EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND JOB

SATISFACTION AMONG NIGERIAN PRISON OFFICERS

By

Richard OK Nwankwoala

KEVIN BEAVER, PhD, Faculty Mentor and Chair

SCOTT MIRE, PhD, Committee Member

KATHY MCKOY, PhD, Committee Member

Jim Wold, PhD, Acting Dean, School of Public Service Leadership

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Capella University

January 2014

UMI Number: 3610685

UMI 3610685

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction among the Nigerian prison officers. Specifically, the study investigated the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The study utilized the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X rater form) to capture employees perception of transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and relate them to Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997) Single-Item Global Measures of overall job satisfaction to establish a linkage between leadership and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. A total of 160 survey packages were mailed out to the Nigerian prison junior officers stationed in the Eastern part of Nigeria. However, 115 participants returned their completed survey packages representing 71.9% return rate while 45 did not return theirs representing 28.1%. The result of the study showed that management by exception (active) leadership factor had a positive correlation with job satisfaction. Based on the analysis, the study concluded that management by exception (active) was the only leadership factor that had positive relationship with job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. Therefore, management by exception (Active) factor accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to SAT GURU MAHARAJI the Living Perfect Master for his spiritual guidance. This dissertation is also dedicated to my wife Modesta Uchechi Nwankwoala who endured sleepless nights, frustrations, and long hours of study to ensure that this dissertation process is completed. I thank you for all that you have sacrificed to ensure that this dream is realized. I also will thank my children Kelechi, Amakiri, and Adanma Nwankwoala who had to wait endless hours for daddy to check their homework assignments before going to bed. I thank my brothers Sir, Chief Ndubuisi Nwankwoala and Mr. Charles Emenike Nwankwoala for their patience and understanding. I must not fail to mention the late Chief J.A. Nwankwoala (father), late Mrs. Fidelia Ukachi Nwankwoala (mother), and late Professor RNP Nwankwoala (brother), who passed on without giving me the opportunity to thank them for their support and encouragement. Finally, I say thank you to a family friend, Dr. Ezewuchi Amaefule, who helped and encouraged me in every possible way during my entire doctoral journey. You have all made a difference in my life. I love you all.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Background of the Study

An increased attention is given to the role which leadership plays as it relates to job satisfaction in many organizations, including public safety organizations (Bass & Avolio, 1995; Burns, 1978; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Meyer & Allen, 1991). This concern is consistent with globalization, growing competition, and trends in high technological advancement. Indeed these trends in high technological advancement have brought so much unusual changes in both internal and external conditions under which many organizational leaders, including public safety organizations conduct their businesses. In many correctional institutions including the Nigerian prisons, the increasing role of leadership as it pertains to job satisfaction cannot be emphasized enough. Leadership role in correctional settings including the Nigerian prisons has the potential to influence job satisfaction, productivity, turnover, employee behavior, employee morale, and employee effort (Olorunsola, 2010).

In effect, whether prison officers are responding to safety of incarcerated inmates, sanctioning inmates, reforming inmates, dealing with the issues of prisons overcrowding, rehabilitating inmates, maintaining public safety (Nigerian Prisons Service, 2008), the balance as to whether or not these goals can be achieved depends largely on leadership and officers job satisfaction. It is in this regard that scholars and public safety practitioners have focused on identifying the best style of leadership that supports job satisfaction among officers for effective discharge of their duties and

1

optimal performance. Following this dramatic, dynamic, and complex nature under which public safety organizations' operate that the present study was conducted to investigate the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

The concern in the style of leadership boils down on the need for leaders that will not only set goals and direct agency scarce resources towards these goals but equally stimulate the appropriate attitude and behaviors among subordinates to ensure job satisfaction. This concern have manifested to the evolution of leadership models such as trait, behavioral, contingency, contemporary, transactional, laissez faire, and more recently transformational leadership models. For example, trait model of leadership assumed that leaders are believed to be inborn. In other words, leaders are born with some unique and special gene that distinguishes them from the rest of the population (Lord, De Vader & Alliger, 1986; Mann, 1959).

