Shared Values in Relation to Job Satisfaction and Leadership Styles of Staff at Faculty of Nursing

Fathya Abdelrazek1, Wafaa Abdelazeem Elhosany2

1Associate Professor of Nursing Administration, Faculty of Nursing, Suez Canal University, Egypt

2Professor of Nursing Administration Faculty of Nursing, Suez Canal University, Egypt

Abstract

Background: Values are an integral part of a virtuous society and successful work. Their integration with the job ensures cooperative participation and mutual respect among the workforce and directs work to its highest possible outcomes. The workforce's job satisfaction, how to be led, and their shared values affect their performance and their organizational accomplishments. **Aim:** It was to assess shared values in relation to job satisfaction and leadership styles among academic and administrative staff. **Subjects & Methods:** The study was conducted on (120) academic and administrative staff of the faculty of nursing following comparative and correlational descriptive designs. Three tools were used for data collection: The Shared Value Questionnaire; The Job Satisfaction Survey; The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. **Results:** Shared values had no statistically significant differences between academic and administrative staff (P=0.660). Job satisfaction had no statistically significant difference between academic and administrative staff (P=0.260). Leadership styles had statistically significant differences between academic and administrative staff except for passive avoidant leadership styles (P=0.486). **Conclusion:** Both academic and administrative staff of faculty of nursing has shared their values and their level of satisfaction compared to leadership styles. Shared values had no significant correlation with leadership styles and job satisfaction among academic and administrative staff. However, the enhancement of the three issues will contribute to staff well-being and organization welfare. **Recommendations:** Taking needed measures regarding energizing shared values of both academic and administrative staff is endorsed. Also, improving job satisfaction of both staff especially regarding fringe benefits, communication, and creating activities contributing to staff promotion is recommended. Training programs are suggested for both staff on shared values and different leadership styles, the best for situations.

_____

Keywords: Job satisfaction, Leadership Styles, Shared Values.

1. Introduction

Values are an integral part of a virtuous society and successful work. When integrated with the job elements, they support the human nature of the work, and ensure cooperative participation and mutual respect directing work to the highest its possible results related to the individual (**Ravari et al, 2013; Ali et al., 2015; Taşkıran et al., 2017; Han, 2023**). They transform the individual's effort into a collective one that is more accurate,

distinctive, and creative. Hence, it contributes to the highest levels of productivity, work engagement and the best performance of individuals (**Nusari et al, 2018; De Vecchi & Sala, 2023**).

Work values are features of a job that are necessary to improve and support job satisfaction. They are positive reinforcers of job satisfaction. Also, the personal values represent one of the satisfaction attributes (**Ravari et al, 2013; Taşkıran et al., 2017**). How much employee could share values will reflect on their performance (**Hansen & Leuty, 2012; Ravari et al, 2013; Ali et al., 2015**) and exaggerated by effective leadership (**Stoller, 2021**). Value is regards to the individual norms and manners about what is right and what is wrong that persons internalize during the process of socialization along their live. It constitutes the intellectual and behavioral processes. Value can be defined as the sum of beliefs and persuasions that woks as guiding principles shaping the moral judgment for the individuals' ideals, opinions, preferences, choices & decisions, actions & behaviors, and attitudes (**Ravari et al, 2013; Taşkıran et al., 2017**).

Work values have great effect on people' choosing for their profession. They set individuals standards and expectations beside to principles and motivations that direct them when taking decisions towards work issues and managing barriers of profession satisfaction (**Ravari et al, 2013; Singhapakdi et al., 2019**). These values could be as transparency, autonomy, equity, respect, cooperation, openness to change, excellence, responsibility and accountability, communication efficiency, community participation and stakeholders' involvement, loyalty (**Ali et al., 2015; Tvedt et al., 2023**), passion, corporate social responsibility (**Singhapakdi et al., 2019; Han, 2023**), trust, compassion, courage, justice, wisdom, temperance, and hope (**Stoller, 2021**).

Job satisfaction is the derived pleasure during performing the job. It is the overall attitude towards a one's work representing the sum of what is already the employee have compared to what is expected and desired to have in regards to his/her work (**Asghar & Oino , 2018; Wahyudi et al., 2023**). Also, it is indicated to it as a sense of pride and inner gratification attained when doing the job. It is the feeling of "like" or "dislike" indicating to satisfaction or dissatisfaction feelings positive emotional state resulting from job appraisal (**Saleem, 2015; Taşkıran et al., 2017; Nazim & Mahmood, 2018**). The

highly satisfied individuals have a positive and auspicious attitude towards their work **(Asghar & Oino, 2018)**. There are many factors interfering with job satisfaction. They include nature of work, operating conditions, pay, benefits, promotion opportunities, supervision, coworkers, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, coworkers, and communication **(Almutairi, 2019; Wahyudi et al., 2023)**.

