LEADERSHIP STYLES AND EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION IN UGANDA: THE CASE OF UGANDA MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

Epiphany Picho Odubuker[i]
Muni University, Uganda

Abstract:

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between Leadership Styles and job satisfaction among the staff of Uganda Management Institute. A descriptive cross-sectional survey design was used with a sample size being 118. Purposive, stratified and systematic sampling techniques were used to select respondents. Data analysis involved frequencies and percentages, Spearman rank Order correlation, coefficient of determination, regression, and ANOVA. There was a strong positive relationship between employee perception of leadership styles and job satisfaction. Employee perception of leadership styles accounted for 37.0% of variance in job satisfaction. It is concluded that there was a linear relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. It is recommended that leaders at Uganda Management Institute should revisit its leadership styles practices in order to enhance employee job satisfaction at the institute.

Keywords: leadership styles, job satisfaction, Uganda Management Institute

Introduction

Job satisfaction is viewed as a positive emotional state resulting from the pleasure a worker derives from the job, a state where one's needs and one's outcomes match well and conceptualized in terms of satisfaction with work, involvement in work and commitment to work. It is a highly studied phenomenon because many experts believe that it has some relationship with labour market behaviour and is likely to influence productivity, work effort and decisions of employers to leave a job (Gazioglu & Tasel, 2002). Organizations have significant effects on the people who work for them as

[i] Correspondence: email epipicho@gmail.com

evidenced by how people feel about their work (Spector, 1997). Likewise, employees are also expected to be happy in their work which makes job satisfaction an issue of substantial importance for both employer and employees. Unfortunately, many organizations have failed to include job satisfaction on their priority lists (Gazioglu & Tasel, 2002), perhaps because they have failed to assess its actual impact or failed to measure it. Despite the emphasis on job satisfaction worldwide, one of the limitations in literature is that it is not yet clear as to how exactly leadership styles affect job satisfaction. This study will focus on leadership styles and establish their effect on job satisfaction.

Leadership as adapted in this study has been defined by Roach and Behling (as cited in Watkins & Rikard, 1991, p. 46) as "*the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement*." Placing this definition in the context of the institute under study, since it has been adapted in the study, one can see its application to the most top management who would influence the activities of an organized group, toward the goals success and economic viability, all within the unique atmosphere of academia.

Many researchers identify in several ways in definition of job satisfaction. Greenberg and Baron (1997) define job satisfaction as an individual's cognitive, affective, and evaluative reactions towards his or her job; while according to Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992) job satisfaction is a combination of cognitive and affective reactions to the differential perceptions of what an employee wants to receive compared to what he or she actually receives. Job satisfaction is a factor that would induce the employee to work in the long term position. Regardless of job satisfaction the organization or firm would confront with the cost of recruitment caused by turnover. For this reason, the organization should pay attention to employees' job satisfaction as well.

Suzuki (2006) believed job satisfaction is a positive or negative attitude that an employee has toward his or her job or some specific aspects of the job, and is an internal state of mind of an individual. Disch, Edwardson and Adwan (2004) pointed out that it is a feeling or affection held by a member of an occupation system; if the feeling is positive or the response is active, then the member is satisfied, and vice versa. Similarly, Melnyk (2006) proposed that job satisfaction is an employee's feeling about his or her work environment, which includes the job itself, supervisor, work group, organization, and life; yet, Castle, Engberg and Anderson (2007) suggested that the level of job satisfaction depends on the difference between what a person actually gains from his or her job and what he or she expects.

Judge, Timothy and Joyce (2001) proposed that job satisfaction is the level in which an employee likes or dislikes his or her job. Best and Thurston (2004) also pointed out that job satisfaction is an employee's feeling about his or her job and is a general attitude derived from an evaluation of all aspects in a job. From the various definitions, it can be observed that many scholars have reckoned in various ways about what job satisfaction is; it is noticed that almost all the definitions are similar with some having an edge over others. The researcher adopts the definition by Locke (1976) that provides more specific definition on job satisfaction as the state where one's needs and one's outcomes match well. That is, a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering.

Contextual background

Uganda Management Institute (UMI) profiles itself to have been established in March 1992 with the aim of strengthening the management and institutional capacity of the public, private and non-governmental sectors in Uganda and beyond. Strengthening management and institutional capacity in these sectors can only be achieved by offering cyclic training and continuous capacity building to the core resource of any institutions, the human resource. The institute offers a blend of short and long courses for middle, senior, and executive level managers; facilitates conferences, seminars and workshops; and provides research, consultancy and distance learning services. As a national Centre for training, research and consultancy in the field of management and administration in Uganda, UMI with administration and management measures synonymy.

UMI, further vision itself being a World Class Management Development Institute, and existing to excel in Developing Management and Institutional Capacity of the Public Private and Non-Governmental Sectors in Uganda and in the East African Community (EAC) and Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) Market Regions. It is to achieve her mission through being the management development institute of first choice and an acclaimed provider of relevant best-practice management education, training, research and consultancy services; acquiring and sustaining adequate physical and technical infrastructure to cope with increased demand for the institute's services; providing a conducive work environment that retains high caliber academic and administrative staff in an increasingly competitive labor market; being a strong, financially sustainable organization and being a socially responsible corporate citizen locally, regionally and internationally. These are achieved through improving knowledge, skills and attitudes of public, private and NGO managers, providing consultancy services for good governance and sustainable

development, generating knowledge for improved decision-making and policy formulation, building an effective, efficient and competitive institution, and maximizing revenue while thriving in a market driven place.

Uganda Management Institute is a popular institute expected to attract, utilize, train and build capacities of human resources, retain and engage her employees for better service deliveries of the workforce in both the private and public sector. While these best practices must be seen in practice within the institute itself, to the contrary, there is a sustained dissatisfaction amongst the employees regarding leadership styles in practice that is believed to be an enigma to job satisfaction in the institute.

