Online Adjunct Faculty: A Quantitative Examination of the Predictive Relationship between Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Donald E. Barnett
Grand Canyon University

To cite this article:

Barnett, D.E. (2018). Online adjunct faculty: A quantitative examination of the predictive relationship between leadership and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 4*(1), 226-236. DOI:10.21890/ijres.383159

Online Adjunct Faculty: A Quantitative Examination of the Predictive Relationship between Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Donald E. Barnett

Article Info	Abstract
	Advances in technology and the rapid expansion and affordability of the internet have helped facilitate the use of online education, or e-learning. To accommodate increased online enrollments, universities are hiring adjunct faculty to teach online courses. Despite the importance of adjunct faculty, there is a lack of research on the experiences of adjuncts, and particularly on the experiences of adjunct faculty who teach online classes. Likewise, there is a lack of research in the for-profit sector of post-secondary education in the United States. This quantitative correlational study addressed this gap in knowledge by investigating the predictive relationship between dimensions of the Full Range Leadership Theory, transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors, and the overall job satisfaction of adjunct faculty who teach online classes at a for-profit university in the United States. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey were used to collect data to measure the faculty's perceptions of leadership and job satisfaction. The results of multiple linear regression indicated transformational leadership was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, and increased overall satisfaction when present. Transactional leadership was also a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction, but demonstrated a negative relationship. Laissez-faire leadership was not a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction.

Introduction

Online education in the United States has rapidly expanded in the last decade. Nash (2015) observed, in the future, online courses will most certainly account for a preponderance of classes offered in post-secondary education. Recent research found that currently 28% of higher education students in the United States have taken at least one online class. In 2014, online enrollment exceeded 5.8 million students, with 2.85 million of those students studying exclusively online and 2.97 million supplementing traditional classes with online offerings (Allen & Seaman, 2016). The popularity of online learning and increased enrollments (Allen & Seaman, 2016), and the financial benefits to the university that are associated with hiring adjunct faculty (Dailey-Hebert, Mandernach, Donnelli-Sallee, & Norris, 2014), helped facilitate a demand for non-tenured/part-time, or adjunct, faculty (Gilpin, Saunders, & Stoddard, 2015) that are required to teach online classes. Regardless of the increased use of adjunct faculty, few studies have examined factors that affect their job satisfaction (Rich, 2015).

This study examines the predictive relationship between post-secondary administrative leadership behaviors and the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty who teach online courses at a for-profit university located in the United States. The faculty make-up in United States' higher education has shifted over the past decades from full-time, tenured, faculty to a labor force comprised mostly of part-time adjunct faculty (Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015). In 2011, 50% of all faculty at post-secondary schools in the United States were adjuncts (Caruth & Caruth, 2013), and that number continues to grow (Gilpin et al., 2015). Regardless of the popularity of adjunct faculty, Kezar (2013a) observed adjuncts usually do not receive adequate support from university administrators. In general, adjunct faculty have diminished chances for advancement, inadequate raises, no health insurance or retirement benefits, and a limited voice in the policies of their institutions (Halcrow & Olson, 2008; Kezar, 2013b; Morton, 2012). Additionally, Rich (2015) observed online adjuncts might not have the same experiences as their traditional counterparts. Given these factors, Benton and Li (2015) suggested department chairs find ways to increase adjunct faculty job satisfaction, increase their sense of belonging to the organization, and encourage their career development.

In addition to the lack of research on adjunct faculty job satisfaction (Rich, 2015), is the lack of research in for-profit higher education (Chung, 2012). This lack of research is an important observation given the rapid growth of for-profit post-secondary schools in the United States (Gilpin, et al., 2015), which is due largely to the desire of more individuals to obtain a college education, the increased accessibility of federal loans, and the affordability and popularity of online education (Cellini & Chaudhary, 2012). For example, enrollment in the for-profit sector has tripled since 2000 in the United States, with over 1.5 million students enrolled, as of 2014, in a for-profit school. Given the lack of studies on the for-profit higher education (Chung, 2012), there is a need to investigate the effects of leadership behaviors on the job satisfaction of faculty in these institutions (Bateh & Heyliger, 2014).

