Research Article https://doi.org/10.12973/eujem.6.2.119

EUJEM

European Journal of Educational Management

Volume 6, Issue 2, 119 - 134.

ISSN: 2642-2344

https://www.eujem.com/

Academic Chairs' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutions in UAE

Elsayed Mahmoud* City University Ajman, UAE

Shashidhar Belbase UAE University, UAE

Negmeldin Alsheikh UAE University, UAE

Received: March 5, 2023 ▪ Revised: May 15, 2023 ▪ Accepted: June 17, 2023

Abstract: This study aims to identify the dominant leadership styles of chairs from the perspective of faculty members in different college departments in higher education in the UAE. Furthermore, the study aims to identify the teachers' perceptions of leadership styles that affect their job satisfaction. The study used quantitative means with faculty members in different higher educational settings in the UAE. The survey used a five-point Likert scale. The leadership styles have values (completely agree =5, agree = 4, neutral =3, disagree=2, completely disagree=1). The job satisfaction questions have values (completely satisfied =5, satisfied = 4, fairly satisfied =3, dissatisfied =2, completely dissatisfied=1). The chosen subjects were faculty members from different colleges. Those subjects are 135 university teachers who are divided into four age groups. The data revealed no dominant leadership styles in the colleagues from faculty members' perspectives; however, the statistics lean towards the laissez-faire leadership style. It also reveals correlations between the three leadership styles and job satisfaction. The democratic leadership style has the greatest impact and most significant environment and incentives among the three independent variables.

Keywords: *Chairs' leadership, job satisfaction, leadership styles, faculty members' perceptions.*

To cite this article: Mahmoud, E., Belbase, S., & Alsheikh, N. (2023). Academic Chairs' leadership styles and Teachers' job satisfaction in higher education institutions in UAE. *European Journal of Educational Management, 6*(2), 119-134. https://doi.org/10.12973/eujem.6.2.119

Introduction

Leadership styles are the essential criteria of successful institutions, and they affect the performance of employees. Bushra et al. (2011) mention that loyalty and hard work of employees is the milestone of successful organizations under the umbrella of committed and loyal managers. Moreover, Bass (1985) reiterates that effective leadership is mandatory for every educational organization to succeed. Therefore, Deans and chairs of colleges shall be familiar with the fact that leadership styles and job satisfaction are challenging to be separable. Yukl (1989) explains that followers who perceive their leaders as effective are more confident in facing challenges and reaching a sufficient level of satisfaction that leads to desired goals. Also, many researchers know that it is the satisfaction that individuals achieve due to performing their assigned duties with high efficiency (Mosadegh Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). As leaders' relationship with their followers is valuable, investigating the reflection of the relationship and its consequences on job satisfaction has become the ultimate goal of this paper. Therefore, this paper will discuss the impact of chairs' leadership styles on instructors' Job satisfaction in Higher Education Institutions in the UAE. Sethibe and Steyn (2015)) revealed a relationship between leadership styles, innovation, and organizational performance.

Despite the faculty members' colossal responsibility, they suffer from two economic statuses, complicated administrative systems, and their chairs' poor leadership styles, which negatively affect their performance towards themselves, their students, scientific research, and social service. Hence, Armstrong and Taylor (2014) highlight extrinsic and intrinsic motivational factors affecting employees' job satisfaction. Research has shifted from traditional views that see leadership from the personality or traits to situation views that see a situation where leadership is practiced along with the characteristics of the leader (Avolio et al., 2009).

Also, Ibara (2010) outlined five factors that determine the leadership style and influence satisfaction: factors related to the size of the institution, factors related to the communications: factors related to the group members led by the leader, factors associated with Goal Congruency, and factors Related to Levels of decision making. Hence, leadership styles and job satisfaction enable faculty members to perform their duties and tasks well in and out of classrooms. Many studies are

* **Corresponding author:**

Elsayed Mahmoud, City University Ajman, UAE. ✉ s.sayed@cu.ac.ae

tackling leadership styles and job satisfaction (Al Murshidi & Al Riyami, 2020; Kiboss & Jemiryott, 2014; Shin & Reyes, 1991; Singh & Luthra, 2018; Whippy, 2000); however, they have not investigated the issue in colleges or universities.

Also, the researchers felt that many organization instructors were frustrated, unconcerned, indolent, and careless with the old management. However, after the administration changed their chairpersons, they became agile, interested, ambitious, and careful. Therefore, job satisfaction and leadership styles may have relationships. Furthermore, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) has supported all elementary and tertiary academic institutions (Saunders & Quirke, 2002). It also tries to improve the workforce's skills and raise the educational accomplishments of its citizens (Al Abed et al., 2005). Hence, this study intends to clarify the effect of leadership styles on faculty members' job satisfaction in higher education institutions in the United Arab Emirates. That is evidenced by achieving a set of goals, which is the application of various leadership styles (democratic, authoritarian, laissez-faire) in higher education institutions and highlighting the prevailing leadership style from the viewpoint of the faculty members.

Devos et al. (1999) conclude that those who had tremendous support from their school board had good performance with job satisfaction; however, those who felt the management did not support them had low job satisfaction, high emotional exhaustion and cynicism score, and low personal accomplishment scores. Hence, choosing the appropriate leadership style for the institution should be carefully considered as it could lead to satisfying or dissatisfying performance and satisfaction. Furthermore, two influential factors are essential for the success of an organization: leadership and job satisfaction of an employee. Employees with high job satisfaction make more effort to perform their assigned tasks and pursue an organization's interests. An organization with high job satisfaction can retain and attract employees with the skills it needs (Mosadegh Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). This valuable and unique study investigates leadership styles and their effect on instructors' job satisfaction in higher educational settings. While doing so, other theories will be discussed. Leadership styles theory and its impact on job satisfaction will be briefly identified; further research studies will be presented with their results, and discussion, conclusion, and implications will be given. This study takes its importance from treating two crucial topics: leadership styles and job satisfaction. Given that the prevailing leadership style affects teachers' job satisfaction and the leader's optimistic outlook toward individual growth, giving, and creativity. That is to say, the importance of this study lies in its focus on leadership styles (democratic, authoritarian, laissez-faire) and department heads' relationship to the job satisfaction of faculty members in higher education institutions because there are not enough studies at the local level. This study will end by answering the following research questions:

1. What are the dominant leadership styles of chairs from faculty members' perspectives in higher education institutes in the UAE?
2. What is the relationship between faculty members' perspectives of their chairs' leadership styles and job satisfaction?

Literature review

The issue of leadership style has received many concerns from thinkers and researchers. Several studies have emphasized the need to pay attention to leadership styles as the success of chairs depends on their use of the appropriate leadership style. Furthermore, this use affects the instructors under his supervision to complete the work and their job satisfaction. Barnová et al. (2022) state that divergent leadership styles—supportive, directive, engaged, frustrated, and intimate—could positively or negatively influence interpersonal relationship quality and the outcomes achievements.

