the subject, another suggestion for further research would be to perform a qualitative study to understand faculty motivations and opinions. Third, this study did not examine the various demographic specifics of the sample. Future research could examine if there was a difference between male and female faculty members, or differences in the perceptions of adjunct faculty who teach traditional versus online classes.

Although the results of this study added to the body of knowledge, there is still significant research to be performed in the for-profit sector of post-secondary education. Likewise, the relatively new phenomenon of adjunct faculty who teach only online classes provides ample avenues to investigate their work experiences. Given that online education may expand in the future, understanding factors that affect online instructors work experiences may help universities provide a better learning environment to their faculty and students.

References

Al-Smadi, M. S., & Qbian, Y. M. (2015). Assessment of job satisfaction among faculty members and its relationship with some variables in Najran University. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(35), 117-123.

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2016). *Online report card - Tracking online education in the United States*. Retrieved from Online Learning Consortium: http://onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/onlinereportcard.pdf

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

Amin, M., Shah, S., & Tatlah, I. A. (2013). Impact of principals/directors' leadership styles on job satisfaction on the faculty members: Perceptions of the faculty members in a public university of Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, *7*(2), 97-112.

Anjali, K. T., & Anand, D. (2015). Intellectual stimulation and job commitment: A study of IT professionals. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *14*(2), 28-41.

Askling, B., & Stensaker, B. (2002). Academic leadership: Prescriptions, practices and paradoxes. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *8*, 12-125. doi: 10.1080/13583883.2002.9967073

Asmawi, A., Zakaria, S., & Wei, C. C. (2013). Understanding transformational leadership and R&D culture in Malaysian universities. *Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice*, *15*(3), 287-304. doi:10.5172/impp.2013.2612

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Third Edition Manual and Sampler Set*. Menlo Park, PA: Mind Garden Inc.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, *72*(4), 441-462. doi: 10.1348/096317999166789

Aydin, A., Sarier, Y., & Uysal, S. (2013). The effect of school principals' leadership styles on teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *13*(2), 806-811.

Balyer, A. (2012). Transformational leadership behaviors of school principals: A qualitative research based on teachers' perceptions. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *4*(3), 581-591. Retrieved from http://www.iojes.net/userfiles/Article/IOJES_949.pdf

Banks, G. C., McCauley, K. D., Gardner, W. L., & Guler, C. E. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy. *The Leadership Quarterly*. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.02.006

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass' and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *7*(3), 18-40. doi: 10.1177/107179190000700302

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, *17*(1), 112-121.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

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/i3/rf3

Benton, S., & Li, D. (2015). Professional development for online adjunct faculty: The Chair's role. *The Department Chair*, *26*(1), 1-3. doi: 10.1002/dch.30027

Bradley, P. (2013). Invisible no longer. *Community College Week*, *26*(8), 6-7. Retrieved from http://npaper-wehaa.com/ccweek#2014/05/12/?s=issues

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

Chamberlain, S. A., Hoben, M., Squires, J. E., & Estabrooks, C. A. (2016). Individual and organizational predictors of health care aide job satisfaction in long term care. *BMC Health Services Research*, *16*(1), 1-9. doi: 10.1186/s12913-016-1815-6

Chung, A. S. (2012). Choice of for-profit college. *Economics of Education Review*, *31*, 1084-1101. doi: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2012.004

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associated, Inc.

Dailey-Hebert, A., Mandernach, B., Donnelli-Sallee, E., & Norris, V. (2014). Expectations, motivations, and barriers to professional development: Perspectives from adjunct instructors teaching online. *Journal of Faculty Development*, *28*(1), 67-82.

Datray, J. L., Saxon, D. P., & Martirosyan, N. M. (*20*14). Adjunct faculty in developmental education: Best practices, challenges and recommendations. *Community College Enterprise*, *20*(1), 36-49.

Deming, D., Goldin, C., & Katz, L. (2013). For-profit colleges. *Future of Children*, *13*(1), 137-63. Retrieved from http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:12553738

Dussault, M., & Frenette, É. (2015). Supervisors' transformational leadership and bullying in the workplace. *Psychological Reports: Employment Psychology and Marketing*, *117*(3), 724-733. doi: 10.2466/01.PR0.117c30z2

Eagan, M. K., Jaeger, A. J., & Grantham, A. (2015). Supporting the academic majority: Policies and practices related to part-time faculty's job satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *86*(3), 448-481. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2015.0012

Garg, A. K., & Ramjee, D. (2013). The relationship between leadership styles and employee commitment at a parastatal company in South Africa. *The International Business and Economics Research Journal*, *12*(11), 1411-1436. doi: 10.19030/iber.v12i11.8180

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2016). *IBM SPSS Statistics 23 step by step: A simple guide and reference,* Routledge.