Recent research has produced conflicting findings on the effects of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors on faculty job satisfaction. Bateh and Heyliger (2014), in their research at a public university in Florida, discovered transformational and transactional leadership produced a statistically significant positive relationship to faculty job satisfaction, while laissez-faire leadership produced a negative relationship. Conversely, Amin, Shah, and Tatlah (2013) found transactional leadership was negatively related to faculty job satisfaction, while transformational behaviors produced a significant positive relationship. Masum, Azad, and Beh (2015) found transactional behaviors showed a positive relationship and transformational leadership had no significant relationship with faculty job satisfaction. Given the conflicting results of prior research, a study in the for-profit sector is warranted because factors that affect faculty job satisfaction are largely dependent on what type of school is studied (Al-Smadi & Qbian, 2015). Discovering what leadership behaviors positively predict job satisfaction may prove useful in determining future leadership positions. Moreover, the results of this study may be useful in designing leadership training, which address factors that encourage faculty job satisfaction

Review of the Literature

For this study, the theoretical foundation for leadership was the Full-Range Leadership Theory (FRLT) (Avolio & Bass, 2004) and the theoretical foundation for job satisfaction was Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene Theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). Moynihan, Pandey, and Wright (2012) observed the FLRT is one of the best-formulated and promising theories of leadership. Likewise, (Islam & Ali, 2013) stated Herzberg's theory is one of the most used theories in research that investigates employee job satisfaction.

Full-Range Leadership Theory

The FRLT, which has undergone several refinements since first proposed, is comprised of three distinctly different groups of leadership behaviors: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass & Avolio, 1994). A general premise of the FRLT is leadership styles are not mutually exclusive. Leaders can, and do, use different styles of leadership to be effective (Bass, 1985). Recent research produced findings that confirm this statement by showing a mixture of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors resulted in significant positive relationships to the job satisfaction of faculty in a Florida public university (Bateh & Heyliger, 2014). Unlike most leadership theories, the FRLT allows researchers to identify a behavior's positive and negative effects on subordinates, and may be effective in the examination of the effect of different leadership styles in post-secondary education (Samad, Reaburn, Davis, & Ahmed, 2015).

Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) coined the term transformational leadership during his examination of the biographies of political leaders. Bass (1985) made revised the transformational leadership theory to make it germane in the non-political organizational context. Further refinements by Avolio et al. (1999) and Avolio and Bass (2004) produced a multi-dimensional theory that encompasses five distinct behaviors: individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavioral), and inspirational motivation (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Hobman, Jackson, Jimmieson, and Martin (2012) observed the individual dimensions of transformational leadership could be distinguished theoretically and empirically.

Burns (1978) professed transformational leaders understand their subordinate's basic needs, and strive to surpass the satisfaction of these needs to awaken, and fulfill, the "higher order" needs of their followers. A

transformational leader endeavors to obtain their own potential while enthusiastically satisfying the needs of their followers, and empowering their charges to fulfill their highest potential (Northouse, 2013). Transformational leaders motivate and inspire their subordinates to realize their higher potential by fostering an environment that makes followers feel comfortable, and satisfied with their leadership. This fostering environment is based on encouragement, commendation, acknowledgement, and trust (Mujkić, Šehić, Rahimić, & Jusić, 2014). A leader who exhibits transformational leadership is successful when their subordinates begin to place the organization's mission and future goals ahead of their own individual remuneration (Veiseh, Mohammadi, Pirzadian, & Sharafi, 2014).