The contingency leadership model is grounded on the relationship between style of leadership and situational factors. It assumes that the style of leadership must be tailored to a particular situation. The contemporary approach is focused on the capacity of leadership to influence followers' behavior and attitudes in order to respond to the ever evolving environment as most crucial to organizational development (Bass & Avolio, 1995; Burns, 1978; Downton, 1973). The merits of these leadership models notwithstanding, it is evidently clear that there is no universally accepted approach in which to manage changes in public safety organizations. It is in this regard that the choice of the Nigerian prisons is appropriate because, Nigeria is currently going through a

democratic dispensation in terms of socio economic and political reforms and the Nigerian prisons is therefore a critical part of these transition efforts to ensure public safety, safety of incarcerated inmates, reforming inmates, and rehabilitating inmates (Nigerian Prisons Service, 2008).

For decades, Nigeria has been under a brutal military dictatorship. Therefore, the ongoing democratic dispensation which started in 1999 has brought a culture of transparency, accountability, and good governance in all facet of government in the country. In addition to the ongoing democracy, Nigeria is also enjoying a dramatic transformation in response to globalization in terms of privatization, commercialization, deregulation, restructuring among other changes. These dramatic trends requires a change in work culture, attitudes, behaviors, orientation, and a system of leadership that will improve performance, motivate employees, increase productivity, and enhance job satisfaction of subordinates.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style, and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. For decades, the Nigerian government has made reform a central issue in their effort to address the deplorable leadership conditions of Nigerian institutions, including the Nigerian prisons (Olorunsola, 2010). Despite these efforts, the Nigerian prisons have remained largely neglected leading to ineffective leadership and job dissatisfaction among prison officers (Alemika & Alemika, 2002).

3

Ademolekun & Ayeni (1990) noted that the absence of effective leadership was responsible for prison officers' job dissatisfaction. Indeed, effective leadership and employee job satisfaction are critical factors that are fundamental for organizational growth (Voon, Lo, Ngui, & Ayob, 2011).

Essentially, effective leaders provide direction and lead subordinates towards achieving a desired goal. Similarly, employees with high job satisfaction are more likely to work harder and pursue organizational interests (Voon, Lo, Ngui, & Ayob, 2011). Equally, an organization that encourages high employee job satisfaction has the potential to retain and attract employees with expertise that it requires (Mosadegh & Yarmohammadian, 2006). Prior researches have examined the effect of leadership styles on employees and concluded that leadership has significant impact on employee job satisfaction (Lok & Crawford, 1999, 2001; Mosadegh Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006; William & Hazer, 1986). An improved job satisfaction enhances employees' psychology and general wellbeing (Illadi, Leon, Kansser, & Ryan, 1983) and ultimately affects employee performance (Porac, Ferris, & Feder, 1983; Vroom, 1964).

Several studies have focused on Nigeria prisons, including, fungal skin infection among prisons inmates, the pains of imprisonment, job satisfaction and gender factor, prisons reforms and HIV/AIDS, prisons challenges and reforms, (Alabi & Alabi, 2011; Ikuteyijo & Agunlade, 2008; Nigerian prisons Service, 2008; Olorunsola, 2010; Oyeka,& Eze, 2007). However, no empirical study has been conducted on Nigerian prisons leadership and job satisfaction among officers. This present study is different from prior studies that focused mainly on fungal skin infection among prisons inmates, the pains of imprisonment, job satisfaction and gender factor, prison reforms and

HIV/AIDS, prison challenges and reforms, with no empirical study on leadership and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. Therefore, the present study will attempt to fill this gap in the existing literature by investigating the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style, and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The present study aims to show the link between leadership style and job satisfaction among the Nigerian prison officers as a basis for organizational effectiveness.