Leadership Styles

The institution's leadership style determines the prevailing organizational climate, which constitutes other factors related to the job satisfaction and commitment of individuals within the organization. Literature shows divergent definitions of leadership. Some see it as assistance to adapt to problems to overcome them. Fullan (2005) defines it as "Leadership is not mobilizing others to solve the problem because they know how to solve, but they help them cope with the problems which are not successfully resolved, p.1" Other definitions tackle it from the human relationship perspective to achieve the desired goals. Daft (2014, p.5) defines it as "[A] relationship between leaders and followers impactful targeting the real changes and outcomes that reflect their common goals. Bass (1990) defines it as "Leadership is often regarded as a critical point of success or failure." Furthermore, Reed et al. 2019 define it as the interaction and relationship established between a leader and his/her team members. That relationship empowers them to accomplish their tasks for the ultimate goals. Therefore, it is seen that if they achieve their goals, they are considered successful employees. Some of them tackle it from a skilled perspective. Hoy and Miskel (2001) define leadership as "[t]he art of transformation of people and organization to improve the organization." Karabina (2016) commentates that leadership sets the task manager and explains and develops a relationship between leaders and instructors, motivating and inspiring them to promote their performance. Therefore, many definitions have termed leadership, but most of them put it as influencing followers (Bass, 2007; Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Karabina, 2016), and all concentrate on achieving the desirable goal (Bass, 2007; Yukl, 2006).

Additionally, Weddle (2012) outlines five levels of decision-making in an organization. The amount of time and the decision-making involvement goes up with each level: The first level signals that the leader centralizes the decision in his

hand and announces it. Such a level needs little time and no team members' participation. Although it is unacceptable in normal circumstances, it is required in emergencies and crises. The second level signals that a Leader collects information from individuals and makes decisions. Here the leader wants to cover the blind areas he has not known. The third level signals that a leader gathers information from his team members and decides. He can do that by meeting with their team members. The fourth level signals that the leader considers themselves a part of the team members, and they vote among them. The final level signals that a leader delegates his team members to decide according to set criteria. Failure to do this, they must reconsider the decision de novo. Leadership styles could be categorized as Laissez-faire, autocratic, and democratic (Bass, 1990; Lewin et al., 1939;). In the following lines, every style will be depicted:

Bhatti et al. (2012) argue that the democratic leadership style concentrates more on people and their positive interactions. Jones et al. (2016) and Raelin (2012) argue that the principles of democratic leadership are friendly, helpful, and encouraging participation. McGregor (2006) adds that this leadership style is participative, kind-hearted, and trusting, resulting in good employee results. The grounded philosophy of the democratic leadership style is that people are equal, influential, and trustworthy. It also supports the team members in achieving the desired goals (Jones et al., 2016). Additionally, Munir and Iqbal (2018) conducted a study identifying the relationship between principals' leadership styles and the job satisfaction of instructors in Women's colleges. They found out that the most dominant leadership style is the democratic one, and it has a positive relationship with job satisfaction. Furthermore, Rai et al. (2020) found a link between Democratic Leadership Style, job satisfaction, and the employees' commitment to the organization.

The autocratic leadership style (AL) gives more attention to performance; however, it offers less attention to human beings. The power is concentrated in the leader's hand, and all communications and activities are done accordingly (Van Vugt et al., 2004). Autocratic leadership assumes that people are naturally inactive, irresponsible, and untrustworthy. In addition, leaving the authority and freedom to employees to accomplish tasks will lead to negative consequences. Further, Likert (1961) recommends top-down management, which employs rewards and punishments. Jung et al. (2014) explain that leaders make decisions and declare them without letting employees participate in such authority because they need to be qualified to practice such a managerial role. Most hypotheses and theorists connect such a leadership style with authoritarian leaders due to its strong positive correlation with authoritarianism (Schuh et al., 2013; Svolik, 2013).

Laissez-fair leadership focuses its attention on the individual working in work performance. However, this leadership style's main focus is neither on the performance of the ance nor the employees because people are unpredictable and difficult to understand. As this type of leadership believes that people cannot be understood, and persons are changeable and uncontrolled, its leaders keep a low profile and can work within any form with no criticism or suggestions (Fiaz et al., 2017). Hence, the leader trusts his team members to accomplish the tasks they like with the procedures they want (Chaudhry & Javed, 2012). Thus, this type of leadership fully trusts the employees as they can care for themselves (Wong & Giessner, 2018).

Additionally, Schwartz (1996) adds that employees' frustration and anger are usual traits in autocratic organizations. Finally, Bouckenooghe et al. (2015) clarify that the evaluation of leaders is grounded on some criteria. Therefore, the autocratic leadership style is the most effective regarding productivity; the democratic leadership style is the best for ethics and work stability.

Job Satisfaction

Faculty members are always required to satisfy their students and superiors. Although that is a complex question to answer, Nazim and Mahmood (2018) concluded in their study that there is a significant relationship between two leadership styles which are transformational and transactional leadership, and job satisfaction. In this study, we will investigate the issue of three leadership styles on the job. Firstly, we need to know what "job satisfaction" per se is. Locke (1976, p. 1304) defines job satisfaction as "[A] pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job and job experience." This definition stresses that job satisfaction occurs according to what he gains tangibly and intangibly. Herzberg et al. (1959) describe job satisfaction as "[A] global concept with intrinsic and extrinsic facets."

In general, Armstrong and Taylor (2014) mention that extrinsic and intrinsic motivational factors affect the employee's satisfaction level at the job. In particular, Darling-Hammond and Youngs (2002) state that some factors affect instructors' job satisfaction and motivate them. They include but are not limited to a safe environment of the school leadership, colleagues' cooperation, parents' involvement, and educational materials. Imber et al. (1990) argue that instructors record more satisfaction at work if they find their leaders sharing information with the team members, allowing them to share the authority and maintain open communications with everyone. Khassawneh et al. 2022 conclude that leaders' openness and transparency have crucial consequences for innovation, creativity, and knowledge sharing.

Additionally, Akhtar et al., 2021 mention that when leader hides information from their subordinates, it has a negative effect on their teams' behaviors. Furthermore, Qiang et al. 2023 argue that a helpful leadership style positively impacts employees' job performance even if they are passive or control-oriented. However, when that does not happen, they record low satisfaction.

On the one hand, Goodlad (1984) discovers that, unlike instructors who seek economic merits, instructors who chose this profession just for professional values scored higher levels of job satisfaction. On the other hand, Hall et al. (1992) discovered that instructors who intended to quit their job expressed less job satisfaction and more negative attitudes Vis-à-vis the profession of teaching and leadership. Betancourt-Smith (1994) added that teachers' job satisfaction is linked with the satisfaction they have with the management (Zigarelli, 1996). More general studies on job satisfaction and commitment have shown that job satisfaction is directly connected to conditions at work. On the top of these criteria is leadership (Spector, 1997). Bogler (2001) summarizes some factors affecting instructors' job satisfaction. One of these factors is instructors' perceptions of their leadership style. Another factor is instructors' perceptions of their leader's decision-making strategies. Also, teachers' occupation perception is one of the factors. Ssesanga and Garrett (2005) add a correlation between job satisfaction and colleagues' behaviors; however, there is a quantitative correlation between job dissatisfaction and promotions and incentives. Furthermore, Singh and Luthra (2018) found a correlation between the type of leadership style and the employees' intentions of resigning. Additionally, Suong and Dao (2019) show that different leadership styles in higher educational institutes impact the academic staff's job satisfaction directly and indirectly. Similarly, Djaelani et al. (2020) find a positive, direct, and significant relationship between spiritual leadership and academic staff's job satisfaction, and their substitutes admire them. Also, Liu et al. (2021) find that there is a moderate and direct correlation between the leadership styles in higher education and the job satisfaction of academic employees. Moreover, Al Murshidi and Al Riyami (2020) found a positive correlation between salary/benefits and career development chances with the employees' tendency to work diligently on their jobs. Gölebakar (2020) find a positive relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. Adiguzel et al. (2020) find a positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction of employees. That is expected as that leader guides and assists his substitutes in achieving their goals. More importantly, Thanh and Quang (2022) find that Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire Leadership Styles have a positive relationship with Employee Engagement.