The individual facets of transformational leadership focus on fulfilling an individual's intrinsic needs. Individualized consideration involves a leader focusing their individual attention on their follower to develop them to their maximum ability (Bass, 1985). Bass and Avolio (1994), in their observation of individualized consideration, stressed the importance of professionally developing subordinates, and creating an encouraging and compassionate environment. A leader who exhibits individualized consideration frequently interacts with their followers, and acts as a mentor and a coach (Northouse, 2013). Intellectual stimulation encourages creativity and innovation as a method to encourage followers to obtain results that surpass expectations (Northouse, 2013). Leaders who use intellectual stimulation provide interesting and challenging assignments to stimulate their followers. Idealized influence is divided into behavioral and attributed aspects. Behavioral idealized influence refers to a leader displaying strong beliefs and values, a firm sense of purpose, and ethical actions. Attributed idealized influence refers to how employees perceive their leader, which effects leader/follower perceptions (Avolio & Bass, 2004). In other words, behavioral is how a leader acts and attributed is how a leader is perceived. Lastly, inspirational motivation involves exhibiting enthusiasm, inspiring and motivating subordinates, effectively communicating the goals of the organization, and encouraging followers to take an active part in achieving the vision of the organization (Northouse, 2013). A recent study discovered each facet of transformational leadership displayed a significant positive relationship to idea implementation, work commitment, idea promotion, and idea generation in educational institutions (Abbas, Iqbal, Waheed, & Naveed Riaz, 2012).

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership differs from transformational leadership in several ways. James Macgregor Burns (1978), who first proposed the transactional leadership theory, stated transactional leadership entails a leader being aware of subordinate and organizational needs, and clearly communicating what must be done to fulfill these needs. Employees are motivated to obtain specific goals by rewards and promises that fulfill a follower's self-interest while meeting the goals of the organization. All duties, codes of discipline, and benefits are strictly defined (Bass & Avolio, 1994), and agreements, or contracts, that define rewards for acceptable performance and punishments for substandard work or violations of organizational policy are made with employees (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Leaders actively monitor employee performance, and act before work becomes substandard (Bass, 1997). Transactional leadership is comprised of two dimensions: contingent reward and management-by-exception.

Contingent reward is just that, rewards that are contingent on the successful completion of a specific duty. Rewards may be monetary, such as pay-raises and bonuses, or in the form of commendations, praise, or something else the employee deems desirable (Bass, 1997). Self-interest on the part of the employer and employee is the basis for contingent reward (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Management-by-exception is divided into active and passive forms. Active management-by-exception involves management actively monitoring employee performance and intervening when there is a policy violation or unacceptable performance is detected (Bass, 1997). Passive management-by-exception differs from the active dimension in that the leader only acts after a problem occurs. Often, passive management-by-exception includes negative feedback, punishments, or criticism (Northouse, 2013). Avolio & Bass (2004) made passive management-by-exception a dimension of laissez-faire leadership for purposes of measuring perceptions of full-range leadership with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

Laissez-faire Leadership

Passive/Avoidant, or laissez-faire, leadership is essentially an absence of any leadership behavior (Bass & Riggio, 2006). This style differs from passive management-by-exception in that when a problem is discovered, the leader fails to act, help, or provide feedback that would help their subordinates obtain their highest potential

(Northouse, 2013). Laissez-faire leaders typically are indifferent, uninfluential, inactive, absent when needed, and devoid of any sense of subordinate development (Bass, 1985). Although infrequently seen in entire organizations (Bass, 1985), laissez-faire leadership is still exhibited by some members of management (Bateh & Heyliger, 2014).

Job Satisfaction

Faculty job satisfaction is a principal element that influences the dynamics of an organization and major indicator of employee effectiveness (Pan, Shen, Liu, Yang, & Wang, 2015). Despite its importance, scholars fail to agree on what job satisfaction is, and what it entails. In his seminal work, Locke (1976) stated job satisfaction is "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience" (p. 1300). Islam and Ali (2013) suggested job satisfaction is the outcome of how individuals regard different aspects of their job, with supervision, type of work, environment, policies, and similar aspects contributing to their perception of how the job satisfies their needs. Chamberlain, Hoben, Squires, & Estabrooks (2016) professed job satisfaction is a complex combination of how an individual evaluates the task performance, emotions, and values associated with a job. Instead of attempting to define job satisfaction, for this study, Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene Theory serves as the theoretical foundation for job satisfaction.

Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene Theory

Herzberg et al. (1959) laid the foundations of the Motivation/Hygiene Theory in their study of 203 members of middle management. They found jobs had distinct elements related to job dissatisfaction and job satisfaction. Factors that encouraged satisfaction were identified as motivators. Conversely, factors that encouraged dissatisfaction were called hygiene factors. Herzberg (1987) clearly separated the notions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction when he noted the opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction. Similarly, Herzberg (1987) observed the opposite of dissatisfaction is not satisfaction. Instead, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are related, but also different.

Herzberg et al. (1959) observed the intrinsic factors of the job, known as motivators, increase job satisfaction when present, but do not necessarily increase job dissatisfaction when absent. These motivators include responsibility, achievement, recognition, growth, the work itself, and recognition. These motivators promote long-term job satisfaction, while hygiene factors create dissatisfaction if they are absent. Hygiene factors include the extrinsic factors of relationship with peers, salary, relationships with superiors, supervision, personal life, relationship with subordinates, status, security, organizational policy and administration, and working conditions (Herzberg et al., 1959). Hygiene factors decrease job dissatisfaction when present, but do not necessarily increase job satisfaction. Conversely, if hygiene factors are absent, job dissatisfaction increases. According to Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene Theory, a leader cannot improve employee job satisfaction by only improving hygiene factors. An increase in hygiene factors may raise satisfaction temporarily, but over the long term, leaders must ensure motivator factors are present. They must raise the levels of the six intrinsic motivators to encourage long-term job satisfaction while discouraging dissatisfaction by ensuring hygiene factors are present.

As an example, the workplace of an organization is out-of-date, dirty, and generally unappealing, and workers are dissatisfied with their working conditions. A new leader modernizes the workplace. Instead of a drab office space, the new leader addresses hygiene concerns by installing modern furniture, adds a water machine, and generally improves the working conditions of the employees. Initially, the employees are less dissatisfied because of the improvements, but that does not necessarily mean they are satisfied with their job. The new leader also takes interest in their employees and encourages employee growth, recognizes achievements, and increases employee responsibility. These motivation factors, while not having a relationship with dissatisfaction, raise the levels of job satisfaction. Also, these intrinsic factors increase satisfaction over the long-term (Herzberg et al., 1959). A simple change in the décor of the office may only affect employee perceptions over the short term; however, a combination of an increase in hygiene and motivator factors simultaneously decreases dissatisfaction while increasing job satisfaction, which is what Herzberg professes as the correct manner to foster overall job satisfaction in employees.

Research Question

Syed and Yan (2012) observed employee job satisfaction is fundamental to an organization's success. Despite this, there is little research on the experiences of adjunct faculty who teach online classes (Rich, 2015) or the for-profit sector of higher education (Chung, 2012). Bateh and Heyliger (2014) concluded there is a need to study the effects of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors on faculty job satisfaction in for-profit post-secondary schools in the United States. To address this gap in knowledge, the researcher proposes the following research question and null hypotheses:

RQ1: To what extent does the use of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership by administrators predict the overall job satisfaction of adjunct faculty who teach online classes at a for-profit institution of higher education in the United States?

$H1_0$: There is no statistically significant predictive relationship between the use of transformational leadership and the job satisfaction of the adjunct faculty.

$H2_0$: There is no statistically significant predictive relationship between the use of transactional leadership by administrators and the job satisfaction of the adjunct faculty.

$H3_0$: There is no statistically significant predictive relationship between the use of laissez-faire leadership by administrators and the job satisfaction of the adjunct faculty.