The perception of leadership style by employees would affect their behavior in workplace, and this may have drastic implication for employee job satisfaction. For example, the Nigerian prisons have been perceived as ineffective and inefficient due to poor leadership (Adamolekun & Ayeni, 1990; Owulu et al, 1997; Sekwat, 2001). According to Adamolekun Ayeni (1990), the wide spread of corruption and inefficiency in the Nigerian prisons is attributable to poor leadership and low level job satisfaction among officers. Therefore, leadership and job satisfaction are essential to organizational development and wellbeing. In this study, transformational, transactional, and laissez faire are the independent variables; while job satisfaction is the dependent variable. Factors such as age, education level, gender, years of experience as a prison officer, and

5

marital status constitute the demographic variables that were included in the study. The main purpose of the study is to identify those qualities that workers look for in their leaders and how these qualities influence workers job satisfaction. By assessing the employees perception of leadership, the study was able to isolate the effects of transformational leadership qualities such as idealized influence (attribute) and idealized influence (behavior), intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individual consideration; transactional leadership variables of contingency, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive); and laissez faire on employee job satisfaction.

The study utilized the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X rater form) to capture employees perception of transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and relate them to Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997) Single-Item Measures of overall job satisfaction to establish linkage between leadership and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. To link the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction, the person's product correlation coefficient was used to test the independent leadership variables and the dependent variable job satisfaction to see how leadership correlate with job satisfaction among the Nigerian prison officers. The finding of this study will assist policy formulators and implementers in designing comprehensive leadership and reorientation policies that will position the Nigerian prisons to be more responsive and capable of meeting the changing demands which the modern complex work environment under which the Nigerian prisons operates.

6

Research Questions

The current study investigated the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The study was guided by the following research questions derived from the four variables of transformational leadership style namely: Idealized influence, Individualized consideration, Inspirational motivation, and Intellectual stimulation; three variables of transactional leadership style namely: contingent reward, management by exception (active), and management by exception (passive); and laissez-faire leadership style.

RQ1. What is the relationship (if any) between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

RQ2. What is the relationship (if any) between transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive), and   job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

RQ3. What is the relationship (if any) between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

Relevance of the Study

This study used a quantitative methodology to investigate the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.. The findings will add to

the existing body of literature. Indeed, abundance of job satisfaction literature exists in the areas of occupational health and organizational psychology. However, literature is limited as it pertains to job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. To this end, findings from this study will impact my field by adding new information on job satisfaction among officers of the Nigerian prisons to the existing literature thereby enriching the available information. In addition, it is important to know that most job satisfaction studies were conducted in civilized countries of the US, Canada, and Europe. Therefore, this study will create awareness about job satisfaction among the Nigerian prison officers.

It is equally expected that this study will contributes to the leadership literature as it pertains to the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles are well tested in other organizations such as, the military, nonprofit, and the healthcare (Singer & Singer, 1990). However, the Nigerian prisons leadership and officers are yet to be familiar with these leadership styles as it pertains to job satisfaction among its officers. In this instance, the present study will impact both the Nigerian prisons leadership and officers by providing valuable information.

The findings of this study will also impact my field by contributing to the leadership training of Nigerian prison leaders. As noted by Kanungo (1998), to deal with current issues, leaders are required to have specialized leadership skills. In this context, this study will impact my field by providing prison leaders needed information regarding transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles in order to deal with the issues of job satisfaction among officers' effectively. The outcome of this study will

generate new issues for future research as to which leadership style accounts for the most variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

Definition of Terms

Leadership: This represents the capacity to influence individuals or group towards the achievement of a set goal as well as guiding and regulating the behavior and attitudes of the individuals in the work environment. This study focused mainly on transformational leadership as prescribed by Bass and Avolio (1995).

Transactional leadership style: This type of leadership specifies work schedule to subordinates. It details how to do the job and reward for successful completion of the job (Avolio, Bass, & Yammarino, 1991). Under this leadership style, subordinates clearly understand what the expectations and roles are. Transactional leadership has three attributes namely: contingent reward, management by exception (active), and management by exception (passive).