Leadership styles have a significant impact on job satisfaction, and both could affect staff intention to leave their organization or others job dissatisfaction consequences such as high rate of absenteeism or work un-commitment **(Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016; Saad, 2022)**. Effective leaders are able to convince people expenditure their efforts towards organization's goals and its mission achievement voluntarily, and make them look forward to its vision accomplishment via influencing their activities by working with and through them **(Saleem, 2015; Huber, 2018).** They determine the values and norms of the organization, and their behaviors which constitute their styles are positively correlated with work values and job satisfaction **(Tsai, 2011; Ali et al. 2015; Huber, 2018).** Leadership styles have many classifications that could differ by

names and numbers of styles **(Marquis & Huston, 2012; Cherry and Jacop, 2014; Huber, 2018)**.

Many references showed these styles as autocratic, democratic and laissez faire that have been grouped as traditional leadership styles compared by advanced ones that include transactional and transformational leadership. **Bass & Avolio (2005)** gathered the advanced styles with one traditional style in one approach. This approach aimed to enhance leaders' potentials and practices of a "full range" of leadership styles for individual and organizational optimal outcomes achievement in accompanying with their followers and associates. The leadership styles are classified into: transformational that is constituted of idealized attribute, idealized behavior, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration; transactional that is constituted of contingent reward and management by exception (active); passive avoidant that is constituted of management by exception (passive), and laissez-faire **(Saleem, 2015; Asghar & Oino , 2018; Huber, 2018; Mgaiwa, 2023; Tvedt et al., 2023)**.

Academic and administrative workforce is accountable for running the

work at higher education institutions. Both are responsible for providing good educational service for its students that is the main educational performance target (**Abdelrazek & Mohamed, 2016**). Their job satisfaction and how to be leaded besides their shared values affect their performance and are important for organizational goals achievement and higher organizational performance too (**Megawaty et al., 2022; Han, 2023**). When the interaction between the organization leadership and employees is good, the latter will make a greater contribution to team communication and collaboration supporting the shared values, and being encouraged to accomplish the mission and objectives assigned by the organization, thereby enhancing job satisfaction organizational performance (**Tsai, 2011; Ali et al., 2015; Singhapakdi et al., 2019**).

Several researches are conducted on leadership and job satisfactions (**Asghar & Oino 2018; Mgaiwa, 2023; Sriadmitum et al., 2023; Wahyudi et al., 2023**), and fewer on work values (**Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Danuta & Vytautas, 2010; Gorenak et al., 2020**) which constitutes staff well-being and organization success with better services (**Ali et al. 2015**). However, there is no identified research

compare those variables or test the relationship between them among academic and administrative staff of educational institution. This is helpful when planning for the future of the organizational performance. In addition, the comparative purpose of the study is required for determining the organizational readiness for well-being of both the academic and administrative faculty staff that it is so important too. As they both are the work engine of the faculty for its public good of better education service for students, enhanced role of community service and good chance for upgrading research role. That is depending on the shared values and the effective leadership followed in the faculty towards more job satisfaction.

Aim of the study:

It was to assess shared values in relation to job satisfaction and leadership styles among academic and administrative staff at faculty of nursing.

Research Objectives were to:

- Assess shared values among academic and administrative staff at faculty of nursing.
- Assess job satisfaction among academic and administrative staff at faculty of nursing.

- Identify leadership styles used by academic and administrative managers from the point view of academic and administrative staff at faculty of nursing.

- Determine the relationship between shared values, job satisfaction and leadership styles among academic and administrative staff.

Research questions were to:

- Is there difference between academic and administrative staff regarding shared values, job satisfaction and leadership styles at faculty of nursing?

- Is there a relationship among shared values, job satisfaction and leadership styles among academic and administrative staff?

2. Subjects and Methods:

Research design:

Comparative and correlational descriptive designs were used in the current study.

Setting:

The study was conducted at Faculty of Nursing-Suez Canal University. It is had been confirmed in 2006 adopting new and innovative educational approaches such as Problem Based Learning, Community-Oriented, and Community-Based Education. Moreover, it has sixteen administrative departments, and six academic departments (Adult Health Nursing, Pediatric Nursing, Maternity, Obstetrics and Gynecological Nursing, Community and Family Health Nursing, Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, and Nursing Administration). Also, it authenticates one undergraduate program awarded Bachelor's Degree in Nursing, and twelve postgraduate programs as master and doctorate degrees for the six academic departments in addition to one diploma program.

The faculty is consisted of two buildings. The first one with four floors includes the leaders and academic staff offices in addition to 8 developmental units and a number of administrative departments. On the other hand, the second one with five flours includes all educational settings (teaching halls, classes, labs and library) in addition to the rest of the developmental units and the administrative departments.