Method

The design for this study was quantitative correlational. The research involved the use of multiple linear regression to determine if there was a predictive relationship between the overall transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors of first-line higher education administrators in a for-profit university and the overall job satisfaction of adjunct faculty who teach online classes at the same institution. The dependent variable for the study was the overall job satisfaction of adjunct faculty who teach online classes. The independent variables were the (1) overall transformational leadership behaviors, (2) overall transactional leadership behaviors, and (3) overall laissez-faire leadership behaviors of the faculty's direct supervisor.

Population and Sample

The target population of this sample consisted of approximately 800 faculty members of a for-profit university in the United States. An invitation to participate in an online survey was given to the members of the population via the institutions email system with the stipulation that to be eligible for the survey, they must be adjunct faculty who have taught an online class within the past six months. A total of 84 surveys were returned. Of those, seven surveys were not completed and were removed, which left a total of $N = 77$ respondents. According to G*Power (Faul. Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, 2007), using a 95% confidence level, a 5% margin of error, effect of $f^2 = .15$, and a power of 0.80, the minimum sample size for bivariate linear regression was 77 respondents.

Instruments

The instruments for this study were the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5x (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 2004) and Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1997). The MLQ is a 45-question instrument that uses 36 questions, measured on a five-point Likert type scale, to measure the nine dimensions of the FRLT with five questions each. The dimensions include the "transformational dimensions of inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, attributed idealized influence, behavioral idealized influence, and individual consideration, the transactional dimensions of active management-by exception and contingent reward, and the two dimensions of laissez-faire leadership; laissez-faire behaviors and passive management-by-exception" (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The remaining nine questions address the leadership outcome variables of extra effort, effectiveness, and leader satisfaction, which were not used for this study. The respondents were given statements like my supervisor "is absent when I need him/her", and asked to pick responses ranging from 1, "not at all", to 5 "frequently, if not always". The individual dimensions of each leadership style were combined to measure the overall perceptions of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors.

The JSS is a 36-question instrument that uses a 6-point Likert scale to measure nine work factors. The job factors measured included the "nature of work, communication, operating procedures, coworker relationships, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, supervision, pay, and promotion potential" (Spector, 1997). Respondents could choose answers from 1, "disagree very much", to 6, "agree very much" to statements such as "My supervisor gives me interesting assignments". The individual dimensions of each job factor were combined to measure overall job satisfaction.

Reliability

A Cronbach's alpha value of .90 or more is deemed excellent, .80-.89 is considered good, .70-.79 is considered acceptable, .60-.69 is considered questionable, .50-.59 is poor, and less than .50 is unacceptable (George & Mallery, 2016). All constructs were found to be reliable for the dataset used in this study (Table 1).

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Demographic questions, such as sex, age, education, were not used in this study. A descriptive examination (Table 1) indicates that after adjusting for the number of items measured, transactional leadership was perceived as most used by first-line administrative leaders ($M = 2.87$) with eight items measured. Transformational leadership was perceived as the second most used style of leadership ($M = 2.85$) with 20 items measured. Lastly, laissez-faire leadership was perceived as the third most used style of leadership ($M = 2.79$) with eight items measured. The three styles of leadership were each perceived as being used a significant amount of time by administrators, which indicates leaders use more than one style of leadership.

The overall job satisfaction score had a possible range of 36 – 216. Spector (1997) suggested interpreting the 36-item total for overall job satisfaction, where possible means range from 36 to 216, as follows: The scores of 36 to 108 indicate dissatisfaction, 144 to 216 shows satisfaction, and 108 and 144 viewed as signifying ambivalence. Adhering to Spector's suggestion, the sample indicated ambivalence regarding their overall job satisfaction ($M = 116.34$).