Methodology

This study aims to identify the impact of leadership styles on higher education faculty job satisfaction. A descriptive research design is used, and a quantitative research approach is utilized to describe the research phenomenon's characteristics. The researcher's survey was administered in different educational settings in the Emirates of the UAE. This section will discuss the instruments, sample, data collection, ethical considerations, and data validity and liability.

Participants

Choosing the samples is crucial in scientific research to generalize the results in the local, regional, and global society. The single sample was faculty members who work in UAE as college faculty members ages below 25 and above. They are also from different nationalities. The total number of the sample is 135 faculty members. The single subjects will be faculty members who are in different colleges. Those subjects are 135 university instructors who are divided into four age groups. The first group is below 25 years, and their frequencies are 22 subjects. The second group is 25-35 subjects, and their frequencies are 11 subjects. The third group is from 35 to 45, and their frequencies are 61 subjects. The fourth group is above 45 years, and their frequencies are 41. Also, they were divided into three groups according to their nationalities: 30 Emiratis, 80 other Arab Citizens, and 25 non-Arab citizens. Also, 79 out of 135 subjects work in the private sector, but 56 out of 135 participants work in the public sector.

Moreover, the subjects are divided into their Emirates as follows: 38 subjects are in Ajman, 18 subjects are in Sharjah, nine subjects are in Dubai, 30 subjects are in Abu Dhabi subjects, two subjects are in Um AlQuain, 20 subjects are in Fujairah, 18 subjects are in Rak. Finally, the subjects are divided into males and females. That is 72 males and 63 females. Table 1 will show the demographic statistics.

Table 1. Demographic Statistics

Measure	Category	Number	Percentage (%)
Age	From 20 -25 years	22	16.3
	From 25 – 35	11	8.1
	From 35-45	61	45.2
	Above 45	41	30.4
Nationalities	Emiratis	30	22.2
	Other Arab Citizens	80	59.3
	Non-Arab Citizens	25	18.5
Institution	Public	56	41.5
	Private	79	58.5
Gender	Male	72	53.3
	Female	63	46.7

Table 1. Continued

Measure	Category	Number	Percentage (%)
	Ajman	38	28.1
	Sharjah	18	13.3
	Dubai	9	6.7
Emirate	Abu Dhabi	30	22.2
	Um AlQuain	2	1.5
	Fujairah	20	14.8
	Rak	18	13.3

This table represents the demographic data of the participants. It shows their age, nationalities, institutions, gender, and which emirate they come from. Their age is divided into four categories, their nationalities are divided into three categories, their institution is divided into two categories, their gender is divided into two categories, and their emirates are divided into seven categories.

Instruments

The first step in the scientific method is observation. It is one of the essential elements of empirical research, so the researcher depends on observing the phenomenon to identify its reasons, rules, and theories.

The second step is the survey, one of the most critical tools for collecting data in quantitative research for analysis. To answer the first question, the researcher created 30 questions in English to identify the dominant leadership styles of chairs from the perspectives of instructors in higher education institutes. The researcher translated the questions into Arabic to be easier for the faculty members who need to learn English to understand and answer them. To answer the second question, the researcher also created 30 questions in English to identify how leadership styles affect instructors' job satisfaction from the perspective of instructors. Again, the researcher translated the questions into Arabic to be easier for the faculty members who need to learn English to understand and answer them.

The survey has been built with closed-ended questions to align with the study requirements. Its structure is based on elements: The first is the personal profile, the second is the leadership styles, and the third is the job satisfaction. Five-scale Likert is utilized in the questionnaire. The leadership stylelues (completely agree =5, agree = 4, neutral =3, disagree=2, completely disagree=1). The job satisfaction questions have values (completely satisfied =5, satisfied = 4, fairly satisfied =3, dissatisfied =2, completely dissatisfied=1).

Data Collection Procedure

To collect the data from the participants, the faculty met the research person in charge in the colleges and submitted the ethical research approval for conducting the study. They initially approved that research could be undertaken in their colleges. The researcher asked the participants to conduct the research at their convenient time. The researcher sent an ethical approval letter to the selected samples via email. He started with the faculty members that work with him in the same university, then other faculty members all over the UAE were contacted. The researcher followed the results via Google Forms.

Ethical Considerations

Can anyone these days think of conducting a study without ethical considerations? Neither can I. As participants are eligible to agree or disagree with participating in the study, the researcher sent all the requirements to the research office to get an ethical approval letter for conducting such a valuable study. Another mandatory consideration is that as long as one of the sample's rights is to keep their data confidential (Milroy & Gordon, 2003), the researcher promised them that their data would never be revealed. As a result, they became more motivated to participate without fear or coercion. Also, he promised to send all the findings to the participants for scientific use.

Validity and Reliability of the Data

To validate the survey, the researcher sent the questions to 12 specialized faculty members (arbitrators) to check the questionnaire's structure, meaning, and objectivity. Although the arbitrators agreed with the questions' objectivity, they gave some remarks on the structure and meaning of some questions. They agree with 93 % of the structure of questions and 98 % of the meaning conveyance. The researcher also considered all of their remarks and modified the questions accordingly.

The pilot study was conducted, allowing us to enhance the quality of our questionnaire. Gudmundsdottir and Brock-Utne (2010) recommended the pilot study as an effective way of scaffolding the percentage of the questionnaire quality.

The initial reliability coefficient for the 60 items in the pilot was 0.87 and was considered acceptable. In this study, the overall reliability of the final survey for the 60 items is 0.945. In detail, the reliability for the leadership style is 0.916 for the 30 items. Moreover, the reliability for job satisfaction is 0.979 for the 30 items. The following table (2) will show the reliability of the leadership styles and job satisfaction:

Table 2. The Reliability of the Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction

Constructs	N	No. of Items	Cronbach's α
Democratic Style	135	10	0.948
Autocratic Style	135	10	0.925
Laissez Fair	135	10	0.938
Environment circumstances	135	5	0.888
Incentives	135	5	0.939
Relations with colleagues	135	5	0.916
Promotion	135	5	0.910
Justice for Employees	135	5	0.948
Supervision Type	135s	5	0.945
Overall Reliability	135	60	0.945

Based on the table, there are three leadership styles: Democratic, Autocratic, and Laissez-Fair. All questionnaires have been answered. Cronbach's α of the democratic style is 0.948. Additionally, Cronbach's α for the autocratic style is 0.925. Furthermore, Cronbach's α for the Laissez-fair is 0.938. That means the reliability percentage is so acceptable.

Job satisfaction is categorized into six categories: Environment circumstances, Incentives, Relations with colleagues, Promotion, Justice for Employees, and Supervision Type. The Cronbach's α for the environmental circumstances is 0.888. Additionally, Cronbach's α for the incentives the participants take is 0.939. Furthermore, Cronbach's α for the relationships with colleagues is 0.916. Moreover, Cronbach's α for promotion at work is 0.948. Finally, Cronbach's α for justice for employees is 0.945. The data reveal that all the percentages are acceptable and could be depended on. The researcher also chose the no-parametric test. The data is not normally distributed, so the non-parametric test has been selected.