Statement of the Problem

UMI claims equity and fairness, as imperative principles that underlie her leadership styles and development objectives, policies and programmes, and further professes an equal opportunity employer that believes in implementing a responsive performance-based reward system to attract and retain highly competent and motivated personnel. It therefore, should be seen to attract, retain, utilize, train and build capacities of human resources, and engage her employees who enjoy satisfaction at their job. However, job satisfaction has proven a menace in the institute as review of records on recruitment and resignation, from UMI Human Resource Department by the researcher reveals that between 2006 and 2012, a total of 21 teaching staff and 17 administrative staff, summing to 38 staff, out of 175 in 2012, have voluntarily left work; this indicates prevalence of crisis with satisfaction with work, involvement in work and commitment to work. Left to continue, the prevailing circumstances is likely to subject the institute's performance to jeopardy. This ugly situation for organizational performance explains why the researcher was interested in investigating leadership styles Practices and job satisfaction in the institute.

Conceptual Framework

From figure 1 above, it is conceptualized that leadership styles practices employee reward, employee training and development and engagement has positive relationship with job satisfaction, which in turn influences levels of performance in an organization. An organization which rewards well her employees, trains and develop them and engages them will have high level of job satisfaction which leads to high level performance of the staff, hence, of the organization. Nevertheless, organizations which do not reward well, train and develop nor engages their employees tend to have

dissatisfied employees with the results that there is low level of performance. However, it is also conceptualized that, other than the identified independent variables, also employees' perception of leadership styles in the organization is also linearly related with employee job satisfaction. It suffices to note that due space, only the elements of employee engagement is included in the conceptual diagram, while for the indicators of each, one may make reference to the questionnaires found in the appendix.

Methodology

This section presents the study design, study population, sampling and sampling technique, instrumentation (structured questionnaires, interviews, and documentary analysis), validity, reliability, procedure, data analysis techniques and finally measurement of variables have been presented.

Study Design

The researcher used a descriptive cross-sectional survey design because the study intended to pick only some representative sample elements of the cross section of the population. The study was also cross-sectional because it was conducted across participants over a short period of time. It did not necessitate the researcher make follow up of the participants. The survey was also preferred because it allowed the researcher to get a detailed inspection of the relationship between leadership styles practices and job satisfaction among the staff of Uganda Management Institute. Quantitative and qualitative approaches were adopted. The former enhanced the understanding of the meaning of numbers, while the latter gave precise and testable expression to qualitative ideas.

Study Population

The study population composed of 175 employees, both administrative and academic staff. They are the key players in the running of Uganda Management Institute, and therefore, are conversant with the affairs of the institute.

Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample and sampling technique used are as demonstrated in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Parent Population, Sample Population, Sampling Techniques and the Data Collection Methods

Categories of Respondents	Stratified Categories	Sampling Technique	Methods of Data Collection	Target Population	Sampled Population
Governing Council	Governing Council	Purposive sampling	Interviews	17	06
Administrative staff	Key administrative staff	Stratified sampling	Interviews	09	04
	Other administrative Staff	Purposive sampling	Questionnaires	68	41
Academic staff	Heads of Departments	Systematic sampling	Interviews	11	07
	Lectures/ Consultants	Purposive stratified sampling	Questionnaires	35	31
Staff who have voluntarily left	Staff who have voluntarily left	Convenience sampling	Interviews	35	14
Total				**175**	**118**

Purposive and stratified sampling techniques were used to select the members of the governing council and the administrative staff. Purposive sampling was used for members of the governing council because they were fewer and they were the policy makers in the institute, hence, they understood the policies in the institute; Amin (2005) recommends such knowledgeable people as good for interviews. Stratified sampling was used in order to select administrative staff representative of various departments at the institute.

In order to select the representative sample for both the academic and administrative staff, systematic sampling technique was used; this helped to avoid bias during the selection and for reason of comparative analysis. Two separate lists of the administrative and academic staff each according to their category were compiled and every n^{th} person on the list was selected from each list.

To get the nth for the academic staff, the total number of academic staff was divided by the sample size of academic staff, thus a/b = c. Therefore, every n^{th} academic staff on the list was selected (e.g. that is, the 4th, 8th, 12th and so forth) until a total of representative sample for academic staff was realized. The same was done for administrative staff. The staff that left the institute was conveniently sampled, since accessibility was uncertain.

Methods of Data Collection

The researcher guided by the nature of the problem under investigation, used three types of data collection methods; these included questionnaires, interviews, and documentary analysis that allowed methodological triangulation (Amin (2005).

Questionnaire survey

Information was gathered by administering questionnaires to UMI staff individually who got these filled personally as recommended by Amin (2005). Where required, the researcher offered necessary explanations with reference to the questions. It was more convenient and economical to collect information using the questionnaire survey. It was a suitable method for collecting data from a large sample using this method. This method was impersonal and it avoided bias, which could develop as a result of interaction between the researcher and the respondent. It ensured some degree of anonymity to the respondents. The respondents felt free to express their views through this method than they would do personally to the researcher. It placed less pressure on the respondents for immediate response because they completed questionnaires at their own time and pace.

Interview

The strategic managers were interviewed to solicit information on the relationship between leadership styles practices and job satisfaction among the staff of Uganda Management Institute. Interviewing was a face-to-face interface between the researcher and UMI management, which involved the researcher talking and listening to the UMI management. Interviews allowed pursuance of in-depth information around the topic and were useful as follow-ups to certain responses to questionnaires and to further investigate their response and served the purpose of triangulation (Amin, 2005).