Sample:

Target population was (95) academic staff and (77) administrative staff. Sixty individual of each staff were included in the current study, with total sample size (120). Most of academic staff (93%) were female, with mean age (38.42±14.68) compared to 58% female of administrative staff, with mean age (43.51±7.59).

Academic staff were distributed on nursing specialties as medical surgical nursing (26.7%); pediatric nursing (16.7%); obstetric & gynecological nursing (11.7%); psychiatric & mental health nursing (8.3%); nursing administration (20.0%); community family & health nursing (16.7%). Administrative staff were distributed on specialties degrees as specialized (37.7%); craftsmanship (2.6%); technical (27.3%); auxiliary (assistant services) (13.0%); office (19.5%).

Tools of data collection: Three tools were used for data collection: The Shared Value Questionnaire; Job Satisfaction Survey; The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

The Shared Value Questionnaire: It is divided into two parts. The first part is geared to identify the socio-demographic characteristics of staff such as age, sex, specialty, ..extra. The second part includes twenty four items which were used to assess the shared values using a rating scale adopted from Suez Canal University questionnaire regarding the more common values of academic and administrative staff. They are such as mutual respect, transparency, responsibility & accountability, justice & equal opportunities, and cooperation. It uses a five-point scale ranged from (1) to (5). The

higher mean score of shared values indicate to higher existence of values among the studied samples.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS): It was developed by Spector **(1985)** to determine the level of job satisfaction regarding evaluating nine dimensions of job satisfaction. Each one with 4 items leading to a total of 36 items. They include pay, promotion, contingent rewards, fringe benefits, operating procedures, supervision, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. JSS uses a 6-point Likert scale ranged from (1) strongly disagree to (6) strongly agree **(Spector, 1985, 1986 & 1997)**. The Arabic copy of JSS **(Al-Faouri et al. 2014)** was used for data collection.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ): It was developed by **Avolio and Bass (1995)** to determine the used leadership styles using 36 items in regards to transformational leadership (20 items), transactional (8 items) and passive avoidant (8 items). It uses a five-point rating scale from (0) not at all to (4) frequency if not always **(Avolio & Bass, 1995 &2004)**. The Arabic copy of MLQ **(Alenazi, 2017)** was used for data collection.

The scoring system of the three tools:
The triple cut off point of mean percentages

scoring system was used to determine the levels of shared values, job satisfaction and leadership styles as: low (0%-33.33%), moderate (33.34%-66.66%) and high (66.67%-100%).

Validity and reliability of the tools:

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) are valid and reliable international standardized tools that were translated into Arabic in other studies and checked for their validity and reliability too. **The Shared Value Questionnaire** that is assured was assured for its reliability was exposed to jury to assure its validity.

Pilot study:

It was conducted on 10% of the research participants to test the situation for data collection; checking the suitability of the Arabic copy of tools, and the duration of fulfilling them. No modifications were needed to be done for tools.

Procedure:

The research purpose of the study and how to fulfill the tool of data collection were explained after settling research ethics principles for all the research participants. Then, the data were collected from the research participants using self-instruction questionnaire method. Two questionnaire sheets were used; one for each sample including the three tools for assessing the shared values and the job satisfaction of academic and administrative staff, and determining the used leadership styles with them. The data collection was conducted during July-August 2022. The tools' fulfilling took 25-35 minute for each sample.

Ethical considerations:

After approving the study proposal by the Research Ethics Committee of Faculty of Nursing - Suez Canal University (code 152:6/2022), the official permissions for study implementation was obtained from dean of the faculty of nursing. The purpose of the study and its procedures was explained to the participants. The confidentiality and anonymity of research participants were secured. Also, the right to withdraw at any time during the study was assured.

Data analysis:

Data were collected, analyzed and tabulated using the statistical package of the social science (SPSS) program, version (25) for data analysis. Frequency, mean and standard deviation were used for descriptive statistics, and t test was used to compare means of the studied variables between academic and administrative staff. For testing the relationship between shared values, job satisfaction and leadership

styles, spearman correlation coefficient test was used. P value was set at <0.05.

3. Results:

Table (1) shows that shared values had no statistical significant difference between academic and administrative staff (p=0.660), except loyalty to the faculty (p=0.033), goal-oriented management approach (p=0.012), community participation and stakeholders' involvement (p=0.011), adoption of precision in work (p=0.038), and collaboration in the assigned tasks (p=0.035).

Table (2) reveals that job satisfaction had no statistical significant difference between academic and administrative staff (P=0.260), except for operating conditions, coworkers, and nature of work (p=0.030, p=0.040 and p=0.010 respectively).

Table (3) shows that leadership styles had statistical significant difference between academic and administrative staff regarding transformational (P=0.001) and transactional (P=0.013) leadership styles, except for passive avoidant leadership styles (P=0.486).

Table (4) and table (5) illustrate that there was no statistical significant correlation between shared values, job satisfaction, and leadership styles among academic and administrative staff.