Normality Test of all Variables

The average of each sub-scale variable for the leadership styles and job satisfaction was computed. Then, these sub-scale average values were subjected to the normality test using Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests at 0.05 significance levels. The test of normality of independent and dependent variables has been presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Test of Normality for Sub-scale Variables of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction

	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
Variables	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Democratic Style	.164	134	<.001	.863	134	<.001
Autocratic Style	.132	134	<.001	.939	134	<.001
Laissez Faire Style	.141	134	<.001	.912	134	<.001
Environment	.193	134	<.001	.847	134	<.001
Incentives	.187	134	<.001	.861	134	<.001
Coll Relations	.168	134	<.001	.857	134	<.001
Promotions	.147	134	<.001	.891	134	<.001
Justice	.160	134	<.001	.865	134	<.001
CH Relations	.177	134	<.001	.854	134	<.001

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality for the variables in Table 3 revealed that the distribution of the nine variables related to leadership styles and job satisfaction was significantly different from the normal distribution, so these data were not normally distributed ($p < 0.05$). Thus, the researcher utilized the non-parametric tests (e.g., one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, Mann-Whitney U-test, and Kruskal-Wallis test) in the remaining tests.

Analysis and Interpretation

The data collected in this research paper has been analyzed utilizing the IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (IBM SPSS 26). Additionally, the reliability was analyzed by calculating Cronbach's alpha (α) for the scales of this study tool (Questionnaire). For the three independent variables (Leadership styles) and the six dependent variables above (job satisfaction elements), the researcher has decided to perform a non-parametric test according to the normality tests by Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov. Furthermore, a one-Sample Wilcoxon Signed Ranked Test was administered in

this research, too. Also, a Mann-Whitney U test was performed. This test was administered to check the potentially confounding interrelationships among participants' demographic characteristics (gender and institution). The Kruskal-Wallis test was administered on the same track to compare and contrast the statistical differences between two independent samples (nationalities and years of experience). Finally, Spearman's rank correlation analysis was conducted to check whether correlations existed between the nine variables. The regression tests were also administered to find the correlation between the environment and incentives with the independent variables (democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire).

Results

A One-Sample Wilcoxon Signed Ranked test was administered in this research in tables 4 - 12. Also, a Mann-Whitney U test was performed in Tables 13 & 14. This test was administered to check the potentially confounding interrelationships among participants' demographic characteristics (gender and institution). In addition, the Kruskal-Wallis test was administered on the same track to compare and contrast the statistical differences between two independent samples (nationalities and years of experience) in Tables 15 & 16. Finally, Spearman's rank correlation analysis was conducted to check whether correlations existed between the nine variables in Table 17. The regression tests were also administered to find the correlation between the environment and incentives with the independent variables.

One-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank tests

One-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank tests for the independent variables will be presented and described. Table 4 shows the democratic leadership style, table 5 shows the autocratic leadership style, and Table 6 shows the laissez-faire leadership style.

Table 4. One-Sample Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for Democratic Leadership Style (Test Value = 3 from the 5-Point Likert-Scale Items).

Item No.	Item/Variable	N	Test Statistic	Standard Error	Standardized Test Statistic	Asymptotic Sig. (2-Tailed)
1	The chair exerts efforts for the spirit of cooperation to prevail at work.	135	192.0	413.677	-9.828	.000
2	The chair considers the capabilities of his/her team members while distributing responsibilities.	135	210.000	402.360	-9.578	.000
3	The chair involves his/her team members in the work planning.	135	199.500	369.713	-9.279	.000
4	The chair believes that the participation of everyone is the basis for rational decision-making.	135	152.500	411.868	-9.809	.000
5	The chair takes advice suggested by the employees.	135	132.500	392.030	-9.706	.000
6	The manager allows the team members to give opinions.	135	189.000	407.264	-9.672	.000
7	The manager raises the morale of his/her team members.	135	243.000	392.229	-9.419	.000
8	The manager's relationship with his/her team members is based on mutual understanding.	135	137.500	387.800	-9.638	.000
9	The manager helps his/her team to solve their personal problems.	135	344.500	355.718	-8.734	.000
10	The manager delegates some parts of his/her authority to his/her team members.	135	368.500	374.182	-8.878	.000
	Overall Leadership Style (Democratic)	135	120.000	433.583	-9.694	.000

Table 4 shows the results of the one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test for teacher views about democratic leadership style. The results showed that instructors significantly disagreed with the democratic style of the chair. That is to say; they do not feel that chairs are democratic ($z = -9.694$, $p = 0.000 < 0.05$). In detail, faculty members negatively view "the chair's spirit of cooperation" (-9.828). Additionally, they view "The chair considers the capabilities of his/her team members while distributing responsibilities" as significantly negative (-9.578). Furthermore, they view the chair involving his/her team members in the work planning" significantly negatively (-9.279). In addition, they view "The chair believes that participation of everyone is the basis for reasonable decision making" as significantly negative (-9.809). Also, they view "advice suggested by the employees" as significantly negative (-9.706).

On the same track, they view "allowing opinions) as significantly negative (-9.672). Similarly, they view "raising morale" as significantly negative (-9.419). Similarly, they view "mutual understanding" as significantly negative (-9.638). Last but not least, they view " solving their problems" significantly negative (-8.734). Finally, "delegating some of his authorities" significantly negative (-8.808). These results indicate that teachers generally feel that their chairs are not practicing democratic leadership styles in their institutions.

Table 5. One-sample Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for Autocratic Leadership Style (Test Value = 3 from the 5-point Likert-Scale Items).

Item No.	Item/Variable	N	Test Statistic	Standard Error	Standardized Test Statistic	Asymptotic Sig. (2-Tailed)
11	The manager cares more about work-related issues than his/her team members' needs.	135	2070.000	371.151	-4.530	<.001
12	The manager follows up on the absenteeism of employees strictly without considering employees' conditions.	135	2376.000	342.837	-2.966	.003
13	The manager specifies sufficient time to discuss work-related issues.	135	2091.500	381.636	-4.673	<.001
14	The manager at work cares about quantity without caring about quality.	135	2865.000	350.082	-1.844	.065
15	The manager controls everything in his/her hand.	135	2057.500	324.773	-3.235	.001
16	The manager takes decisions only by himself.	135	2177.000	337.533	-3.260	.001
17	The manager is concerned with achieving business goals without consideration of human factors.	135	2210.000	310.826	-2.358	.018
18	The manager is ONLY tolerant of his/her opinions, but he considers the exchange of opinions a waste of time.	135	2873.000	333.114	-1.214	.225
19	The manager ensures that the work is carried out according to the instructions.	135	1906.500	339.180	-4.212	<.001
20	The manager is not tolerant of other people's mistakes.	135	2652.500	328.268	-1.730	.084
	Overall Leadership Style (Reversed to Autocratic)	135	2996.500	443.778	-3.288	.001

Table 5 shows the results of the one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test for teacher views about autocratic leadership style. The results showed that faculty members significantly agreed with the autocratic style of the chair. That is to say, they feel that chairs are autocratic ($z = -3.288$) $p = 0.001 < 0.05$); as for items 11- 20, they seemed to disagree with most of them, and hence the overall leadership style represents autocratic. In detail, faculty members view "caring about work-related issues" as significantly negative (-4.530). Additionally, they view "following up absenteeism" as significantly negative (-2.966). Furthermore, they view "sufficient time" as significantly negative (-4.673). In addition, they view "caring about quantity without quality." negatively (-1.844), but it is not significant. Also, they view "controlling everything" significantly negatively (-3.235). Similarly, they negatively view "taking decisions only by himself" (-3.260). Also, they view "achieving goals without consideration to human factors" negatively (-2.358), but it's not significant. They also negatively view "only tolerant of his opinions" (-1.214), which is not significant. Last but not least, they negatively view "ensure the work is carried out according to the instructions" (-4.212). Finally, they negatively view "he is not tolerant of mistakes" (-1.730), but it is not significant. With all these results, it is clear that the teachers view that their chairs' leadership styles are generally guided by autocratic style.