Table 1. Measures of Central Tendency and Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha (N = 77)

Leadership Style	*M*	*SD*	α
Transformational leadership	2.85	0.84	.95
Transactional leadership	2.87	0.65	.69
Laissez-faire leadership	2.79	0.77	.79
Total satisfaction	116.34	19.92	.90

Note. M = Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation

Multiple Linear Regression

A multiple linear regression was performed to regress the dependent variable of overall job satisfaction on the three independent variables of (a) transformational leadership, (b) transactional leadership, and (c) laissez-faire leadership. Results of the multiple linear regression are presented in Table 2.

The model indicated at least one predictor was significantly different from zero [F (3, 73) = 13.57, p < .0005], with R^2 of .358 (.332 adjusted). The adjusted R-square value of .358 indicated approximately 36% of the variability in the dependent variable of total satisfaction was predicted by the three independent variables in the model. Two predictors were significant for the outcome of overall job satisfaction, (a) transformational leadership [t (73) = 4.85, p < .0005; 95% CI (1.78, 4.26], and (b) transactional leadership [t (73) = -2.81, p = .006; 95% CI (-7.61, -1.29]. The squared semi-partial correlation for the predictor of transformational leadership was 0.21, indicating this variable contributed 21% of unique variance to the outcome of total satisfaction. The squared semi-partial correlation for the predictor of transactional leadership, 0.07, indicated 7% of unique variance on the outcome of total satisfaction can be attributed to the transactional leadership variable. The size and direction of the coefficient for transformational leadership (B = 3.02) indicates on average, the

score of total satisfaction increases approximately 3 points for each 1-point increase in the transformational leadership scores. Thus, increases in transformational leadership are associated with increases in total satisfaction. The negative value of the coefficient of the predictor of transactional leadership (-4.45) indicates total satisfaction decreased by approximately 4.5 points on average for each 1-point increase in transactional leadership. This suggests increases in transactional leadership are associated with decreases in total satisfaction.

Table 2. Multiple regression results for total satisfaction

Variable	B	*SE* B	β	*t*	Sig.
Transformational leadership	3.02	0.62	.638	4.858	<.0005
Transactional leadership	-4.45	1.59	-.289	-2.81	.006
Laissez-faire leadership	-0.34	1.60	-.026	-0.21	.833
Constant	100.71	16.66	---	---	---

Model Summary: $F = 13.57, p <.0005$
$N = 77$
$R^2 = .358$
Adjusted $R^2 = .332$

Note. Sig.= Significance (p-value).

Hypothesis 1

$H1_0$: There is no statistically significant predictive relationship between the use of transformational leadership by administrators and the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty who teach online classes.

The predictor of transformational leadership was statistically significant for the outcome of total satisfaction [t (73) = 4.85, p < .0005; 95% CI (1.78, 4.26)]. Null Hypothesis 1 was rejected. There is sufficient evidence to indicate there is a statistically significant predictive relationship between the use of transformational leadership and the job satisfaction of the sample.

Hypothesis 2

$H2_0$: There is no statistically significant predictive relationship between the use of transactional leadership by administrators and the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty who teach online classes.

The predictor of transactional leadership was statistically significant for the outcome of total satisfaction [t (73) = -2.81, p = .006; 95% CI (-7.61, -1.29]. Null Hypothesis 2 was rejected. There is sufficient evidence to indicate there is a statistically significant predictive relationship between the administrators' transactional leadership style and the job satisfaction of the sample.

Hypothesis 3

$H3_0$: There is no statistically significant predictive relationship between the use of laissez-faire leadership by administrators and the job satisfaction of the adjunct faculty who teach online classes.

The predictor of laissez-faire leadership was statistically significant for the outcome of total satisfaction [t (73) = -0.34, p = .833; 95% CI (-3.52, 2.84]. Null Hypothesis 2 was not rejected. There is not sufficient evidence to indicate there is a statistically significant predictive relationship between the administrators' laissez-faire leadership style and the job satisfaction of online adjunct faculty in a for-profit university in the United States.