However, transformational leadership style had statistical significant correlation with transactional and passive avoidant leadership styles.

4. Discussion:

The current study results showed that shared values had no statistical significant difference between academic and administrative staff (p=0.660), except loyalty to the faculty (p=0.033), goal-oriented management approach (p=0.012) (that coincide with the transactional leadership style of administrative staff), community participation and stakeholders' involvement (p=0.011), adoption of precision in work (p=0.038), and collaboration in the assigned tasks (p=0.035).

The significant difference between both staff regarding some values could be referred to the difference of work and tasks differences besides to the individual difference between both staff as one's values are self-concept that constitute the moral identity of each person **(Taşkıran et al., 2017)**. In this regard, **Singhapakdi et al., (2019)** indicated that persons adopted values govern their practices and viewpoints towards their live and work.

Moreover, concerning the difference among staff, **Ali et al. (2015)** assured on the importance of the loyalty for

organization, and collaboration for helping each other in completing work assignments, whereas **Tvedt et al., (2023)** assured on excellence, trust in addition to transparency as important organizational values affecting resilience of the organization. Other studies assured on the importance of corporate social responsibility, the way for community participation and stakeholders' involvement. As corporate social responsibility is interested with the staff's perception of their organization's commitment to socially responsible actions combined with stress on society's welfare **(Singhapakdi et al., 2019).**

The totally non-significant difference between academic and administrative staff regarding shared values with high score is good for staff and organization. It indicates that both staff is strongly sharing the organizational values. That supports the organizational service and performance **(Ali et al., 2015; Singhapakdi et al., 2019; Han, 2023),** and constitutes staff well-being **(Ali et al. 2015; Singhapakdi et al., 2019; Kang et al., 2023)**.

Also, the current study results revealed that job satisfaction had no statistical significant difference between academic and administrative staff, except for operating conditions, coworkers, and

nature of work.

The significant differences between academic and administrative staff for operating conditions, coworkers, and nature of work is logical findings because of these factors which have different natures between academic and administrative staff whether the performance activities/duties, colleagues' tasks and roles. However, the totally non-significant differences for other factors may be referred to the similarity effect of these factors on both academic and administrative staff as they are based on consistent policies and procedures which the organization represented in their leaders are obligated to follow and implement such as pay, fringe benefits, promotion and contingent rewards. However, organization could improve contingent rewards, and providing programs on effective communication and work supervision. In addition, job satisfaction is laid at moderate levels for academic and administrative staff. That assures on taking actions towards improving job satisfaction of both staff.

Moreover, the current study results showed that leadership styles had statistical significant difference between academic and administrative staff regarding transformational (as a highest

score for academic staff) and transactional (as a highest score for administrative staff) except for passive avoidant leadership styles.

The non-significant difference between academic and administrative staff regarding passive avoidant leadership styles may be due to the nature of avoidant leadership styles themselves and the work situation as when the work situation requires giving chance to subordinates to independently work and take decision, or avoiding interference and letting events take their own course especially with highly motivated and self-directed subordinates (**Marquis and Huston, 2012; Huber, 2018**). Also, it is applicable in case of new issue or when there is a poorly defined problem and brainstorming is needed for generating alternative solutions (**Marquis and Huston, 2012**). That could be usually practiced by leaders regardless their field as a part of their adopted leaderships.

However, academic staff reported their highest score for transformational leadership styles compared to administrative staff who reported their highest score for transformational leadership styles with statistical significance difference. This may reflect the progressive nature of academic staff

view and their strategic vision of organizational development achievement compared to the nature of administrative staff that concerned more with organizational objectives and mission achievement. The transactional leaders focused on the maintenance and management of ongoing and routine work compared to the transactional leaders focused on the performance beyond expectation and reformed organizational culture for more development (**Huber, 2018; Sullivan, 2018; Mgaiwa, 2023; Tvedt et al., 2023**).

All types of leadership styles were laid at moderate levels for academic and administrative staff. This means that all styles have been used with close rates indicating to the variety using of leadership styles. That is good as the best leadership style is the best for situation (**Abdelrazek, 2016; Huber, 2018**). In this regards **Marquis and Huston (2012)**, indicated that leaders could move dynamically along the continuum in response to each new situation.

In addition, the current results illustrated that there was no statistical significant correlation between shared values, job satisfaction, and leadership styles among academic and administrative staff. However, transformational

leadership style had statistical significant correlation with transactional and passive avoidant leadership styles.

For the non-significant relationship between shared values and leadership styles, the current study results disagree with the study results of **Gillespie and Mann (2004)** which indicated that common values had a positive relationship between transformational styles and negative relationship with avoidant styles represented in laissez-faire style. Also, the results disagree with results of **Ali et al. (2015)** that values of work culture had had positive relationship with leadership styles. Besides, for the non-significant relationship between shared values and job satisfaction relationship, the current study results disagree with **Danuta and Vytautas (2010)** who indicated that that there is a positive relationship between individual & organizational values and job satisfaction, and organizational culture. Also, **Gorenak et al. (2020)** found weak positive correlation between organizational values and job satisfaction.

