Abstract

Purpose: This study explored the influence of leadership behavioural factors on employees’ job satisfaction, and consequently on employees’ performance.

Design/methodology/approach: Empowerment, Humility, Courage, Forbearance, Directive, Supportive and Participative are the key factors applied in this study as significant dimensions of leadership behaviours.

Random samples of 78 participant managers were collected from a six manufacturing organizations in Dubai to be applied for the analysis of this study. The data needed to measure the hypotheses of the proposed conceptual methods were collected via the 5-point Likert scale structured questionnaire from top, middle and first line managers through survey questionnaires.

SPSS statistics tool has been used to analyse the collected data and formulate and measure the proposed hypotheses using regression and correlation analyses.

Findings: Results show that the five leadership behaviour’s dimensions were statistically significant and positively related with employee’s job satisfaction.

Originality/Values: This study adds to the existing literature by shedding the light on the process by which the selected leadership behavioural factors enhance employees’ satisfactions and performance.

Keywords: Leadership behaviour; employees’ job satisfaction; employees’ job performance.

1. Introduction

Nowadays, one of the main difficulties facing businesses is maintaining effective employee’s skills needed in competitive business environment so as to accomplish their business objectives effectively and professionally.

Employees’ sensations to their responsibility and solidarity in business are a significant feature which can’t be disregarded by any advanced business.

As renovation, and inventiveness have become important root of competitive advantage for business (Garcia-Morales et al., 2008), Job satisfaction still the main motivation and incentive source to the renovation and inventiveness of the employee in the human capital focused businesses.

During the last decade, different studies discusses the significance of leadership behaviours on developing a constructive employee approaches (Kreitner, 2008; Hebert, 2003; Wilderom, Berg & Peter, 2004; Garcia-Morales et al., 2008; Luthans, 2002; Long et al., 2010; Adler et al., 2008; Amadeo, 2008; Madlock, 2008; Harris et al., 2009). These studies accomplished that leadership behaviour has a substantial influence on job satisfaction.

Leaders’ behaviour can influence job satisfaction through presenting humility, authenticity and courage; forgiving employees for their mistakes; standing back and giving credit to others; giving them accountability for the results that are core of their duty; increasing their ability, and giving them authorisation needed to enhance and increase productivity and service quality.

In general, Business’s leadership behaviour is deemed to have a direct influence on the employee’s job satisfaction, and consequently the organization’s total coherence (Wilderom, Berg & Peter, 2004). Furthermore, other researches have revealed that in businesses which have a developed leadership behaviour, leads to high business achievement (Mckinnon, Harrison, Chow & Wu, 2003).

The purpose of this study is to measure the influence of business leadership behaviours on employees’ job satisfaction in relation with different factors, proposed within a conceptual framework derived from bibliographical and research studies.

To meet these objectives, the research question for this study is “What are the key factors influencing the employees’ job satisfactions and performance?” To achieve this aim, a conceptual model based on previous literatures was proposed to measure selected variables.
The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews the literature and hypotheses development. Section 3 discusses the research methodology, Section 4 provides analytical results and discusses and lastly, Section 5 provides the conclusion of this study.

2. Literature review and Hypotheses development

There have been numerous studies achieved by preceding authors concerning the execution correlated with leadership behaviour. Though, the effects were different. Many authors stated that the leadership behaviour is able to enhance the employees’ job satisfaction and consequently job performance (Harris et al., 2009; Yiing and Jaman, 2008). Conversely, other authors stated that there is no direct influence between leadership behaviour and employees’ job satisfaction (Politis, 2005; Griffith, 2003).

Many previous studies lead to a fact that the accomplishment of business goals are essentially depends on all levels of managers and their leadership behaviour. The leadership behaviour has a direct influence on employees’ job satisfaction and productivity (Kreitner, 2008).

Tordera et al., (2008) reflects numerous images of leadership behaviour such as attitudes, characteristics and skills applied by a leader in various occasions in line with employee’s performance and managerial principles.

Different circumstances may face different employees at various times which may require Leaders to take right behaviours to stimulate them to achieve their highest potential.

Tordera et al., (2008) believes leadership as a significance stimulus for the constructive employment results which guarantees an assured and inspired employees. Vecchio et al., (2008) revealed that, conscious leadership has been proposed as a stimulator to several business results such as employees’ job satisfaction.

A review of the existing literature has emphasised that the factors that most researchers and academics cite in discussing leadership behaviour such as autocratic, bureaucratic, laissez-faire, charismatic, democratic, participative, situational, transactional, and transformational leadership. However, there is unanimity between different authors that a specific leadership behaviour may produce result in a specific occasion. Specifically, a particular leadership behaviour may not be ideal for every leader at every situation.

2.1 Empowerment

Empowerment is a key factor in leadership behaviour and could be one of its main focus (Russell & Stone, 2002).