Table 6. One-sample Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for Laissez-Faire Leadership Style (Test Value = 3 from the 5-Point Likert-Scale Items).

Item No.	Item/Variable	N	Test Statistic	Standard Error	Standardized Test Statistic	Asymptotic Sig. (2-Tailed)
21	The manager does not recognize scientific criteria in nominating his/her team members to a higher level.	135	2527.000	332.309	-2.087	.037
22	The manager frequently allows workers to go out for personal issues during work.	135	2677.000	305.603	-.870	.384
23	Every team member is fanatic about only his/her personal opinion for work-related situations.	135	2501.500	295.900	-.950	.342
24	The manager makes general remarks to his/her team members without following them up.	135	2574.500	311.661	-1.357	.175
25	The manager tends to evade his/her responsibilities.	135	2958.000	319.280	-.470	.638
26	The manager depends on his/her team members to evaluate their performances.	135	2892.500	322.749	-.841	.400
27	The manager does not have a specific workflow policy.	135	2932.500	334.937	-1.030	**.303**
28	The manager gives all his/her administrative authority to all the employees.	135	2861.000	325.341	-.931	.352
29	The manager is passive in solving work problems.	135	3173.000	342.212	-.643	.520
30	The manager does not care about any criticism levelled at him.	135	3333.500	335.986	-.004	.996
	Overall Laissez Faire Style	135	4226.000	433.170	-.224	.823

Table 6 shows the results of the one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test for teacher views about Laissez fair leadership style. The results showed that faculty members neither agreed nor disagreed with the Laissez fair style of the chair ($z = -.224$, $p = 0.823 > 0.05$). While observing the results for each item in this leadership style, the result for the first item, "The manager does not recognize scientific criteria in nominating his/her team members to a higher level" ($z = -2.087$, $p = 0.037 < 0.05$) shows that faculty members have positive perceptions about manager's use of scientific criteria in nominating them in the higher responsibilities. Likewise, the faculty members agreed upon their managers having a specific workflow policy, following up faculty members for their general remarks, caring about their responsibility (without evading them), having a proper workflow policy, being active in solving work-related problems, and caring about any criticism; however, these results are not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). The faculty members seem to slightly disagree with their manager's role in allowing them to go out for personal issues during the work, team members' roles, dependency on team members for the evaluation of their performance, and delegating authority, although statistically not significant ($p > 0.05$).

Also, they view "evade his responsibility" negatively (-.470), but it is not significant. Similarly, they view "depending on his team members) negatively (-.841), but it is not significant. Also, they view does not have specific workflow policy" negatively (-1.030), but it is not significant. They also view "gives his administrative authority" as negative (-.931), but it is not significant. Last but not least, they view "Passive in solving work problems" negatively (-.643), but it is not significant. Finally, they do "not care about any criticism (-.004, but it is not significant. The instructors could view the three leadership styles negatively, but statistics lean toward the third leadership style, "Laissez Fair Style." Hence, in general, the teachers' views showed that their chair's leadership style could not be agreed upon or disagreed upon Laissez Fair style.

One-Sample Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Tests for Dependent Variables

One-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank tests for two dependent variables will be presented and described. Table seven will present the one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test for the environmental factor, whereas Table eight will present the one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test for the incentives.

Table 7. One-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test for the environment factor related to Job Satisfaction (test value = 3 from the 5-point Likert-scale items).

Item No.	Item/Variable	N	Test Statistic	Standard Error	Standardized Test Statistic	Asymptotic Sig. (2-Tailed)
1	It is easy to get to and from work.	135	208.500	379.537	-9.497	.000
2	I think the working hours are appropriate to the needs of the business and the individual	135	418.000	383.647	-8.849	.000
3	I feel the physical conditions, such as (ventilation, lighting, and heating) are suitable in my workplace.	135	209.000	386.479	-9.486	.000
4	I believe in the sufficiency of the capabilities needed to do my job perfectly.	135	112.000	401.846	-9.835	.000
5	I see that the work requirements are clear and understandable.	135	353.000	392.707	-9.128	.000
	Environment	135	98.000	436.907	-9.821	.000

Table 7 shows the results of the one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test for teacher views about the environmental factor of job satisfaction. The results showed that faculty members significantly disagreed with the environmental factor. That is to say; they do not feel it is comfortable (z = -9.821) p = 0.000 < 0.05). In detail, faculty members' view of "easily getting to and from work" is significantly negative (-9.497). Additionally, they negatively view "working hours" (-8.849). Furthermore, they negatively view "physical conditions" (-9.486). In addition, they view "sufficiency" negatively (-9.835). On the same track, they view "work requirements) significantly negative (-9.128).

Table 8. One-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test for the incentive factor related to Job Satisfaction (test value = 3 from the 5-Point Likert-Scale Items).

Item No.	Item/Variable	N	Test Statistic	Standard Error	Standardized Test Statistic	Asymptotic Sig. (2-Tailed)
6	The incentives are commensurate with performance.	135	1000.500	383.466	-7.334	<.001
7	I feel the fairness of incentive systems.	135	1249.500	383.567	-6.683	<.001
8	The annual incentive represents a moral incentive to increase my productivity.	135	970.500	391.571	-7.577	<.001
9	I feel that the rewards given to me are appropriate.	135	1170.500	379.029	-6.810	<.001
10	I feel that my salary does not allow me to exceed the job requirements.	135	892.500	365.218	-7.331	<.001
	Overall Incentives	135	957.000	433.105	-7.772	<.001

Table 8 shows the results of the one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test for teacher views about the incentives factor of job satisfaction. The results showed that faculty members significantly disagreed with the incentives factor. That is to say; they do not feel it is comfortable (z = -7.772) p = 0.001 < 0.05. In detail, faculty members significantly negatively view "Incentives commensurate" (-7.334) p = 0.001 <.05. Additionally, they view "Fairness" significantly negatively (-6.683) p = 0.001 <.05. Furthermore, they negatively view “annual incentives” (-7.577) p = 0.001 <.05. In addition, they view "rewards" Significantly negatively (-6.810 p = 0.001 <.05). Also, they view "salary" significantly negatively (-7.331) p = 0.001 <.05.

Variables Correlations and Regressions

Spearman’s bivariate rank correlation between variables is presented and described in Table 17 to identify the correlations between the variables. Also, to know the regressions between variables, the regression test is shown and described in Table 18.