For the non-significant relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction, the current study results agree with the study results of **Sriadmitum et al. (2023)** and **Wahyudi et al. (2023) which** indicating that leadership styles had no

significant effect on job satisfaction and staff performance. However, the study results disagree with **Nazim and Mahmood (2018)** who found significant relationship between both transformational & transactional style and job satisfaction. Also, the study results disagree with **Asghar and Oino (2018)** who illustrated that transformational style has a positive effect on job satisfaction compared to transactional style which had no statistical significant effect on job satisfaction. Whereas, **Saleem (2015)** found transactional style had a negative effect on job satisfaction and **Mgaiwa (2023)** found that both styles had positive significant effect on job satisfaction.

In addition, the non-significant relationship between job satisfaction and leadership styles or shared values may be as a result of the moderate level of job satisfaction that is due to low salary and incentives that is out of the organizational hand. So, in spite of using various leadership styles and high level of shared values the job satisfaction still low. Hence, taking excessive measures towards job satisfaction factors is required.

This non-significant relationship between shared values, job satisfaction and leadership styles could indicate that shared values are part of individuals' values and

moral system regardless their satisfaction level or the used leadership styles (**Dempsey, 2015; Dattm, 2021**). That is in some way is good as it guarantees best following and implementations of organizational values in work and communication for better individuals and organizational performance and outcomes (**Singhapakdi et al., 2019; Han, 2023**). In addition, in spite of the non-significant relationship between shared values and job satisfaction, shared values as a part of moral system still keep people in work, still be source of job satisfaction (**Ravari et al. 2013; Tu et al. 2017; Singhapakdi et al., 2019**). They stand up by themselves by the moral merit regardless the circumstances in work environment. That is considered as a basis of energizing shared values whether supporting their dissemination or providing training program of best implementations by both leaders and subordinates from academic and administrative staff.

In addition, for the significant correlation between transformational and transactional leadership in the current study, **Ali et al. (2015)**, **and Nazim and Mahmood (2018)** agree with this study result indicating to positive strong relationship between transformational and transactional styles.

Furthermore, the significant correlation between transformational and transactional leadership styles was strong in the current study**.** This indicates to the complementary relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles and hence their complementary effect of both on each other. That is also evidence on the necessity of both existences for more staff and organizational progress and at the same time, the more commitment with policy and procedures of organization and the day by day activities to achieve the mission and vision of the organization by practicing both types of leadership styles (**Huber, 2018; Sullivan, 2018; Tvedt et al., 2023**). Whereas, the significant correlation between transformational and passive avoidant leadership styles was moderate in the current study. This may suggest that passive avoidant leadership styles could be sometimes used with transformational styles for more benefits from the freedom of take decision for more staff and organization development (**Marquis and Huston, 2012; Huber, 2018 Mgaiwa, 2023**)**.**

5. Conclusion:

Both academic and administrative staff of faculty of nursing has shared their

values and their level of satisfaction in almost compared to leadership styles. They have disparities in transformational and transactional leadership styles practices. However they shared practicing passive avoidant leadership. The variety practice of leadership styles is a good action by leaders for the best faculty benefits. Also, sharing high levels of values among academic beside to administrative staff is good too. Both are contributing to better staff and organizational performance besides to better organizational services. However, the moderate level of job satisfaction needs to be enhanced using various strategies.

Shared values had no significant correlation with leadership styles and job satisfaction among academic and administrative staff. They haven't affected by either job satisfaction level or leadership styles practices. They stand up by themselves by the moral merit regardless the circumstances in work environment. However, revitalizing shared values and more supporting them could be positively reflected on job satisfaction. The enhancement of the three issues will contribute to staff well-being and organization welfare.

6. Recommendations:

Taking needed measures regarding energizing shared values of both academic and administrative staff is endorsed whether supporting their dissemination or providing training program of best implementations by both leaders and subordinates from academic and administrative staff. That is also associated with training programs are suggested for both academic and administrative staff on different leadership styles, the best for the situations.

In addition, improving job satisfaction of both staff especially regarding fringe benefits, contingent rewards, and creating activities contributing to staff promotion is recommended. This is in addition to providing programs on effective communication and work supervision. Furthermore, holding brain storming meetings for both staff for providing suggestions regarding job satisfaction improvement is requisite following by scheduling them into the faculty policies.