Documentary analysis

To provide the secondary source of the data, the researcher gathered available relevant institute records and reports to collect information on leadership styles practices and job satisfaction. This helped to corroborate findings from questionnaires as well as from interviews and showed how the variables relate.

Research Instruments

The researcher, for purposes of triangulation, used three types of instruments, which were developed with the guidance of the objectives of the study, conceptual framework

and literature reviewed. These included: structured questionnaires, interviews guide, and documentary analysis guide (Kothari, 2004).

Structured questionnaires

Structured questionnaires containing closed-questions were preferred because of the number of subjects, cost, time and the nature of the topic. Thus, data collected using this method was quantitative (Kothari, 2004). One set of questionnaires was administered, to both the academic and administrative staff. Section one consisted of items of the background; sections two consisted of items about leadership styles the independent variable and section three solicited information on job satisfaction the dependent variable.

Interview guide

The interview guide was a tool, which consisted of open-ended questions as recommended by Amin (2005). The guide consisted of two sections: leadership styles and job satisfaction in Uganda Management Institute.

Documentary analysis checklist

Documentary analysis checklist was drawn in order to guide the researcher on the documentary information required by the study. The checklist was used to request for such documents from UMI (Kothari, 2004).

Data Quality Control

Data are only useful if they are *valid* (i.e., measure what they are supposed to measure) and *reliable* (i.e., collected in the same way by different people and at different locations). To obtain valid and reliable data, the researcher had to determine that the two met statistical requirements.

Validity

Accuracy of information was ensured by the use of relevant instruments. The questionnaires adapted from previous studies were subjected to the scrutiny of other experts in the field of research and their recommendations were used to finally formulate instruments that had the ability to solicit the expected relevant data. Strategic managers were the relevant subjects that were interviewed to obtain crucial data. The administrative and academic staffs were administered questionnaires, which after designing, were, subjected to rating and the Content Validity Index (CVI) computed using the following formula:

$$CVI = \frac{No.\ of\ items\ rated\ as\ relevant}{All\ items\ in\ the\ questionnaire}$$

Table 2: Validity

Raters	Relevant Items	Not Relevant Items	Total
Rater 1	35	14	49
Rater 2	37	12	49
Total	72	26	98

Thus, the CVI $= \frac{72}{98} = 0.735$

The CVI for the questionnaire for both the academic and support staff was 0.735. The recommended validity measure by Amin (2005) is 0.7. Hence, the questionnaires were considered valid for data collection.

Reliability

The questionnaires were piloted in three similar institutions to ensure reliability, namely Uganda College of Commerce - Pakwach, National Teachers' College - Muni and Nile Institute of Management Studies – Arua (NIMSA); it helped to ensure consistency and dependability of the research instruments and their ability to tap data that answer to the objectives of the study. Raw data from the instruments was subjected to a reliability factor analysis and reliability test from which a CVI was computed as recommended by Amin (2005), and the findings are as tabulated in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Reliability

Variables	No. of items	Cronbach Alpha
Employee Perception of leadership styles	14	0.895
Job Satisfaction	3	0.759

Given that the Crombach alphas were greater than .07, as recommended by (Amin, 2005), the items measuring the variables were considered dependable for the data collection.

Procedure

The researcher sought permission of the relevant authorities to collect data. The raw data obtained were then arranged into a format from which meaningful conclusions were drawn.

Data Analysis

To investigate the relationship between leadership styles practices and job satisfaction, and job satisfaction among the staff of UMI, the researcher analysed the quantitative data collected using structured closed ended items in the questionnaires. They were subjected to frequencies and percentages, which helped to show the distribution of respondents on each of the independent variable and the dependent variable.

Spearman rank correlation was used to determine relationships between variables because the variables were accompanied with an ordinal scale. The coefficient of determination was used to determine effect of the leadership styles practices on job satisfaction. The regression analysis technique was used to determine the effect of the dimensions of leadership styles practices and job satisfaction.

Content analysis was used to analyse qualitative data where all the qualitative data collected through interviews and documentary records were categorized, interpreted and analysed under their respective themes. These were used to corroborate and triangulate findings obtained through quantitative data analysis.

Findings

This section presents, analyses and interprets the findings of the study.

Response Rate

Response rate (also known as completion rate or return rate) in survey research refers to the number of people who answered the survey divided by the number of people in the sample population. It is usually expressed in the form of a percentage. A low response rate can give rise to sampling bias if the non-response is unequal among the participants regarding exposure and/or outcome (Babbie, 1998; Don Dillman, 2000; Bailey, 1987 cited in Hager et al., 2003). The response rate is as in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Response rate

	Stratified Categories	Target Population	Sampled Population	Response Rate	% Response
Governing Council	Governing Council	17	06	06	100
Administrative staff	Key administrative staff	09	04	04	100
	Other administrative Staff	68	41	41	100
Academic staff	Heads of Departments	11	07	04	57
	Lectures / Consultants	35	46	31	67
Staff who have left voluntarily	Staff who have left voluntarily	35	14	14	100
Total		175	118	100	85

$$Response\ Rate\ =\ \frac{No.\,of\ Response}{Sample\ Population}\ x\ 100\ =\ \frac{100}{118}\,x\ 100\ =\ 85\%$$

From the study population of 175, Using Krejcie and Morgan Table as advocated by (Amin, 2005), the researcher sampled 118 to participate in the study. From the 118 total sampled, 100 participated. This gives a response rate of 85 % that is considered high response rate and therefore, the more likely the results are representative of the population (Singer, E. (1978).

Background Information

In order to inform and explain certain phenomena the researcher obtained relevant background information, including category, age, number of years of work experience with UMI and educational background of the respondents responses to them are as in Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8. Specifically, Table 5 presents findings on categories of respondents.