Table 9. Non-Parametric Correlations (Spearman's Bivariate Rank Correlations between Variables)

Variables		Demo.	Auto.	Laissez	Env.	Inc.	Coll-relation	Pro.	Justice	Ch. Relation
Democratic Style	Correlation Coefficient	-								
	Sig. (2-tailed)									
Autocratic Style	Correlation Coefficient	-.218*								
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011								
Laissez Fair	Correlation Coefficient	-.159	.750**							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.066	<.001							
Env	Correlation Coefficient	.648**	-.157	-.138						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.068	.111						
Inc	Correlation Coefficient	.636**	-.204*	-.182*	.834**					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.018	.034	<.001					
Coll-relation	Correlation Coefficient	.578**	-.163	-.152	.694**	.679**				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.059	.079	<.001	<.001				
Promotion	Correlation Coefficient	.600**	-.253**	-.254**	.635**	.759**	.761**			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.003	.003	<.001	<.001	<.001			
Justice	Correlation Coefficient	.595**	-.280**	-.217*	.700**	.705**	.671**	.823**		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.001	.012	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		
Ch. Relation	Correlation Coefficient	.607**	-.293**	-.213*	.669**	.648**	.662**	.787**	.882**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	.013	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	

All study variables were not distributed normally, so Spearman's rank correlations have been administered to check the association between these variables that shall not be construed as cause-and-effect relationships. The results of rank correlation analysis showed that the democratic leadership style had the most significant association with the environment (r=.648, p<.001) and it is significant at the 0.01 level; however, it had the least association with colleagues relations (r= .578, p=.001<.05) and it is significant at the 0.01 level. Also, rank correlation analysis showed that the autocratic leadership style had a negative impact on the environment (r=-.157, p=068>.05), and it is not significant. It had a negative association with the chair relationship (r=-293, p=.001 <.05), and it is significant at the 0.01 level. Additionally, rank correlation analysis showed that the laissez-faire leadership style had a significant negative association with the work environment, sense of inclusiveness, collegial relationship, justice, and overall relation with the chairs ($p < 0.05$) (Table 9).

Discussion

Because leadership styles have essential roles in educational institutions, the researcher aimed to explore the leadership styles of chairs on faculty members' job satisfaction. The researcher used the descriptive correlative method to achieve the study's goals. In this qualitative study, the 60-question survey has been utilized and quantitatively analyzed. Cronbach's α of the democratic style is 0.948. In addition, Cronbach's α for the autocratic style is 0.925. Further, the Cronbach's α for laissez-faire is 0.938. For job satisfaction, Cronbach's α for the environmental circumstances is 0.888. Additionally, Cronbach's α for the incentives is 0.939. Furthermore, Cronbach's α for the relationships with colleagues is 0.916. Moreover, Cronback's α for promotion at work is 0.948. Finally, Cronbach's α for justice for employees is 0.945. The data reveal that all the percentages are acceptable and considered reliable. Administering the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality for the variables, the data were not normally distributed ($p<.0.05$); therefore, the researcher applied the non-parametric tests in the research study.

To answer the first question**:** What are the dominant leadership styles of chairs from faculty members' perspectives in higher education institutes? One –sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test was applied to identify the instructors' views about the democratic leadership style. The data revealed that they disagreed with this leadership style (z= - 9.694), which was significant. Hence, it is not the dominant leadership style. Also, a one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test was applied to identify the researchers' views about the autocratic leadership style. The data revealed that they disagreed that this leadership style (z= - 3.288) was significant. Hence, it is also not the dominant leadership style.

Furthermore, a one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test was applied to identify the instructors' views about the laisses-fair leadership style. The data revealed that they disagreed with it (z= -224), which is insignificant. Therefore, it could be seen that the instructors negatively view the three leadership styles, but statistics lean vis-à-vis the third leadership style, "Laissez Fair Style ."This result contradicts (Kiboss & Jemiryott, 2014; Machumu & Kaitila, 2014; Munir & Iqbal, 2018), who concluded that the dominant leadership type in their studies is the democratic leadership style. It also contradicts the results of Awan and Mahmood (2010), who found that the most dominant leadership type in university libraries in Pakistan is the autocratic style. It also contradicts the results of Achimugu and Obaka (2019), who found that autocratic leadership was the dominant leadership type among the three types utilized by senior secondary school principals in Nigeria. However, it agrees with Al-Nairab (2003) that no dominant leadership style exists. However, this study somewhat leans towards the laissez-faire leadership style. That means, in most cases, the chairs give freedom to their employees in doing their tasks. They also try to fairly support, guide, and train them once needed. In addition, they trust their employees to finish their tasks with forgiveness for their mistakes. It is seen that these leaders consider the results without much interference in the given tasks. It is seen that this type of leadership is pragmatically acceptable and beneficial to all sides if it is fully administered.

For job satisfaction factors, one-sample Wilcoxon signed test was to identify the instructors' views about the environment; the data revealed that instructors disagreed with the environmental factor and were uncomfortable with it (z=-9.821), which is significant. Additionally, a one-sample Wilcoxon signed test was used to identify the faculty members' views about the incentives. The data revealed that instructors disagreed with the incentives factor and were uncomfortable with it (z= -7.772), which is significant. Furthermore, a one-sample Wilcoxon signed test was to identify the instructors' views about the colleagues' relationship; the data revealed that faculty members disagreed with the colleagues' relationship factor, so they were uncomfortable with this factor (z= - 9.245) and its significance. Also, a one-sample Wilcoxon signed test to identify the faculty members' views about the promotions revealed that faculty members disagreed with the promotions factor, so they are uncomfortable with this factor (z= -8.269); it is significant. In the same track, a one-sample Wilcoxon signed a test to identify the faculty members' views about justice; the data revealed that faculty members disagreed with the justice factor and were uncomfortable with it (z= - 8.463), which is significant. Finally, a sample Wilcoxon signed a test to identify the faculty members' views on chair supervision. The data revealed that faculty members disagreed with the chair supervision factor, so they were uncomfortable with this factor (z=-8.693); it is significant.

For question two, to know the non-parametric correlations between the independent and dependent variables, non-parametric Spearman's Bivariate rank correlations have been administered to check the association between the independent variables (Three Leadership Styles) and dependent variables (Six Job Satisfaction Factors). The data revealed that the democratic leadership style had the most significant association with the environment (p=.648, p<.001), and it is significant at the 0.01 level; however, it had the least association with colleagues' relationships (p = .578 ; p = .001 < .05) and it is significant. In addition to this, the data revealed that laissez-faire leadership style had the most significant impact on the environment (p= -.138 p = .111 <.05), and it is not significant; however, it had the least correlation with promotions (p = - .254, p = .003 < .05) and it is significant at the 0.01 level. Based on the literature (Adiguzel et al., 2020; Akhtar et al., 2021; Al Murshidi & Al Riyami, 2020; Armstrong & Taylor, 2014; Betancourt-Smith, 1994; Bogler, 2001; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Fiaz et al., 2017; Goodlad, 1984; Gölebakar, 2020; Hall et al., 1992; Imber et al., 1990; Khassawneh et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2021; Munir & Iqbal, 2018; Nazim & Mahmood, 2018; Qiang et al., 2023; Rai et al., 2020; Singh & Luthra, 2018; Suong & Dao, 2019; Spector, 1997; Thanh & Quang, 2022; Zigarelli, 1996) there is a positive relationship between leadership styles and the job satisfaction. More specifically, the data reveals a significant relationship between the democratic leadership style and the environment, which is one of the criteria of job satisfaction in this study; hence, the more positive environment, the more satisfied the faculty members are. In other words, a toxic environment could make the employees dissatisfied and might leave the work. This result is supported by Munir and Iqbal (2018), and Rai et al. (2020). Also, it is seen that it is the best leadership style for the employees' ethics and work stability, and that is supported by Bouckenooghe et al. (2015).