Table (1): Comparison between academic and administrative staff regarding shared values (n=120)

Items	Academic Mean±SD	Administrative Mean±SD	t test (P value)
1. The faculty follows the approach of opinion and alternative opinions and mutual respect.	3.70±1.17	3.65±1.04	0.241(0.810)
2. Competencies are valued and opportunities are provided.	3.64±1.05	3.74±1.09	0.493(0.623)
3. The faculty management is characterized by transparency and clarity.	3.80±1.12	3.86±1.08	0.260(0.796)
4. Responsibility and accountability are activated.	3.80±1.03	3.83±1.12	0.140(0.889)
5. The faculty provides effective and influential leadership.	3.64±1.24	3.95±1.05	1.35(0.178)
6. The faculty emphasizes unlimited excellence.	3.56±1.25	3.74±1.14	.781(0.437)
7. Community participation and stakeholders' involvement.	3.57±1.10	4.09±0.87	2.58(0.011*)
8. The faculty adopts a goal-oriented management approach.	3.62±1.07	4.15±0.94	2.55(0.012*)
9. The faculty management is characterized by justice, equal opportunities, and non-discrimination.	3.62±1.07	3.88±1.09	1.20(0.234)
10. There is clear cooperation among department members.	3.97±2.61	3.95±0.97	0.033(0.974)
11. Appropriate communication methods exist between department members.	3.77±1.12	4.00±0.93	1.11(0.271)
12. There are no administrative disputes among department members.	3.49±1.29	3.67±1.14	.710(0.480)
13. Scientific integrity is present in most department members.	3.75±1.22	4.10±0.85	1.57(0.120)
14. Each individual assists others in their field of expertise.	3.80±1.12	4.00±1.02	.912(0.364)
15. Department members contribute to performance improvement.	3.74±1.15	4.02±1.06	1.29(0.201)
16. Department members adhere to regulations and laws.	3.70±1.13	4.05±0.97	1.61(0.112)
17. Department members are treated with complete neutrality.	3.72±1.14	3.86±1.16	.589(0.557)
18. Department members are committed to precision in their work.	3.62±1.02	4.05±1.00	2.10(0.038*)
19. Department members collaborate in the assigned tasks.	3.48±1.25	3.98±1.08	2.13(0.035*)
20. The decisions of the department head are characterized by objectivity.	3.52±1.10	3.79±1.25	1.15(0.254)
21. Each individual in the department respects the opinion of others.	3.61±1.14	4.00±0.94	1.84(0.068)
22. Each individual in the department is loyal to the faculty.	3.70±1.10	4.17±1.01	2.16(0.033*)
23. Appropriate academic freedom is granted to each individual in the department.	3.72±1.13	3.98±1.02	1.17(0.245)
24. Every faculty administrator respects general ethical principles.	3.66±1.11	4.07±1.03	1.93(0.057)
Total mean score (**Total mean percentages**)	3.89±.22 (77.8%)	3.94±.84 (78.8%)	0.446(0.660)

*P value<0.05; Low (0%-33.3%); Moderate (33.4%-66.6%); High (66.7%-100%)

Table (2): Comparison between academic and administrative staff regarding job satisfaction (n=120)

Items	Academic Mean±SD	Administrative Mean±SD	t test (P value)
1. Pay	10.63±3.08	10.07±3.36	0.952(0.340)
2. Promotion	9.86±4.24	8.47±4.24	1.79(0.080)
3. Supervision	11.37±3.21	11.33±4.14	.059(0.950)
4. Fringe Benefits	10.03±3.34	9.40±3.84	.96(0.330)
5. Contingent rewards	11.26±3.44	12.20±3.61	1.56(0.150)
6. Operating conditions	13.31±3.92	11.60±4.53	2.21(0.030*)
7. Coworkers	11.74±3.01	10.47±3.50	2.13(0.040*)
8. Nature of work	12.91±3.91	11.13±3.89	2.50(0.010*)
9. Communication	9.57±3.58	10.33±3.85	1.12(0.270)
Total mean score (Total mean percentages)	99.91±22.89 (46.25%)	95.00±24.79 (43.98%)	1.13(0.260)

*P value<0.05; Low (0%-33.3%); Moderate (33.4%-66.6%); High (66.7%-100%)

Table (3): Comparison between academic and administrative staff regarding leadership styles (n=120)