1. *Contingent reward* includes leaders that specify employees' expectation and offers reward when tasks are successfully completed. In addition, leaders under this category provide subordinates with assistance in exchange for their efforts.

2. *Management-by-exception (active)* refers to leaders that specify standards for compliance and monitor for errors or deviations from the set standards. All errors on the parts of employees are met with serious consequences and prompt actions are taken to correct any deviations or errors from the set standards.

3. *Management-by-exception (passive)* refers to leaders who do not promptly respond to issues and problems. They tend to be reactionary and allow errors to occur

9

prior to intervening. Essentially, they do nothing until problems become very serious.

Transformational leadership: This leadership style refers to organizational changes that include development and implementation of vision. Leaders in this category tend to develop followers, raise followers' awareness, energize, promote positive changes among individuals and groups, team and organization (Avolio, Bass, & Yammarino, 1991). This leadership style has characteristics which includes idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

     1.   *Idealized influence*. This aspect is as defined by Avolio and Bass (2004b). It entails the capacity to develop referent power and influence over subordinates. In addition, it motivates subordinates and enables them to emulate the leaders' behavior, attitudes, and values. An idealized leader shows followers that tasks which were thought to be difficult could be accomplished with ease as well as setting future goals (Avolio, Bass, Yammarino, 1991). This has two types namely: idealized influence (attributed) and idealized influence (behavior).

     i.   *Idealized influence (attributed)* is charismatic leaders that displays power, confidence, instill pride to subordinates, and are well respected by their followers.

     ii.   *Idealized influences (behavior)* are leaders that emphasize ethics, principles, values, and they consider ethical consequences in all their decisions.

     2.   *Inspirational motivation*. This refers to the capacity of leaders to inspire subordinates by their actions such as personal achievement, ability to communicate effectively, and their role model effects. These characteristics inspire subordinates to

actually believe that their leader has the capacity to overcome challenges and assist the team to meet set goals and aspire for future opportunities.

      3.   *Intellectual stimulation*. According to Avolio, Bass, and Yammarino (1991), intellectual stimulation refers to how leaders stimulate their subordinates to think about old problems in new ways and how to use facts to support their reasoning in an effort to solve problems (p. 15). In doing so, leaders in this category align their subordinates values with organizational goals. This type of leader stimulates subordinates to think more critically, be creative, and participate in problem solving efforts.

      4.   *Individual consideration*. This characteristic involves leaders who pay attention to followers and their individual needs. In addition, the leadership style involves mentoring that will tend to remove obstacles which would overshadow optimum performance.

      Job satisfaction. Brayfield & Rothe (1951) defined job satisfaction as an attitude of an individual toward his/her work (p. 307). Similarly, Smith et al. (1969) postulates that job satisfaction is a feeling a worker has regarding his/her job (p. 100). The use of feelings and attitude in defining job satisfaction seems to be a common theme. Job satisfaction according to Mullins (2005) is more of an attitude, an internal state of mind which could be linked to personal feelings of achievement in real life. Robins (2001) added that job satisfaction represents an individual's attitude towards his/her job. Riggio (2000) on the other hand noted that job satisfaction is a kind of feeling and attitude that people have regarding their job which may be good and bad, negative and positive and are likely to contribute to satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Weiss (2002) discovered from prior research that satisfaction as an influence and satisfaction as a feeling tend to be

11

consistent. He further added that job satisfaction is a positive (or negative) evaluative judgment which individuals make regarding job situations (Weiss, 2002, p. 175). Evidently, there has not been a generally accepted definition of job satisfaction.

Assumptions and Limitations

The current dissertation investigated the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. It is assumed that both Nigerian prisons leadership and officers are ambivalence about job satisfaction.