Discussion

Adjunct faculty face different challenges than their traditional counterparts. Generally, they receive fewer benefits and have a lesser voice in the university (Kezar, 2013a, 2013b). Adjunct faculty who teach online classes may face even more challenges. They generally work from home and are largely isolated from

leadership and their co-workers, which may explain the ambivalence displayed in this study concerning overall job satisfaction. Spector (1997) noted mean scores between 108 and 144 indicates ambivalence. A mean value of 116, as found in this study, suggests online adjuncts at this university are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their job. Further examination of the descriptive statistics shows the sample perceived their direct superior used transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership to a similar extent, which supports the assertion by Bass (1985) that leaders use all three leadership behaviors to a certain degree.

Transactional leadership is largely based on compensation and the monitoring of employee work, while transformational leadership motivates, stimulates, and encourages followers to strive to accomplish the goals of the organization (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Interestingly, the sample perceived transactional leadership as being the most used leadership behavior. Moreover, transactional leadership displayed a significant negative relationship with overall job satisfaction. These two observations suggest the use of transactional leadership may have encouraged ambivalence, or increased dissatisfaction, in the sample. Herzberg et al. (1959) noted extrinsic hygiene factors, if not present, increase job dissatisfaction. Transactional leadership, unlike transformational leadership, focuses on contingent rewards and adherence to the policy and rules of the organization. It is arguable contingent rewards are largely extrinsic in nature, which suggests some aspects of contingent rewards may be lacking, as perceived by this sample, which may help explain the ambivalence exhibited towards job satisfaction.

The sample perceived transformational leadership as being the second most used style of leadership by their superiors. Additionally, transformational leadership was found to be a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction. The findings of this study suggest that as the use of transformational leadership increases the overall job satisfaction of online adjuncts increases. Likewise, if transformational leadership behaviors decrease, overall job satisfaction decreases as well. This finding is consistent with other studies (Bateh & Heyliger, 2014; Omar & Hussin, 2013) that came to a similar conclusion. Online adjuncts, who are often isolated from their co-workers and leadership, appear to benefit from transformational leadership despite perceiving transactional leadership as the most used by their leaders. The mean for transformational leadership ($M = 2.85$), which is under the standard mean for the scale ($M = 3$), indicates the respondents did not feel their leaders used transformational a majority of the time. Moreover, the means of each independent variable, transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership were below the standard mean, which suggests the respondents did not perceive any of these leadership styles as being used a majority of the time. Laissez-faire leadership, perceived as the third most used style of leadership, was not a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction ($p = .833$).

Arguably, transformational leadership is largely based on intrinsic dimensions. Moreover, intrinsic motivators encourage job satisfaction if present and decrease satisfaction if absent (Herzberg et al., 1959). The findings of this study suggest the leadership of this organization may under use transformational leadership. Significant interaction between leader and follower may be hampered by the distance that separates online adjuncts from their superiors, and may help explain the sample's perception that transformational leadership was the second most used type of leadership. Conversely, the findings may suggest leaders in this organization simply do not use transformational leadership as much as they do transactional leadership. This observation suggests the organization should design leadership development programs that emphasize the benefits of transformational leadership to the organization and employee. Additionally, administrators may be having difficulty effectively leading in the virtual environment, which suggests training in e-leadership may be warranted.

This study demonstrates the positive effects of transformational leadership on the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty who teach online classes at one specific university. This study also shows the detrimental effects of transactional leadership on the same sample, as shown in previous research (Saleem, 2015). Laissez-faire leadership did not display a significant predictive relationship with overall job satisfaction. The findings support the Motivation/Hygiene theory, which emphasized the importance of satisfying motivators and hygiene factors. The results of this study may be helpful in designing leadership development programs by identifying leadership behaviors that increase or decrease satisfaction.

Conclusion

The results of this study showed transformational leadership was a significant predictor of overall online adjunct job satisfaction, and is positively related to the overall job satisfaction of the sample. Transactional leadership, while also being a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction, demonstrated a negative relationship to the overall job satisfaction of the sample. Laissez-faire leadership did not display a significant relationship with overall job satisfaction. This study provided valuable information on an under researched demographic that

included adjunct faculty who teach online classes at a for-profit university in the United States. This research also yielded limitations and several suggestions for further research.