Items	Academic Mean±SD	Administrative Mean±SD	t test (P value)
A. transformational leadership styles			
Idealized Influence (Attribute)	12.90±5.46	9.56±4.71	3.52(0.001*)
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	7.93±3.53	5.57±3.04	3.87(0.000*)
Inspirational Motivation	13.47±5.59	10.28±4.80	3.29(0.001*)
Intellectual Stimulation	7.70±3.60	5.78±3.34	3.03(0.003*)
Individual Consideration	9.76±4.16	7.96±4.29	2.36(0.020*)
Total mean score (Total mean percentages)	51.76±21.59 (64.70%)	39.15±17.964 (48.93%)	3.40(0.001*)
B. transactional leadership styles			
Contingent Reward	12.71±4.27	9.86±4.23	3.69(0.000*)
Management by exception (Active)	6.26±2.95	6.35±2.62	0.158(0.875)
Total mean score (Total mean percentages)	18.97±6.02 (59.28%)	16.21±6.11 (50.65%)	2.51(0.013*)
C. Passive avoidant leadership styles			
Management by exception (Passive)	9.22±5.08	9.28±3.24	0.073(0.942)
Laissez-Faire	6.43±2.56	5.54±2.67	1.89(0.061)
Total mean score (Total mean percentages)	15.65±7.08 (48.90%)	14.82±5.33 (46.31%)	0.699(0.486)

*P value<0.05; Low (0%-33.3%); Moderate (33.4%-66.6%); High (66.7%-100%)

Table (4): Correlation matrix between shared values, job satisfaction, transactional leadership, transformational leadership and passive avoidant leadership of academic staff (n=120)

Items		Total Shared Values	Total Job Satisfaction	Total Transformational Leadership	Total Transactional Leadership	Total Passive Avoidant Leadership
Total Values	r					
	P value	———				
Total Job satisfaction	r	0.028				
	P value	0.831	———			
Total Transformational Leadership	r	-0.114-	-0.098-			
	P value	0.381	0.451	———		
Total Transaction Leadership	r	-0.057-	-0.131-	0.848**		
	P value	0.660	0.315	.000	———	
Total Passive Avoidant Leadership	r	0.016	-0.019-	0.452**	0.094	
	P value	0.900	0.882	0.000	0.470	———

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Spearman r test was used

Table (5): Correlation matrix between shared values, job satisfaction, transactional leadership, transformational leadership and passive avoidant leadership of administrative staff (n=120)

Items		Total Shared Values	Total Job Satisfaction	Total Transformational Leadership	Total Transactional Leadership	Total Passive Avoidant Leadership
Total Values	r					
	P value	——				
Total Job satisfaction	r	-0.004-				
	P value	0.979	——			
Total Transformational Leadership	r	-0.067-	-0.108-			
	P value	0.612	0.524	——		
Total Transactional Leadership	r	0.008	-0.031-	0.781**		
	P value	0.951	0.854	.000	——	
Total Passive Avoidant Leadership	r	-0.067-	0.122	0.581**	0.244	
	P value	0.615	0.474	0.000	0.061	——

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Spearman r test was used

7. References:

Abdelrazek F. (2016): Nursing academic staff engagement in work against traditional and innovative leadership styles. International Journal of Advanced Research, 4(9): 331-341

Abdelrazek, F. & Mohamed, M.F. (2016): Nursing student satisfaction and organizational performance gap. International Journal of Advanced Research, 4(7): 1484-1498.

Alenazi, F. A. (2017): The relationship between leadership, organizational commitment, and turnover in the Saudi Arabian banking sector, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

Al-Faouri, I., Al-Ali, N., & Al-Shorman, B. (2014): The influence of emotional intelligence training on nurses? Job satisfaction among Jordanian nurses. European Journal of Scientific Research, 117(4), 486-494.

Almutairi, M. (2019): Leadership styles and faculty satisfaction of the education college at a Saudi university. A Dissertation Presented in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy, Concordia University, Chicago River Forest, Illinois.

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

Asghar, S.; Oino, I. (2018): Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction, Market Forces, 13(1), 1-13., Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3197150

Avolio, B.; Bass, B. (1995): The multifactor leadership questionnaire–5x short form. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (2004): Multifactor leadership questionnaire manual and sample set (3rd Ed.) Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2005): Multifactor leadership questionnaire manual and sample set (4th Ed.) Mind Garden.

Cherry, B. and Jacob, S.R. (2014): Contemporary nursing issues, trends, & management. 6th ed., Missouri: Mosby.

Danuta, D.; Vytautas, G. (2010): Relationship between individual and organizational values and employees' job satisfaction. Current Issues of Business & Law / Verslo ir Teisės Aktualijos, 5 (2): 295-319.

Datt, S. (2021): Taxonomy of the Affective Domain and Developments in Axiology.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353287655_Taxonomy_of_the_Affective_Domain_and_Developments_in_Axiology

Dempsey, J. (2015): Moral Responsibility, Shared Values, and Corporate Culture. Business Ethics Quarterly, 25 (3):319–340.DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2015.31

De Vecchi, F.; Sala, R. (2023): Compliance with justice: shared values and modus vivendi, Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy. 26:1, 56-70, DOI: 10.1080/13698230.2021.1893252

Gillespie, N.A.; Mann, L. (2004): Transformational leadership and shared values: the building blocks of trust, Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19 (6): 588-607. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940410551507

Gorenak, M.; Edelheim, J.R.; Brumen, B. (2020): The Influence of Organizational Values on Job Satisfaction of Employees. Human Systems Management, 39 (3): 329-343.