Table 5: Category of respondent

Category of Respondent	Frequency	Percent
Administrative staff	43	58
Academic Staff	31	42
Total	74	100

Source: *Primary data*

Table 5 shows that more staff, numbering 43 (58%) who participated in the study were administrative staff, while the rest 31 (42%) were academic staff. This demonstrates a rational representation by each category because the number of the former is higher than the number of the latter in the staff establishment of UMI. This implied that the views of both categories were fairly considered in the study. Table 6 presents findings on age of respondents.

Table 6: Age of respondent

Age	Frequency	Percent
Below 20 years	0	0
Between 20-29	12	16
Between 30-39	27	37
Between 40-49	26	35
Between 50-59	6	8
Above 60 years	3	4
Total	**74**	**100**

Source: *Primary data*

The data in Table 6 demonstrates that most UMI staff of 53 (72%) who participated in the study were aged between 30 to 49 years. This implied that the respondents were mature enough to give information that can be relied on. Table 7 presents findings on number of years of working with UMI.

Table 7: Number of year of working with UMI of respondent

Number of year of working with UMI	Frequency	Percent
Below 5 years	30	41
Between 5-10	22	30
Between 11-15	15	20
Between 16-20	6	8
Between 21-25	1	1
Above 25 years	0	0
Total	**74**	**100**

Source: *Primary data*

Table 7 presents data that depicts that most UMI staff numbering 43 (50%) who participated in the study had worked at UMI for 5 to 20 years. This implied that respondents were not only mature, but also had sufficient experience in the institute and have a deeper understanding of the internal dynamics of the institute, hence could

give reliable responses. Table 8 presents findings on the level of education of the respondents.

Table 8: Education level of respondent

Education Level	Frequency	Percent
Secondary level	0	0
Diploma	8	11
Bachelor's degree	28	38
Master's degree	34	46
PhD degree	4	5
Total	**74**	**100**

Source: *Primary data*

Table 8 presents data that depicts most of UMI staff numbering 62 (84%) who participated in the study qualified with Bachelor's degree and Master's degree. This implied that the respondents have very good degree of knowledge and therefore understood not only the work environment, but also what they were answering.

Relationship between leadership Styles and Employee Job Satisfaction in UMI

Before establishing the contribution of employee view of leadership styles practices on job satisfaction, descriptive statistics on employee view on leadership styles were computed. Findings are presented in the following sub section.

Findings about employee perception of leadership style

Using a questionnaire, fourteen items about employee perception of leadership styles were presented to respondents at UMI. They were requested to respond to the items using a five response scale where: 1 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (D), 3 = Neither Disagree not Agree (NDA), 4 = Agree (A) and 5 = Strongly Agree (SA). Findings are presented in Table 9. Following the table is the analysis and interpretation of findings.

Table 9: Findings about employee perception of leadership style

Items about perception of leadership style	SD	D	NDA	A	SA	Total
1. The overall leadership has genuine concern for needs of employees at all levels	9 (12%)	16 (22%)	18 (24%)	24 (33%)	7 (9%)	74 (100%)
2. The welfare of workers comes first before any other consideration	7 (9%)	30 (41%)	19 (25%)	16 (22%)	2 (3%)	74 (100%)
3. The leadership in general usually considers suggestions by workers	7 (9%)	14 (19%)	23 (31%)	28 (38%)	2 (3%)	74 (100%)
4. The leadership in general seeks the opinion of all categories of workers in important issues	9 (12%)	15 (20%)	21 (28%)	27 (37%)	2 (3%)	74 (100%)
5. I perceive the overall leadership as considerate to the needs of employees at all levels	9 (12%)	19 (26%)	9 (12%)	35 (47%)	2 (3%)	74 (100%)
6. The overall leadership lays out specific procedures and rules that guide the performance of all jobs	4 (5%)	10 (14%)	7 (9%)	41 (56%)	12 (16%)	74 (100%)
7. The overall leadership closely schedules and coordinates all works	2 (3%)	12 (16%)	17 (23%)	36 (49%)	7 (9%)	74 (100%)
8. Leadership does monitoring and following up on assignments	7 (9%)	6 (8%)	12 (16%)	42 (58%)	7 (9%)	74 (100%)
9. Leadership sets challenging goals	2 (3%)	12 (16%)	11 (15%)	38 (51%)	11 (15%)	74 (100%)
10. Leadership always expects an improvement on performance at all times	0 (0%)	4 (5%)	4 (5%)	49 (67%)	17 (23%)	74 (100%)
11. The overall leadership demonstrates confidence that the workers will attain excellence	0 (0%)	13 (18%)	11 (15%)	37 (49%)	13 (18%)	74 (100%)
12. Decisions are seldom made without the participation of every body's input	6 (8%)	15 (20%)	16 (22%)	25 (34%)	12 (16%)	74 (100%)
13. Consultation by leadership has very weak reaching effects	3 (4%)	15 (20%)	22 (30%)	28 (38%)	6 (8%)	74 (100%)
14. Leaders in the institute perceive their followers as being competent	1 (1%)	11 (15%)	17 (23%)	35 (47%)	10 (14%)	74 (100%)

Source: *Primary data*

Findings show that most of the UMI staff opposed to one item in Table 9 (that is items 2) compared to the proportion of respondents who concurred to the item. It is shown that the percentage of UMI staff that opposed the item was 50% while the percentage of

UMI staff that concurred to the items was 25% and the percentage of UMI staff that neither disagreed nor agreed to the items was 25%. Thus, from the analysis it is interpreted that most UMI staff's welfare did not come first before any other consideration.