Empowering leader behaviour is referring to the process of allowing different level of employees to use different level of power and authority to make decisions (Konczak et al., 2000; Patterson, 2003).

Empowering process given by leaders assist subordinates remove hindrances by themselves instead of suggesting solutions, inspires the subordinates to use their abilities and skills to provide valuable solutions that will develop solutions appropriately and smoothly, (Russell & Stone 2002; Konczak et al., 2000; Van Dierendonck, 2011). Empowering provided by leaders authorises the business to stay away from the monotonous of hierarchical shapes of management and follow self-managing labour which consequently enhance manageability, efficiency, creativity and productivity of business (Liden et al, 2008; Arnold et al., 2000).

Therefore, our first hypothesis is:

H1: Empowerment leadership behaviour has a positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction.

2.2 Humility

During the last decade, leadership scholars have gradually focused on the significance of humility leadership behaviour. Humility refer to the state where everyone is fallible.

Humility leadership behaviour is one of the key features of the developing people-centered leadership notion (Dierendonck, 2011). Patterson (2003) explained humility leadership behaviour as a
leader’s ability to understanding the idea of not knowing or having all the answers. Such a notion of humility is introductory to leader self-assessment.

Leaders can condone their boundaries and request for assistance to solve such mistakes (Page & Wong, 2000; Robbins’, 2003).

The demands for humility leadership behaviour have been deepened in the get rid of corporate dishonours such as ego, hubris, and arrogance of the business managers (Knottnerus, Ulsperger, Cummins, & Osteen, 2006), and consequently leader conceit and vanity leads to leaders wrong decisions (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007).

Hence, Humility is concerning the leader’s aptitude to acknowledge their own faults and inadequacies, and to accept interceptions for the purpose of reform (Dennis & Bocarneo, 2005).

Accordingly, the relationship between humility and employees’ job satisfaction is hypothesized as follows:

H2: Humility leadership behaviour has a positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction.

2.3 Courage

Courage leadership behaviour is about a leader’s alacrity and enthusiasm to over boldness to provideresolutions in line with their own principles, despite the fact that there is vagueness in the support of the top management (Russell & Stone, 2002; Robbins’, 2003).

In business, courage is concerning the defying traditional sorts of leadingbehaviours and replaced with novelty and productivity (Patterson, 2003).

Corresponding to the above we propose the following hypothesis:

H3: Courage leadership behaviour has a positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction.

2.4 Forbearance

Forbearance leadership behaviour is about turning the blind eye for what went wrong previously, discussing others’ faults and keep positive concerning a subordinates. This will makesubordinates feel accepted, less fretful regarding makeerrors, and being refused. Forbearance is about assisting the subordinates to accomplish themost creative (Page & Wong, 2000; Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

Therefore, our fourth hypothesis is:

H4: Forbearance leadership behaviour has a positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction.

2.5 Directive

Directive leadership behaviour is about guiding subordinates to achieve their task thoroughly. Leader may also set guidelines, rules and regulations for followers (Northouse, 2013). Directive leadership behaviour is needed particularly when tasks are complicated or confusing (Lussier and Acha, 2010).

Corresponding to the above we propose the following hypothesis:

H5: Directive leadership behaviour has a positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction.

2.6 Supportive

Supportive leadership behaviour is about subordinates’ comfort and fulfill personal desires. Supportive leadership behaviour refer to the dealing of being welcoming and open-minded as a leader is the main person needed by followers (Northouse, 2013; Lussier and Acha, 2010).

Hence, the following hypothesis is proposed.

H6: Supportive leadership behaviour has a positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction.

2.7 Participative

Participative leader behaviour is when he/she discusses with followers before make decisions. This type of discussion with followers is to acquire their concepts and beliefs and incorporates their opinions into final decision (Page & Wong, 2000; Northouse, 2013). Participative leadership
behaviour is applicable when followers can’t work in arbitrary environment, have top level point of control, and subordinate skills is extreme, business power is unwise (Lussier and Achua, 2010). Corresponding to the above we propose the following hypothesis:
H7: Participative leadership behaviour has a positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction.

2.8 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a widely researched topic and observed as one of the essential means for the employees’ job performance (Kleinman, 2004). Many previous studies conducted by different researchers lead to a fact that the employees’ job satisfaction have a direct influence on employee performance (Chen, 2006; Knneth Harrist et al, 2009; Jui-Chen Chen, 2008; Karatepe et al, 2005; Lussier and Achua, 2010; Thomas et al 2005). Whereas other researchers revealed that there was no clear correlation between job satisfaction and employee performance (Alf Crossman, 2003).

Job satisfaction refers to the general feeling of the employees to their job and denotes reliable features of their employment, including a remuneration system, operational circumstances, business leaderships and co-workers (Vecchio, 2008; Robbins, 2003).