Although this study addressed a gap in academic knowledge, there are limitations to this study. The first limitation is the fact that only one university was investigated. Future research into other samples of adjunct faculty who teach online classes is warranted. The second limitation is the fact that a quantitative study can only capture a point in time and cannot investigate the respondent's motives and feelings. It may be beneficial to perform a qualitative study to determine why online adjuncts hold a specific view about their leadership and job satisfaction. The findings may add depth to quantitative research performed on a similar sample. It may also be beneficial to examine the individual dimensions of the FRLT, and their effects on overall job satisfaction. Likewise, further investigation into e-leadership and its effect on online employees is warranted. Further research should examine how leadership behaviors affect the individual dimensions of job satisfaction. Lastly, similar research should be performed using descriptive data that includes demographic information such as sex, age, years under current leader, and other questions that may help identify any differences in the sample.

An abundance of previous research has shown transformational leadership to be beneficial to organizational and individual outcomes in addition to job satisfaction (Amin et al., 2016). Given the findings of this research, a prudent suggestion is leadership in for-profit sector, and specifically organizations that are predominately online, consider incorporating transformational leadership training into their employee development programs, and make transformational leadership a part of their day-to-day operations. Doing so may help foster employee job satisfaction, which may increase the effectiveness of the organization and the quality of education provided to students.

Acknowledgements

References

Abbas, G., Iqbal, J., Waheed, A., & Naveed Riaz, M. (2012). Relationship between transformational leadership style and innovative work behavior in educational institutions. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, *22*(3), 18-32.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bass, B. M. (1997). Personal selling and transactional/transformational leadership. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, *17*(3), 19-28.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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

Bateh, J., & Heyliger, W. (2014). Academic administrator leadership styles and the impact on faculty job satisfaction. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *13*(3), 34-49. http://dx.doi.org/10.12806/v13/i3/rf3

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

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

Caruth, G. D., & Caruth, D. L. (2013). Adjunct faculty: Who are these unsung heroes of academe? *Current Issues in Education*, *16*(3), 1-10.

Cellini, S. R., & Chaudhary, L. (2012). The labor market returns to a for-profit college education. *Economics of Education Review*, *43*, 125-140. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2014.10.001

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

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

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

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

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*, 175-191. http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/bf03193146

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

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

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

Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, *65*(5), 109-120. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-02701-9_2

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York, NY: Wiley.

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

Islam, S., & Ali, N. (2013). Motivation-Hygiene Theory: Applicability on teachers. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, *7*(1), 87-104.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nash, J. A. (2015). Future of online education in crisis: A call to action. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *14*(2), 80-88. Retrieved from http://tojet.net/volumes/v14i2.pdf#page=90

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

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

Pan, B., Shen, X., Liu, L., Yang, Y., & Wang, L. (2015). Factors associated with job satisfaction among university teachers in northeastern region of China: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of*

    Environmental research and Public Health, *12*(10), 12761-12775. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph121012761

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

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

Samad, A., Reaburn, P., Davis, H., & Ahmed, E. (2015). Towards an understanding of the effect of leadership on employee wellbeing and organizational outcomes in Australian universities. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, *49*(6), 441-448. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jda.2015.0121

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

Syed, N., & Yan, L. X. (2012). Impact of high performance human resource management on employee job satisfaction: Empirical analysis. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, *4*(2), 318-342.

Veiseh, S., Mohammadi, E., Pirzadian, M., & Sharafi, V. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership and organizational culture (Case study: Medical school of Ilam). *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, *5*(3), 113-124.

Author Information

Donald E. Barnett
Grand Canyon University
Phoenix AZ, USA
Contact e-mail: *don.barnettjr@yahoo.com*