Findings also show no significant difference among the UMI staff who opposed, neither disagreed not agreed or concurred to four items in Table 9 (that is items 1, 3, 4 and 13) although a slightly higher percentage concurred. It is shown that the percentage of UMI staff that opposed the items was 24% to 34% while the percentage of UMI staff that concurred to the items was 40% to 46% and the percentage of UMI staff that neither disagreed nor agreed to the items was 24% to 31%. Thus, from the analysis it is interpreted that at UMI, some UMI staff, the overall leadership had genuine concern for needs of employees at all levels, usually considered suggestions by workers and sought the opinion of all categories of workers in important issues. However, for some UMI staff, consultation by leadership had very weak reaching effects.

Regarding non consideration of suggestions from some employees by top leadership an interview with the Head of Department X at UMI agreed and explained thus, *"This is because all opinions that are brought up by the staff are short down and under looked by leadership (Interview with a Head of Department X at UMI)*. The UMI Top Leadership X also agreed to non-consideration of suggestions from some worker by top leadership but gave reasons why this happened as revealed by the following:

It is very difficult to dismiss this. However, from my observation, firstly, sometimes management may not implement certain things because it is impractical or because it is a process that sometimes has to go up to the Council and in some cases there are legal implications which the staff may not be in the know of. For example the two opinions on either having lecturers or consultants is an issue very contentious, technical and legal. Management has to be extra careful in handling it as it has serious implications. Secondly, a centre demanding a vehicle may not have considered its cost effectiveness and the overall organization efficiency. If management were to take in what they are demanding, without considering the cost effectiveness and efficiency, then that would not be management. Besides, there are certain things which come at a particular time and may have to be put to a haul *(Interview with UMI Top Management X)*.

This explanation by the interviewees could also imply that there exists a foul communication between management and the employees that could be leading to such interpretation that leadership does not consider suggestions from some employees.

As to why some employees do not perceive the overall leadership as considerate to the needs of employees at all levels, the UMI Top Leadership X responded, thus; *"People would like to rush to the Director General without following the hierarchical levels in the institute. They expect him to respond directly to their concerns; he however, has to operate within system" (Interview with UMI Top Management X)*. Similarly, Head of Department X at UMI explained, thus; *"Because there is mistrust in top leadership which is going to cause the institute to slowly decay as quality will go down (Interview with a Head of Department X at UMI)*.

Lastly, findings show that most UMI staff concurred to nine items in Table 9 (that is items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14) compared to the proportion of respondents who opposed the items. It is shown that the percentage of UMI staff that opposed the items was 5% to 38% while the percentage of UMI staff that concurred to the items was 50% to 90% while the percentage of UMI staff that neither disagreed nor agreed to the items was 5% to 23%. Thus, from the analysis it is interpreted that at UMI, most staff perceived the overall leadership as considerate to the needs of employees at all levels and that the overall leadership laid out specific procedures and rules that guide the performance of all jobs and closely scheduled and coordinated all works. In addition, for most UMI staff, leadership monitored and followed up on assignments, set challenging goals and always expected an improvement on performance at all times. Lastly, for most UMI staff, the overall leadership demonstrated confidence that the workers would attain excellence; decisions were seldom made with the participation of every body's input and leaders in the institute perceived their followers as being competent.

When asked about their view on leadership at UMI, the Head of Department X at UMI responded, *"Majority of the staff have failed to understand the top leadership, the outcome of which is suspicion and psychological dissatisfaction among the staff (Interview with a Head of Department X at UMI).*

Testing hypothesis

Having presented findings about employee perception of leadership styles and job satisfaction, the next stage was to establish how employee perception of leadership styles affected job satisfaction. This was achieved by computing the Spearman correlation coefficient and coefficient of determination. Findings are presented in Table 10 accompanied with an analysis and interpretation.

Table 10: Correlation between employee perception of leadership styles and job satisfaction

	Job satisfaction
Employee perception of leadership styles	rho = .608
	rho^2 = .370
	p = .000
	n = 74

Source: *Primary data*

There was a strong correlation (*rho* = .608) between employee perception of leadership styles and job satisfaction. The sign of the correlation was positive. Since the correlation does not indicate the percentage variance in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable, a coefficient of determination (*rho²* = .370), which is a square of the correlation coefficient was computed. The coefficient of determination was expressed into percentage to determine the effect of employee perception of leadership styles on job satisfaction. This revealed that employee perception of leadership styles accounted for 37.0% of variance in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to a test of significance, which showed that significance of the correlation coefficient (p = .000) was less than the critical significance at 0.05. This implied there was a strong positive relationship between employee perception of leadership styles practices and job satisfaction. The strong nature of the relationship meant that a big change in employee perception of leadership styles was related to a big change in job satisfaction. The positive nature of the relationship implied that the change in the two variables was in the same direction, whereby better employee perception of leadership styles was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa.

A further correlation analysis was conducted focusing on each of the dimensions of leadership style (participative leadership, directive leadership, achievement oriented leadership and supportive leadership) in relation to the job satisfaction. Findings are presented in tables 11 to 16. Table 11 presents findings about participative leadership and job satisfaction.

Table 11: Correlation between participative leadership and job satisfaction

	Job satisfaction
Participative leadership	rho = .503
	rho^2 = .253
	p = .000
	n = 74

Source: *Primary data*

The finding in Table 11 reveals that there was a moderate correlation (*rho* = .503) between participative leadership and job satisfaction. The sign of the correlation was positive. Since the correlation does not indicate the percentage variation in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable, a coefficient of determination (*rho²* = .253), which is a square of the correlation coefficient was computed. The coefficient of determination was expressed into percentage to determine the effect of participative leadership on job satisfaction. This revealed that participative leadership accounted for 25.3% of variation in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to a test of significance, which showed that significance of the correlation coefficient (p = .000) was less than the critical significance at 0.05. This implied there was a moderate positive relationship between participative leadership and job satisfaction. The moderate nature of the relationship meant that a moderate change in participative leadership was related to a moderate change in job satisfaction. The positive nature of the relationship implied that the change in the two variables was in the same direction, whereby more participative leadership was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa. Table 26 presents findings about directive leadership and job satisfaction.