Conclusion

This research highlights three leadership styles: Democratic, Autocratic, and Laissez-faire. Every leadership style has its unique characteristics. For the first question, the study reveals that the dominant leadership style is autocratic in these educational settings in the UAE. Finally, there are correlations between independent and dependent variables. That is to say, the teachers feel that the democratic leadership style can have the most significant association with the work environment followed by inclusive practices; however, it had the least association with colleague relationships. Therefore, the democratic style may positively influence an exemplary environment in educational settings, colleges, institutions, and universities. Furthermore, when the autocratic style does not contribute because there are negative associations with all other factors of environment, inclusiveness, sense of justice, and relationship with the chair. When laissez-faire is associated with these environmental factors, they are also not positively associated with the environmental factors in the workplace. Therefore, the study concludes that the democratic style significantly impacts the environment- one job satisfaction criterion. It also reveals that the impact of the democratic style on the incentives is positive; however, the impact of autocratic and lasses-fair leadership styles on incentives is negative.

Implications

Some implications should be considered in the educational settings of higher education in the UAE. One of these considerations is that criteria, standards, and regulations have to be considered while appointing department chairs, including but not limited to leadership style, professionalism, educational levels, gender, and age. In addition, planners, leaders, and top management of educational institutions in the UAE must provide the chairs with leadership training courses to familiarize them with the most significantly positive leadership styles and their impacts on the faculty members. It will also familiarize them with choosing the best practices, positively influencing the instructors' job satisfaction and performance. Another point to consider is that leaders of educational institutes have to open channels between chairs and instructors and find formal and informal meetings between them. These will be done by building trust and providing support to them.

Recommendations

In light of the results of this research, the researchers present several recommendations that they hope will be beneficial to the chairs of departments in the educational institutions in the UAE in particular and in other countries in general, as follows:

1- Departments Chairs should have state-of-the-art theoretical knowledge of leadership skills that enable them to use appropriate leadership styles to lead faculty members. That could happen by attending leadership workshops, seminars, training courses, and conferences. Most of them are available ubiquitously.

2- The organization's decision-makers should consider the criteria and conditions for appointing department heads according to the light of the study, such as seniority, occupation, educational level, gender, and age.

3- Higher education settings should increase attention and focus on the satisfaction of faculty members because of its potential relation with fulfilling the employees' requirements, which would raise the degree of their satisfaction with work and thus increase their productivity, which achieves their organization's objectives and goals. Also, their job satisfaction will enhance their class management.

4- Universities should organize a research environment considering the leadership styles and their relations with employees. That will let them consider the best application to the research topic in the organization first.

5- Opening communication channels between the heads of departments and their direct faculty members and creating a periodic forum that gathers the two categories to achieve the institution's and subordinates' objectives. That also could be done by building trust with them and then conducting surveys to faculty members on their job satisfaction.

6 - Educational institutions should increase the level of expertise of their leaders through recognition direct on the experiences of educational institutions in different local and international settings.

7 - This study recommends that the leadership in the institution under study be keen to follow the leadership style democratically because it promotes performance and raises productivity.

This study quantitatively tried to tackle the dominant leadership style among three household leadership styles and their effects on job satisfaction; however, researchers in the futuristic research could add more leadership styles: Visionary Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Charismatic Leadership, and Transformational Leadership. Another point is that they could explore this topic through mixed-method research, as the qualitative results could strengthen the quantitative results. Furthermore, they should integrate public and private schools with a bigger sample to make the results more authentic. Moreover, the chairs and higher management should consider having more than one leadership style to be used at different times. They will then be able to adapt to the changes over time. For example, in a crisis, employees need a stricter leadership style.

Limitations

There are some limitations of this research. First, the sample of this research is limited as it is derived from higher education institutions. If the study had integrated more educational institutes, it would have included more participants, as the samples are just 135 faculty members. Secondly, this study only focused on different higher education institutions; however, the research should have integrated public and private schools throughout the UAE because they could add value to the research. Finally, according to the time constraint, the researcher needed to increase the number of educational institutions. Hence, we suggest other researchers apply it to private and public colleges, institutes, and schools.

Statement and Declaration

I) Ethical approval: The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of United Arab Emirates University (protocol code *ERS_2022_8486* and date of approval April 19, 2022).

II) Funding details (if any): The study received no funding from any institution.

III) Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest in publishing this article.

IV) Availability of data and materials: The data for this study can be made available upon request.

Authorship Contribution Statement

Mahmoud: Finding topic-related articles, conceptualization, design, writing, brainstorming ideas, and creating all sections. Belbase: Methodological supervision. Alsheikh: Proofreading, research design supervision, references supervision.

References

Achimugu, L., & Obaka, H. P. (2019). Influence of Principals' leadership styles on senior secondary school students' achievement in chemistry. *Science Education International*, *30*(2), 92-96. https://doi.org/10.33828/sei.v30.i2.2

Adiguzel, Z., Ozcinar, M. F., & Karadal, H. (2020). Does servant leadership moderate the link between strategic human resource management on rule breaking and job satisfaction? *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, *26*(2), 103-110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2020.04.002

Akhtar, M. W., Karatepe, O. M., Syed, F., & Husnain, M. (2021). Leader knowledge hiding, feedback avoidance, and hotel employee outcomes: A moderated mediation model. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 34*(2), 578–600. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-04-2021-0545

Al Abed, I., Vine, P., & Hellyer, P. (2005). *United Arab Emirates yearbook 2005*. Trident Press Ltd.

Al Murshidi, G., & Al Riyami, R. (2020). Emiratisation policy: Factors affecting job satisfaction and intentions to continue jobs in the public sector. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, *14*(1), 1043–1057. https://bit.ly/3Nxp5kJ

Al-Nairab, A. M. A. (2003). *Leadership patterns of Palestinian university faculty members in the northern governorates of the West Bank as perceived by faculty members and students* [Doctoral dissertation, An-Najah National University]. An-Najah National University. https://bit.ly/3pbzB83 [In Arabic]

Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2014). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (13th ed.). Kogan Page Publishers.

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 421-449. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621

Awan, M. R., & Mahmood, K. (2010). Relationship among leadership style, organizational culture and employee commitment in university libraries. *Library Management*, *31*(4/5), 253–266. https://doi.org/10.1108/01435121011046326

Barnová, S., Trelová, S., Krásna, S., Beňová, E., Hasajová, L., & Gabrhelová, G. (2022). Leadership styles, organizational climate, and school climate openness from the perspective of Slovak vocational school teachers. *Societies, 12*(6), Article 192. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc12060192

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.

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

Bass, B. M. (2007). Concepts of leadership. In R. P. Vecchio (Ed.), *Leadership: Understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organizations* (pp. 3–22). University of Notre Dame Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvpg85tk.6

Betancourt-Smith, M. (1994). *Professional attrition: An examination of minority and nonminority teachers at-risk* (ED 388639). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED388639.pdf

Bhatti, N., Maitlo, G. M., Shaikh, N., Hashmi, M. A., & Shaikh, F. M. (2012). The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style on job satisfaction. *International Business Research*, *5*(2), 192-201. https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v5n2p192

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational administration quarterly*, *37*(5), 662–683. https://doi.org/10.1177/00131610121969460

Bouckenooghe, D., Zafar, A., & Raja, U. (2015). How ethical leadership shapes employees' job performance: The mediating roles of goal congruence and psychological capital. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *129*, 251-264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2162-3

Bushra, F., Usman, A., & Naveed, A. (2011). Effect of transformational leadership on employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment in banking sector of Lahore (Pakistan). *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *2*(18), 261–267. https://bit.ly/42IfD2C

Chaudhry, A. Q., & Javed, H. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez-faire leadership style on motivation. *International Journal of Business and social science*, *3*(7), 258–264. https://bit.ly/3PBHuP9

Daft, R. L. (2014). *The leadership experience* (6th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher*, *31*(9), 13–25. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X031009013

Devos, G., Verhoeven, J. C., Beuselinck, I., Van den Broeck, H., & Vandenberghe, R. (1999). *De rol van schoolbesturen in het schoolmanagement* [The role of school boards in school management]. Garant.