Gilpin, G. A., Saunders, J., & Stoddard, C. (2015). Why has for-profit colleges' share of higher education expanded so rapidly? Estimating the responsiveness to labor market changes. *Economics of Education Review*, *45*, 53-63. doi: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2014.11.004

Halcrow, C., & Olson, M. R. (2008). Adjunct faculty: Valued resource or cheap labor? *Focus on Colleges, Universities, and Schools*, *6*(1), 1-8.

Hijazi, S., Kasim, A. L., & Daud, Y. (2016). Leadership styles and their relationship with the private university employees' job satisfaction in United Arab Emirates. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, *6*(4), 110-124. doi: 10.5296/jpag.v6i4.10347

Hobman, E. V., Jackson, C. J., Jimmieson, N. L., & Martin, R. (2012). The effects of transformational leadership behaviours on follower outcomes: An identity based analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *20*, 553-580. doi: 10.1080/1359432x.2010.490046

Kalargyrou, V., Pescosolido, A. T., & Kalagriros, E. A. (2012). Leadership skills in management education. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, *16*(4), 39-63.

Kezar, A. (2013a). Departmental cultures and non-tenure track faculty: Willingness, capacity, and opportunity to perform at four-year institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(2), 153-188. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2013.0011

Kezar, A. (2013b). Examining non-tenure track faculty perceptions of how departmental policies and practices shape their performance and ability to create student learning at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, *54*(5), 571-598. doi: 10.1007/s11162-013-9288-5

Levy, D. (2015). For-profit versus nonprofit private higher education. *International Higher Education*, *54*, 12-13.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In N. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Machado-Taylor, M. D., Soares, V. M., Brites, R., Ferreira, J. B., Farhangmehr, M., Gouveia, O. M., & Peterson, M. (2016). Academic job satisfaction and motivation: Findings from a nationwide study of Portuguese higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *41*(3), 541-559. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2014.942265

Masum, A. M., Azad, M. K., & Beh, L. (2015). Determinates of academics' job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from private universities in Bangladesh. *Plos ONE*, *10*(5), 1-15. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0117834

Moradi, E., Almutairi, D. O., Idrus, D., & Emami, R. (2013). The influence of organizational learning culture on job satisfaction among academic staff. *Journal of Global Management*, *5*(1), 56-66.

Morton, D. R. (2012). Adjunct faculty embraced: The institution's responsibility. *Christian Education Journal*, *9*(2), 398-407.

Moynihan, D., Pandey, S., & Wright, B. (2012). Setting the table: How transformational leadership fosters performance information use. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *22*, 143-164. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mur024

Mujkić, A., Šehić, D., Rahimić, Z., & Jusić, J. (2014). Transformational leadership and employee satisfaction. *Ekonomski Vjesnik*, *27*(2), 259-270.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_303.10.asp?current=yes

Nisar, M., Rehman, K., Shah, T. A., & Rehman, I. (2013). Significant predictor and outcome of interpersonal trust: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, *7*(9), 671-677. doi: 10.5897/AJBM11.1021

Northouse, P. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Omar, W. A., & Hussin, F. (2013). Transformational leadership style and job satisfaction relationship: A study of structural equation modeling (SEM). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *3*(2), 346-365.

Ott, M., & Cisneros, J. (2015, September 21). Understanding the changing faculty workforce in higher education: A comparison of full-time non-tenure track and tenure line experiences. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *23*(90), 1-28. doi: 10.14507/epaa.v23.1934

Rich, T. (2015). A worthy asset: The adjunct faculty and the influences on their job satisfaction. *To Improve the Academy*, *34*(1/2), 156-170. doi: 10.1002/tia2.20010

Sakiru, O. K., Othman, J., Silong, A. D., Kareem, S. D., Oluwafemi, A. O., & Yusuf, G. O. (2014). Relationship between head of department leadership styles and lecturers job satisfactions in Nigerian public universities. *Asian Social Science*, *10*(6), 138-144. doi: 10.5539/ass.v10n6p138

Saleem, H. (2015). The impact of leadership styles on job satisfaction and mediating role of perceived organizational politics. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *172*, 563-569. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.403

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *13*(6), 693-713. doi: 10.1007/bf00929796

Spector, P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction survey, JSS page. Retrieved from http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jsspag.html

Starcher, K., & Mandernach, B. J. (2016). An examination of adjunct faculty characteristics: Comparison between non-profit and for-profit institutions. *Online Journal of Distance Administration*, *19*(1). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring191/starcher_mandernach191.html

Tetteh, E. N., & Brenyah, R. S. (2016). Organizational leadership styles and their impact on employees' job satisfaction: Evidence from the mobile telecommunications sector of Ghana. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, *4*(4), 12-24.

Van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic-transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *The Academy of Management Annals*, *7*(1), 1-60. doi: 10.1080/19416520.2013.759433

Van Saane, N., Sluiter, J. K., Verbeek, J. H., & Frings-Dresen, M. H. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction - a systematic review. *Occupational Medicine*, *53*, 191-200. doi: 10.1093/occmed/kqg038

Wilson, R. (2010). For-profit colleges change higher education's landscape. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *56*(22), A1-A9.