Table 12: Correlation between directive leadership and job satisfaction

	Job satisfaction
Directive leadership	*rho* = .599
	rho² = .359
	p = .000
	n = 74

Source: *Primary data*

The finding in Table 12 reveals that there was a moderate correlation (*rho* = .599) between directive leadership and job satisfaction. The sign of the correlation was positive. Since the correlation does not indicate the percentage variation in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable, a coefficient of determination (*rho²* = .359), which is a square of the correlation coefficient was computed. The coefficient of determination was expressed into percentage to determine the effect of directive leadership on job satisfaction. This revealed that directive leadership accounted for 35.9% of variation in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to a test of significance, which showed that significance of the correlation coefficient (p = .000) was less than the critical significance at 0.05. This implied there was a moderate positive relationship between directive leadership and job satisfaction. The moderate nature of the relationship meant that a moderate change in directive leadership was

related to a moderate change in job satisfaction. The positive nature of the relationship implied that the change in the two variables was in the same direction, whereby more directive leadership was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa. Table 13 presents findings about achievement oriented leadership and job satisfaction.

Table 13: Correlation between achievement oriented leadership and job satisfaction

	Job satisfaction
Achievement oriented leadership	rho = .630
	rho^2 = .397
	p = .000
	n = 74

Source: *Primary data*

The finding in Table 13 reveals that there was a strong correlation (rho = .630) between achievement oriented leadership and job satisfaction. The sign of the correlation was positive. Since the correlation does not indicate the percentage variation in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable, a coefficient of determination (rho^2 = .397), which is a square of the correlation coefficient was computed. The coefficient of determination was expressed into percentage to determine the effect of achievement oriented leadership on job satisfaction. This revealed that achievement oriented leadership accounted for 39.7% of variation in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to a test of significance, which showed that significance of the correlation coefficient (p = .000) was less than the critical significance at 0.05. This implied there was a strong positive relationship between achievement oriented leadership and job satisfaction. The strong nature of the relationship meant that a big change in achievement oriented leadership was related to a moderate change in job satisfaction. The positive nature of the relationship implied that the change in the two variables was in the same direction, whereby more achievement oriented leadership was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa. Table 14 presents findings about supportive leadership and job satisfaction.

Table 14: Correlation between supportive leadership and job satisfaction

	Job satisfaction
Supportive leadership	rho = .603
	rho^2 = .363
	p = .000
	n = 74

Source: *Primary data*

The finding in Table 14 reveals that there was a strong correlation (rho = .630) between supportive leadership and job satisfaction. The sign of the correlation was positive. Since the correlation does not indicate the percentage variation in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable, a coefficient of determination (rho^2 = .363), which is a square of the correlation coefficient was computed. The coefficient of determination was expressed into percentage to determine the effect of supportive leadership on job satisfaction. This revealed that supportive leadership accounted for 36.3% of variation in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to a test of significance, which showed that significance of the correlation coefficient (p = .000) was less than the critical significance at 0.05. This implied there was a strong positive relationship between supportive leadership and job satisfaction. The strong nature of the relationship meant that a big change in supportive leadership was related to a moderate change in job satisfaction. The positive nature of the relationship implied that the change in the two variables was in the same direction, whereby more supportive leadership was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa.

Interview findings shade some light on the effect of leadership style on employee satisfaction as the UMI Top Leadership X had this to say:
We as leaders have been caught up in the saga. We have not gone through a nice period. The Director General consistently assured the staff after the boat was wracked, trying to put the team together. There is however, a mutual distrust of each other after the turmoil (*Interview with UMI Top Management X).*
Similarly, in response, the Head of Department X at UMI had this to say:

There are leadership problem which has caused dissatisfaction. The leaders need to be ethical and fair. Top leadership has taken to sneaking their relatives into jobs in UMI. These are some of the issues. The Chief Executive is really a   chief in this foul (*Interview with a Head of Department X at UMI*).

A further analysis was conducted using a regression to determine the effect of the dimensions of perception of leadership styles (participative leadership, directive leadership, achievement oriented leadership and supportive leadership) on job satisfaction. Findings are presented in Table 15, accompanied with an analysis and interpretation.

Table 15: Effect of dimensions of perception of leadership styles on job satisfaction

Regression Statistics					
Multiple R	0.67				
R Square	0.45				
Adjusted R Square	0.42				
Standard Error	2.01				
Observations	74				
ANOVA					
	SS	df	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	227.5	4	56.9	14.1	0.000
Residual	278.8	69	4.0		
Total	506.3	73			
	Coefficients	t Stat	P-value		
Participative Leadership	-0.6	-1.9	0.068		
Directive Leadership	0.1	0.2	0. 864		
Achievement Oriented Leadership	1.6	2.0	0.052		
Supportive Leadership	-0.5	-1.0	0.314		

Source: *Primary data*

Findings in Table 15 show a strong linear relationship (Multiple R = 0.67) between dimensions of perception of leadership styles (participative leadership, directive leadership, achievement oriented leadership and supportive leadership) and job satisfaction. Going by the adjusted R Square, it is shown that dimensions of perception of leadership styles (participative leadership, directive leadership, achievement oriented leadership and supportive leadership) account for 42% variation in job satisfaction. These findings were subjected to an ANOVA test, which showed that the significance (Sig F = .000) of the Fishers ratio (F = 14.1) was less than the critical significance at .05. Hence, the findings were accepted.

However, the coefficients findings show that none of the dimensions of perception of leadership styles (participative leadership, directive leadership, achievement oriented leadership and supportive leadership) singly significantly affected job satisfaction because they had significant p-values greater than the critical significance.