Job satisfaction reveals the extent to which an employee willing to work and give performances, as any business that have contented workers are highly creative than those with discontented workers (Hellriegel and Slocum, 2007).

A business workers may be more comfortable with particular aspects of the job while frustrated with others, for instance an employee may be happy with colleagues but unhappy with overtime job (Luthans, 2008; While Muchinsky, 2007).

Corresponding to the above we propose the following hypothesis:
H8: Employees’ job satisfaction has a positive influence on employees’ performance.

In this study we are focusing on the seven factors (Empowerment, Humility, Courage, Forbearance, Directive, Supportive, Participative) used by contemporary leadership behaviours.

Based on the review of the above-mentioned past searches, the proposed research model is shown in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: Conceptual research model**
3. Methodology

3.1 Research design

This study was accomplished for the purpose of observing the influence of leadership behaviour on employee job satisfaction and performance.

The research was following a deductive quantitative approach, using descriptive research methods.

3.2 Data collection and population

The required data was collected by using a survey questionnaire. Random samples of 78 participant managers were collected from a six manufacturing organizations in Dubai to be applied for the analysis of this study. From 175 disseminated questionnaires, 32 questionnaires were removed because they were unfinished or had mistaken. Only 78 questionnaires were received. These comprised 62 first line managers, 12 middle managers and 4 top managers. 88% were males and the rest are females. The proposed conceptual framework was tested using such survey questionnaire.

Each hypothesis was tested using two close ended survey questions and is divided into two main sections. Section 1 consists of 6 questions to measure personal profile and demographic characteristics of respondents includes, including gender, age, educational background, internet use experiences, and job title.

Section 2, comprises of 14 questions for measuring leadership behaviours hypotheses and 2 questions for measuring employee’s job performance using a 5-point Likert scale questions. Data was analysed using SPSS version 17.

The population of the research was based on various level positions, variations in the natures of tasks, the extent of influence and accountabilities enclosed to the position.

4. Data Analysis and Results

4.1 Reliability and Validity of Scales

The reliability of scales applied in this research was calculated by Cronbach's coefficient alpha. As shown in Table 1, reliability coefficient alpha scales for the measurement of leadership behaviour variables are exceeded the minimum acceptable level of 0.7 (Tenenhaus et al., 2005), which revealing that the scales used in this study were highly reliable.

Table 1: Reliability and validity scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.975</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Correlation Test

Correlation analysis was performed (see table 2) to examine the relationship between the independent variables (Empowerment, Humility, Courage, Forbearance, Directive, Supportive, Participative) and the dependent variable (Employees’ Job satisfaction).

It also measures the relationship between Employees’ Job satisfaction and Employees’ Job Performance.

To inspect the bivariate relationships between the above variables, a Pearson’s correlation analysis was carried out and the results shows that variables (Empowerment =0.970, Humility=0.970, Courage=0.970, Forbearance=0.941, Directive=0.970, Supportive=0.970, participative=0.406) are correlated to Employees’ Job satisfaction. The result also revealed that Employees’ Job satisfaction=0.883 is correlated to Employees’ Job Performance.

Also, and as all of the p-values are above 0.932 (accept participative) which is very close to 1, this indicates that there is a strong relationship between independents and dependent variables. In other
words, this indicates that changes in any independent variable will strongly correlate with changes in the dependent variable.

Table 2: Correlation test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Humility</th>
<th>Courage</th>
<th>Forbearance</th>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Participative</th>
<th>EmpJobSat</th>
<th>EmpJobPer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.939(**)</td>
<td>.939(**)</td>
<td>.912(**</td>
<td>.939(**</td>
<td>.939(**</td>
<td>.406(**</td>
<td>.970(**</td>
<td>.853(**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>.939(**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.939(**</td>
<td>.912(**</td>
<td>.939(**</td>
<td>.970(**</td>
<td>.406(**</td>
<td>.970(**</td>
<td>.853(**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbearance</td>
<td>.912(**</td>
<td>.912(**</td>
<td>.912(**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.941(**</td>
<td>.912(**</td>
<td>.417(**</td>
<td>.941(**</td>
<td>.856(**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>.939(**</td>
<td>.970(**</td>
<td>.939(**</td>
<td>.912(**</td>
<td>.939(**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.436(**</td>
<td>.970(**</td>
<td>.853(**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmpJobSat</td>
<td>.970(**</td>
<td>.970(**</td>
<td>.970(**</td>
<td>.941(**</td>
<td>.970(**</td>
<td>.970(**</td>
<td>.406(**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.883(**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmpJobPer</td>
<td>.853(**</td>
<td>.853(**</td>
<td>.853(**</td>
<td>.856(**</td>
<td>.912(**</td>
<td>.853(**</td>
<td>.394(**</td>
<td>.883(**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.3 Regression Test

For additional analysis, Linear Regression was carried out to measure the hypothesised relationships among the variables and the extent to which the independent variables influence the dependent variable.
The result of each hypothesis is shown in table 3. All result shown above measured with \( \alpha=0.05 \).