Han, S. (2023): Enlightened shared value: a new stakeholder approach to corporate social responsibility. Social Responsibility Journal, 19 (1): 20-37.

https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-05-2021-0211

Hansen, J.C. and Leuty, M.E. (2012): Work Values Across Generations. Journal of Career Assessment 20(1): 34-52. DOI: 10.1177/1069072711417163

Huber, D. L. (2018): Leadership and nursing care management. **6th** ed., Missouri: Elsevier.

Kang, J.Y.; Lee, M. K.; Fairchild, E.M.; Caubet, S.L.; Peters, D.E.; Matti, L.; Jr, T.G.H. (2023): Do Organizational Values and Leadership Impact Staff Engagement, Wellbeing, and Patient Satisfaction?, Journal of Healthcare Leadership, 15:, 209-219, DOI: 10.2147/JHL.S421692

Marquis, B. L. and Huston, C. J. (2012): Leadership roles and management functions in nursing: Theory and application. 7th ed., Philadelphia: Williams & Wilkins.

Megawaty, M.; Hamdat, A.; Aida, N. (2022): examining linkage leadership style, employee commitment, work motivation, work climate on satisfaction and performance. Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management, 2(1): 1-14.

Mgaiwa, S.J. (2023): Predicting academics' job satisfaction from their perceived leadership styles: Evidence from Tanzania, Cogent Psychology, 10:1,

2156839,DOI: 10.1080/23311908.2022.2156839

Mohammed Nusari, Mohammad Al Falasi, Ibrahim Alrajawy, Gamal Sayed Khalifa, & Osama Isaac. (2018): The impact of project management assets and organizational culture on employee performance. International Journal of Management and Human Science (IJMHS), 2(3): 15-26. Retrieved from https://ejournal.lucp.net/index.php/ijmhs/article/view/813

Mustafa, G., & Lines, R. (2013): The triple role of values in culturally adapted leadership styles. International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 13(1), 23-46. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595812452636

Nazim, F.; Mahmood, A. (2018): A Study of relationship between leadership style and Job Satisfaction. Journal of Research in Social Sciences-JRSS, 6: (1): 165-181. ISSN: (E) 2306-112X (P) 2305- 6533.

Saad, E (2022): Exploring the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Practices with Subordinates' Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave a Community Hospital. Dissertations, Central Michigan University.

Saleem, H. (2015): The Impact of Leadership Styles on Job Satisfaction and Mediating Role of Perceived

Organizational Politics. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 172 (27): 563-569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.403

Singhapakdi, A.; Lee, DJ.; Sirgy, M.J.; Roh, H. ;Senasu, K.; Yu, G.B. (2019): Effects of perceived organizational CSR value and employee moral identity on job satisfaction: a study of business organizations in Thailand. Asian J Bus Ethics 8, 53-72. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13520-019-00088-1

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

Spector, P. E. (1986). Assessing employee job satisfaction with the job satisfaction survey. Mental Retardation Systems, 3, 5-13.

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

Sriadmitum, I.; Sudarno; Nyoto. (2023): Leadership Style, Work Environment, and Compensation on Job Satisfaction and Teacher Performance. Journal of Applied Business and Technology, 4(1), 79-92. https://doi.org/10.35145/jabt.v4i1.122

Stoller, J.K. (2021): Leadership Essentials for CHEST Medicine Professionals: Models, Attributes, and Styles Author links open overlay panel. CHEST, Volume 159 (3): 1147-1154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2020.09.095

Taşkıran E.; Çetin, C.; Özdemirci, A.; Aksu, B.; İstoriti, M. (2017): The Effect of the Harmony between Organizational Culture and Values on Job Satisfaction. International Business Research; 10 (5): 133-147. URL: https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v10n5p133

Tsai, Y. (2011): Relationship between Organizational Culture, Leadership Behavior and Job Satisfaction. BMC Health Services Research, 11(98): 1-9. http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6963/11/98

Tu, Y., Lu, X. & Yu, Y. (2017): Supervisors' Ethical Leadership and Employee Job Satisfaction: A Social Cognitive Perspective. *J Happiness Stud* **18**, 229–245. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-016-9725-1

Tvedt, I.M.; Tommelein, I.D.; Klakegg, O.J.; Wong,J.(2023): Organizational values in support of leadership styles fostering organizational resilience: a process perspective. International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 16 (2): 258-278 DOI 10.1108/IJMPB-05-2022-

0121

Wahyudi, L.; Panjaitan, H. P.; Junaedi, A. T. (2023): Leadership Style, Motivation, and Work Environment on Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance at the Environment and Hygiene Department of Pekanbaru City. Journal of Applied Business and Technology, 4(1), 55-66. https://doi.org/10.35145/jabt.v4i1.119