Discussion

Four sub sections are presented. The first section is about the relationship between employee reward and job satisfaction among UMI staff. The second section is about the contribution of employee training and development to job satisfaction among UMI staff. The third section it about the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction among UMI staff. The fourth section it about the relationship between employee perception of leadership style and job satisfaction among UMI staff.

Relationship between employee perception of leadership style and employee job satisfaction in UMI

There was a strong positive relationship between employee perception of leadership styles and job satisfaction. Employee perception of leadership styles accounted for 37.0% of variation in job satisfaction. The strong nature of the relationship meant that a big change in employee perception of leadership styles was related to a big change in job satisfaction. The positive nature of the relationship implied that the change in the two variables was in the same direction, whereby better employee perception of leadership styles was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa. Relating to the relationship between the dimensions of employee perception of leadership style and job satisfaction, findings revealed a moderate positive relationship between participative leadership and job satisfaction, whereby more participative leadership was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa and participative leadership accounted for 25.3% of variation in job satisfaction. There was also a moderate positive relationship between directive leadership and job satisfaction, whereby more directive leadership was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa and directive leadership accounted for 35.9% of variation in job satisfaction. On the other hand, there was a strong positive relationship between achievement oriented leadership and job satisfaction, whereby more achievement oriented leadership was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa and achievement oriented leadership accounted for 39.7% of variation in job satisfaction. Lastly, there was a strong positive relationship between supportive leadership and job satisfaction, whereby more supportive leadership was related to more job satisfaction and vice versa and supportive leadership accounted for 36.3% of variation in job satisfaction.

Furthermore, it was established that the dimensions of leadership styles (participative leadership, directive leadership, achievement oriented leadership and supportive leadership) accounted for 42% variation in job satisfaction. However, none of the dimensions of leadership styles (participative leadership, directive leadership,

achievement oriented leadership and supportive leadership) singularly significantly affected job satisfaction because they had significant p-values greater than the critical significance.

While the study found out quantitatively that at UMI, most UMI staff, held that their welfare did not come first before any other consideration. Nonetheless, for some, the overall leadership had genuine concern for needs of employees at all levels; management usually considered suggestions by workers and sought the opinion of all categories of workers in important issues. This may explain why the findings revealed the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction as being insignificant, much as most staff were dissatisfied.

Moreover, qualitative findings also intimated the over ambitiousness of some staff in craving for administrative positions, notwithstanding numerous anomalies ranging from sectarianism in recruitment to disparities in treatment of staff. This situation, in the researcher's opinion, is not far from what is revealed by a study conducted in India amongst the air force and officers, thus; the study examines subordinates' perception of leadership styles and their work behaviour in the Indian Air Force. A self–reported questionnaire was used to collect data from 287 airmen and 75 officers. The results revealed that the leaders of airmen had a predominantly authoritarian style and the leaders of officers had a nurturant–task style.

Regarding work behaviour, officers were more committed and satisfied with the job than airmen. Officers accepted challenging tasks, showed better performance, achieved targets on time and expressed less desire to quit the defence services compared to airmen. Airmen and officers' commitment to the organisation and job satisfaction decreased, and stress effect and intention to quit the services increased under an authoritarian leader. Conversely, airmen and officers felt committed, satisfied with the job, accepted challenging tasks, showed higher job performance, and expressed unwillingness to quit the organisation under nurturing–task and participative leaders (Damodar, Hare & Kostubh, 2006).

In addition, for some UMI staff, consultation by leadership had very weak reaching effects. Lastly, most staff perceived the overall leadership as considerate to the needs of employees at all levels and that the overall leadership laid out specific procedures and rules that guide the performance of all jobs and closely scheduled and coordinated all works. In addition, for most UMI staff, leadership monitored and followed up on assignments, set challenging goals and always expected an improvement on performance at all times. Lastly, for most UMI staff, the overall leadership demonstrated confidence that the workers would attain excellence; decisions were seldom made with the participation of every body's input and leaders in the

institute perceived their followers as being competent. These findings match the findings of the study on Perceived Leadership Styles & Levels of Satisfaction of Selected Junior College Athletic Directors and Head Coaches resemble those of other studies (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996; Wallace & Weese, 1995) that examined the relationship between leader behaviour within the transactional-transformational paradigm and organizational factors such as levels of satisfaction. In the studies, transformational leadership behaviours were found to be positively associated with high levels of satisfaction. This elucidates the hypothesis, but goes further to reveal the insignificance that that exist between them.

Conclusion

Employee perception of leadership styles and job satisfaction, being a critical success factor, organizational leaders have no choice, if they want to thrive, but to apply appropriate leadership styles in order for their organization to succeed. Uganda Management Institute, in a similar vein, does not form an exception.

References

1. Amin M. E. (2005). *Social science research: Conception, methodology and analysis*. Kampala: Makerere University Printery.

2. Armstrong, M. (1987). A Handbook of Human Resource Management, London: Kogan Page.

3. Aswathappa, K. (2002). *Human resource and personnel management*: Text and cases. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.

4. Aswathappa, K., (2008). *Human resource management: Text and cases*. Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.

5. Babbie, E. (1998). *The practice of social research* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

6. Bailey, Kenneth. (1987). *Methods of Social Research*. (3rd ed.). Free Press, New York, NY.

7. Best, M. E. & Thurston, N. E. (2004).Measuring nurse job satisfaction. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 34*:283-290.

8. Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life.* Wiley, Inc., New York.

9. Blyton, P. & Turnbull, P. (1992). HRM: debates, dilemmas and www.repositorium.sdum.uminho.pt/bitstream/1822/3379/15/bibliografia.pdf.