The result of the regression in the coefficient summary (Table 3) revealed that Empowerment (\( t=4.649, \text{ sig}<0.0005 \)) is found to be highly positive and significantly affects employees’ job satisfaction. These results strongly support H1.


They have revealed that Empowerment leadership behaviour has a significant influence on enhancing employees’ job satisfaction.

The result of the regression in the coefficient summary also indicates that humility (\( t=2.363, \text{ sig}<0.05 \)) is found to be significantly influence employees’ job satisfaction, which leads to accept and support H2. This result is in consistent with the view of Patterson (2003), Page & Wong (2000), Robbins’ (2003), Knottnerus et al. (2006) and Dennis & Bocarneo (2005), who all confirm that humility leadership behaviour is one of the key factors for that strongly affects employees’ job satisfaction.

The result of the regression in the coefficients table (table 3) also revealed that courage (\( t=4.649, \text{ sig}<0.0005 \)) is found to be highly significantly affect employees’ job satisfaction. This result supports H3. This result is in consistent with the view of Russell & Stone (2002), Robbins’ (2003) and Patterson (2003), who revealed that the employees’ job satisfaction is influenced by the courage leadership behaviour.

The fourth hypothesis is revealed in the coefficient result which shows Forbearance (1.717, sig=0.09) which may accepted as low significantly affecting employees’ job satisfaction. This result may partially supports H4. This result is in accordance with the view of Page & Wong (2000), Wilderom, Berg & Peter (2004), Kreitner (2008) and Van Dierendonck & Nuijten (2011), who all claimed that the Forbearance leadership behaviour has a positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction.

The coefficients table also indicate that directive (\( t=3.487, \text{ sig}<0.005 \)) is found to significantly influence employees’ job satisfaction, which leads to accept and support H5. This result is in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Employee Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.649</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>Employee Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.363</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Employee Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.649</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbearance</td>
<td>Employee Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Employee Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.487</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Employee Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.609</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>Employee Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-1.096</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>Non-Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Employee Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>16.374</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consistent with the view of Northouse (2013), Wilderom, Berg & Peter (2004), Kreitner (2008), and Lussier and Achua (2010) are all support the fact that directive leadership behaviour will have positive influences on employees’ job satisfaction.

The coefficients table also indicate that Supportive (t=2.609, sig<0.05) is found to significantly influence employees’ job satisfaction, which leads to accept and support H6. This result is in consistent with the view of Northouse (2013), Wilderom, Berg & Peter (2004), Kreitner (2008), and Lussier and Achua (2010) are all support the fact that supportive leadership behaviour will have positive influences on employees’ job satisfaction.

The coefficients table also indicate that participative (t=-1.096, sig>0.05) is found to insignificantly influence employees’ job satisfaction, which leads to reject H7. This result is not in consistent with the view of Page & Wong, 2000; Northouse, 2013, and Lussier and Achua, (2010).

Finally, table 3, clearly indicate that employees’ job satisfaction (t=16.374, sig<0.0005) is found to be highly significant and positively influence employees’ job performance. This fact leads to accept H8.

This result is in consistent with the view of Kleinman (2004), Chen (2006), Kenneth et al (2009), Juin-Chen Chen (2008), Karatepe et al (2005), Lussier and Achua (2010), and Thomas et al (2005), as all support the fact that a employees’ job satisfaction will have positive influences on employees’ job performance.

5. Conclusion

This study was conducted to measure which type of leadership behaviour has a greater impact on employees’ job satisfactions and job performance.

Correlation and Regression analyses revealed that there is significant and positive influence of specific leader behaviours, specifically empowerment, Humility, Courage, Forbearance, Directive, and Supportive.

Empowerment, Courage, Directive and Supportive have higher positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction.

The effect of Participative on employees’ job satisfaction was not significant. The analysis also shows that there was a high positive significant influence of employees’ job satisfactions on employee’s job performance.

This concludes that the enhanced leadership behaviour will enhance employee job performance and promoting the establishment of a beneficial working environment within the business. With the behaviour of reputable and reliable leadership would enhanceemployees’ trust and assurance that employees needed to enhance business service and productivity.

The proposed conceptual framework of this study could be utilised to increase the research into measuring the proposed leadership behaviours on other organisation’s values.

6. References


Robbins S. P (2003). Organizational behavior concepts, controversies, application. 8th ed, Publisher: Prentice-hall International. New Jersey, USA.


Thomas Sy et al (2005); The Contagious Leader: Impact of the leader’s Mood on the Mood of Group Members, Group Affective Tone, and Group Processes” Journal of Applied Psychology 90 pp.295-305