Djaelani, A. K., Sanusi, A., & Triatmanto, B. (2020). Spiritual leadership, job Satisfaction, and its effect on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Management Science Letters, 10*, 3907-3914. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.7.020

Fiaz, M., Su, Q., Ikram, A., & Saqib, A. (2017). Leadership styles and employees' motivation: Perspective from an emerging economy. *The Journal of Developing Areas, 51*(4), 143–156. https://doi.org/10.1353/jda.2017.0093

Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership & sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Corwin Press.

Gölebakar, S. (2020). *The relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction in multinational companies: The role of power distance in German and Turkish national cultures* [Master's thesis, Marmara University]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi [National Thesis Center]. https://bit.ly/3Nc6gCt

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school. Prospects for the future*. McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Gudmundsdottir, G. B., & Brock-Utne, B. (2010). An exploration of the importance of piloting and access as action research. *Educational Action Research*, *18*(3), 359-372. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2010.499815

Hall, B. W., Pearson, L. C., & Carroll, D. (1992). Teachers' long-range teaching plans: A discriminant analysis. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *85*(4), 221–225. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1992.9941119

Herzberg, F., Mausner, R. O., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2001). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (6th ed.). McGraw Hall.

Ibara, E. C. (2010). *Perspectives in educational administration*. Rodi Printing and Publishing.

Imber, M., Neidt, W. A., & Reyes, P. (1990). Factors contributing to teacher satisfaction with participative decision making. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, *23*(4), 216–225.

Jones, S. S., Jones, O. S., Winchester, N., & Grint, K. (2016). Putting the discourse to work: On outlining a praxis of democratic leadership development. *Management Learning*, *47*(4), 424–442. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507616631926

Jung, Y., Jeong, M. G., & Mills, T. (2014). Identifying the preferred leadership style for the managerial position of construction management. *International Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *3*(2), 47–56. https://doi.org/10.5923/j.ijcem.20140302.02

Karabina, M. (2016). The impact of leadership style to the teachers 'job satisfaction. *European Journal of Education Studies, 2*(3) 80–94. http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.60881

Khassawneh, O., Mohammad, T., & Ben-Abdallah, R. (2022). The impact of leadership on boosting employee creativity: The role of knowledge sharing as a mediator. *Administrative Sciences, 12*(4), Article 175. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12040175

Kiboss, J. K., & Jemiryott, H. K. S. (2014). Relationship between principals' leadership styles and secondary school teachers' job satisfaction in Nandi South District, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, *3*(2), 493-509. https://bit.ly/3JjmKYa

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

Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management.* McGraw-Hill.

Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Gümüş, S. (2021). The effect of instructional leadership and distributed leadership on teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction: mediating roles of supportive school culture and teacher collaboration. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 49*(3), 430–453. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220910438

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1343). Rand McNally College Pub. Co.

Machumu, H. J., & Kaitila, M. M. (2014). Influence of Leadership Styles on Teachers' Job Satisfaction: A Case of Selected Primary Schools in Songea and Morogoro Districts, Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, *6*(4), 53-61. https://doi.org/10.5897/IJEAPS12.036

McGregor, D. (2006). *The human side of enterprise, annotated edition*. McGraw Hill Professional.

Milroy, L., & Gordon, M. (2003). *Sociolinguistics: Method and interpretation* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Mosadegh Rad, A. M., & Yarmohammadian, M. H. (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services, 19*(2), 11–28. https://doi.org/10.1108/13660750610665008

Munir, H., & Iqbal, M. Z. (2018). A study of relationship between leadership styles of principals and job satisfaction of teachers in colleges for women. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, *40*(2), 65-78.

Nazim, F., & Mahmood, A. (2018). A study of relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences, 6*(1), 165-181.

Qiang, Z., Wang, J., He, K., & Xu, L. (2023). Potential of passive employees: How servant leadership can stimulate innovation among control-oriented employees. *Sustainability, 15*(1), Article 144. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15010144

Raelin, J. A. (2012). Dialogue and deliberation as expressions of democratic leadership in participatory organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *25*(1), 7-23. https://doi.org/10.1108/09534811211199574

Rai, A., Budhathoki, P. B., & Rai, C. K. (2020). Linkage between job satisfaction, democratic leadership style and the organizational commitment of employees of privates of bank in Nepal. *Researcher: A Research Journal of Culture and Society*, *4*(1), 97-111. https://doi.org/10.3126/researcher.v4i1.33814

Reed, B. N., Klutts, A. M., & Mattingly, T. J. (2019). A systematic review of leadership definitions, competencies, and assessment methods in pharmacy education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 83*(9), Article 7520. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7520

Saunders, B., & Quirke, P. (2002). "Let my laptop lead the way": A Middle Eastern Study. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, *5*(1), 135–140. https://bit.ly/3N7y4Id

Schuh, S. C., Zhang, X.-A., & Tian, P. (2013). For the good or the bad? Interactive effects of transformational leadership with moral and authoritarian leadership behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *116*, 629-640. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1486-0

Schwartz, S. (1996). *Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems*. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 8, pp. 119–144). Routledge.

Sethibe, T. G., & Steyn, R. (2015). The relationship between leadership styles, innovation and organizational performance: A systematic review. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, *18*(3), Article a1193. https://doi.org/10.17159/2222-3436/2015/v18n3a3

Shin, H. S., & Reyes, P. (1991). *Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: Which comes first?* (ED 338596). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED338596.pdf

Singh, K., & Luthra, A. (2018). Leaders' effective communication competencies: An intercede in amplifying the effect of leadership styles on employee turnover intentions in Indian small and medium scale IT/ITES organization. *International Journal of Management Studies*, *3*(7), 2231–2528.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231549

Ssesanga, K., & Garrett, R. M. (2005). Job satisfaction of university academics: Perspectives from Uganda. *Higher education*, *50*, 33-56. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-6346-0

Suong, H. T. T., & Dao, T. T. X. (2019). The impact of leadership styles on the engagement of cadres, lecturers and staff at public universities-evidence from Vietnam. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 6*(1), 273-280.

Svolik, M. (2013). Incentives, institutions, and the challenges to research on authoritarian politics. *APSA Comparative Democratization Newsletter (June 2013)*. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2668811

Thanh, N. H., & Quang, N. V. (2022). Transformational, transactional, laissez-faire leadership styles and employee engagement: Evidence from Vietnam's Public Sector. *Sage Open, 12*(2), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221094606

Van Vugt, M., Jepson, S. F., Hart, C. M., & De Cremer, D. (2004). Autocratic leadership in social dilemmas: A threat to group stability. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00061-1

Weddle, J. (2012). *Levels of decision-making in the workplace*. Bethlehem University- Office of Human Resources. https://bit.ly/42PpL9v

Whippy, H. J. D. (2000). Leadership and faculty job satisfaction at the University of Guam (Publication No. 9992014) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebsraska]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. https://www.proquest.com/docview/304613289

Wong, S. I., & Giessner, S. R. (2018). The thin line between empowering and laissez-faire leadership: An expectancy-match perspective. *Journal of Management*, *44*(2), 757–783. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315574597

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, *15*(2), 251–289. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638901500207

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Pearson/Prentice Hall

Zigarelli, M. A. (1996). An empirical test of conclusions from effective schools research. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *90*(2), 103-110. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1996.9944451