10. Bratton, J. and Gold, J. (1999). Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice, London: Macmillan.

11. Breaugh, J. A., and Starke, M. (2000). Research on Employee Recruitment: So Many Studies, So Many Remaining Questions. *Journal of Management*, 305-434. Web. 12 Mar. 2011.

12. Castle, N. G, Engberg, J. &, Anderson, R. A. (2007).Job satisfaction of nursing home administrators and turnover. *Medical Care Research and Review, 64*:191-211.

13. Cumming, M. W. (1993). The Theory and Practice of Personnel Management, New York: Heinemann.

14. Disch, J., Edwardson, S., & Adwan, J. (2004). Nursing faculty satisfaction with individual, institutional, and leadership factors. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 20*:323-332.

15. Doherty, A. J., & Danylchuk, K.E. (1996). Transformational and transactional leadership in interuniversity athletics management. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 60, pp. 114- 116.

16. Fowler, A. (1987). 'When Chief Executives Discover HRM', Personnel Management, January 3.

17. Gallup Organization (2005). Employee Engagement: The Employee side of the HumanSigma Equation. Retrieved August 1, 2005, from http://www.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=52.

18. Greenberg, J. and Baron, R. A. (1997). *Behaviour in organizations: Understanding and managing the Human side of work*, 6th ed., Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.

19. Guest (1989), From the foregoing HRM, arguably, does not offer anything new; it is simply "good personnel management described in a fashionable way".

20. Guest, D. (1987). 'HRM and Industrial Relations' Journal of Management Studies 24:5: 503-21.

21. Hatcher, T. (1999). How multiple interventions influenced employee turnover: A case study. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *10*(4), 365–382.

22. Hendry, C. (1995). Human Resource Management: A Strategic Approach to Employment, Boston: Butterworth Heinemann.

23. Hoy, W., and Misckle, C. G. (1991). Educational Administration: Theory, Research and practice, McGrw-Hill, New York.

24. Johnson, E. (2000). The practice of Leadership stylesin New Zealand: Strategic and Best Practice? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 38*(2), 69.

25. Judge, T. A, Timothy, A. and Joyce, E. B. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluation. Self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability – with Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*:80-92.

26. Keenoy, T. (1990). 'HRM: A case of the Wolf in Sheep's Clothing'. *Personnel Review, 19:2.*

27. Kessler, I., Purcell, J., 1992. Performance related pay: objectives and applications. *Leadership styles Journal*, vol. 2, pp. 16–33.

28. Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology*: Methods and Techniques, New Age International, London.

29. Kreitner and Kinicki (2001). *Organizational Behaviour* 5th edition

30. Landy, F. J. (1985). *Psychology of work behavior*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

31. Legge, K. (1995) *Human resource management: Rhetorics and Realities*, London, Macmillan.

32. McGehee, W and Thayer, P. W. (1961). *Training in Business and Industry*. New York.

33. Odubuker, P.E. (2014). The relationship between employee reward and job satisfaction in Uganda Management Institute: An Empirical Study. *The Uganda Journal of Management and Public Policy Studies.* Vol. No. 1, March 2014, pp 1-20.

34. Patrick, J. (2000). Training. In N. Chmiel (Ed.), *Introduction to work and organizational psychology* (pp. 100–125). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

35. Pfeffer, J. 1996. *Competitive advantage through people*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

36. Pfeffer, J., and Veiga, J. (1999). "Putting people first for organizational success". *Academy of Management Journal of Business and Economics Research Volume 1, Number 1* 92.

37. Redman T. and Wilkinson, A. (2001). Contemporary Human Resource Management.

38. Robinson, D., Perryman, S. & Hayday, S. (2004).*The Drivers of Employee Engagement*. Institute for Employment Studies. Retrieved 2006-11-07.

39. Scarlett, K. (2001). *Quality Employee Engagement Measurement* Pages 108-122 as featured in "The New HR Analytics" by Dr. Jac Fitzenz.

40. Schmidt, S. W. (2007). The Relationship Between Satisfaction with Workplace Training and Overall Job Satisfaction. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 18, no. 4.

41. Schneider, B., Hanges, P. J., Smith, D. B., and Salvaggio, A. N. (2003). Which comes first: Employee attitudes or organizational financial and market performance? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 836-851.

42. Sisson, K. (1990), "Introducing leadership styles journal", *Human Resource.*

43. Spector, 1997, Organizations have significant effects on the people who work for them as evidenced by how people feel about their work.

44. Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of Human Service Staff Satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology 13*, 6 (1985): 693-713. Web. 12 Mar. 2011.

45. Spector, P.E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

46. Storey, J. (1992). 'Leadership styles in the Public Sector' in Salaman, G. (ed.), Human Resource Strategies, London: Sage.

47. Suzuki, E., Itomine, I., Kanoya, Y., Katsuki, T., Horii, S., and Sato, C. (2006). Factors affecting rapid turnover of novice nurses in university hospitals. *Journal of Occupational Health, 48*:49-61.

48. Torrington, D. (1989). 'HRM and the Personnel Function' in Storey, J. (ed.) New Perspectives in Human Resource Management, London: Routledge.

49. Torrington, D., Hall, L. and Taylor, S. (2005). Human Resource Management, Essex: Pearson Educational Ltd.

50. Tzafrir, S. S., (2006). A universalistic perspective for explaining the relationship between HRM practices and firm performance at different points in time. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 21, No.2, pp. 109-130.

51. Watson Wyatt Worldwide. (2002). *"Employee Commitment Remains Unchanged...."*. Retrieved 2006- 11-07.

52. Wellins and Concelman. (2004) Creating the culture for employee engagement workforce performance solution. Retrieved: August 1 2005 from www.WPSmag.com.

53. Zigon, J., (1998). Rewards and performance incentives. Retrieved: February 15, 2004.