It is also assumed that transformational leadership theory and its four elements namely: idealized influence, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation; transactional leadership theory and its three variables of transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive); and laissez faire leadership styles will be measured accurately using MLQ 5 X. It is further assumed that job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers will equally be measured correctly using the Single Item Global Job satisfaction Measure (Wanous et al., 1997). It is equally assumed that participants will answer the survey questions truthfully.

The present study sample was drawn from the Nigerian prisons facility located in the Easter part of Nigeria. This was a limitation because the participation of officers from other facilities in other parts of the country was eliminated.

Officers of the Nigerian prisons may be afraid discussing their leadership. This was equally a limitation, because officer may not provide accurate information. Due to cost, participation in the study was limited to the officers in the Eastern part of Nigeria thereby eliminating the experiences of officers from other facilities in other parts of the country from participating.

Nature of the Study/Theoretical Conceptual Framework

The present study investigated the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style, and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The present study was grounded on transformational and transactional leadership theories due to their relevancy to the quantitative correlation study being conducted.

The basic assumption of transformational leadership theory is that it engages leaders and the led, focuses on preference of needs, raise consciousness of specific outcomes and innovative ways in which outcomes might be achieve (Barnett, McCormick & Conners, 2001; Cox, 2001; Gellis, 2001; Griffin, 2003; judge & Piccolo, 2004). This theory promotes capacity development which encourages personal commitment amongst followers to organizational objectives.

As noted by Bass (1990), this type of leadership broadens and uplifts interests among employees'; it creates awareness and acceptance, and stirs employees to aim beyond personal interest for the good of all. Bass (1985) articulated four elements of transformational leadership theory namely: (1) idealized influence, (2) individualized

13

consideration, (3) intellectual stimulation, and (4) inspirational motivation. Idealized

influence (charisma) is about trust, confidence, and providing role model for followers to

emulate (Bono & Judge, 2004). Individualized consideration entails leadership qualities

aimed towards followers' welfare and development (Bass, 1995). Inspirational

motivation is about motivating the entire organization to embrace new ideas (Bass &

Avolio, 1994). Intellectual stimulation improves followers' awareness and arouses

followers to constantly think about innovations (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

On the other hand, Burns (1978) conceptualized that transactional leadership

theory assumes that associates must be motivated by exchanging rewards for services.

For example, in a political setting, a leader must approach followers for their votes and

campaign contribution in exchange for some rewards or service (Burns, 1978).

Transactional theory has three characteristics namely: contingent reward which

involves active and positive exchange between the leader and the led; management by

exception (active) is a system whereby the leader evaluates followers' performance. This

system allows the leader to intervene where necessary (Bass & Avolio, 1995);

management by exception (passive): the passive leaders tend to only intervene to correct

errors where necessary (Bass & Avolio, 1995). These theories guided the study in

examining the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire

leadership styles and Job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounted for

the most variance in job satisfaction among Nigerian Prison Officers.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The study is comprised of five chapters. Chapter 2 examined previous work on leadership

and employee job satisfaction. The main aim of the review was to provide the framework

upon which the present study would develop. Chapter 3 deals with methodology. It explains variables and instruments used for this study and provide support for their use. It equally defines the sample areas, data collection process, and instrument of the data analysis. Chapter 4 deals with data analysis and presentation of findings, while Chapter 5 focuses on discussion of major findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further future studies.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Leadership and Job satisfaction have gained enormous attention among academicians as a critical issue in the field of public safety. To this end, leaders' performance has come to symbolize the success or failure of most public safety organizations due to their crucial function in vision setting, policy formulation, allocating resources, and coordination of activities towards achieving organizational goals (Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978). The success or failure of a leader in this context will however, depend on how effective the leader is able to address the issue of employee job satisfaction. For instance, leaders who are able to address the issue of employee job satisfaction are more effective, while those whose styles elicit dissatisfaction among employees are ineffective (Voon, Lo, Ngui, Ayob, 2011).

It is also a generally accepted view that employees who are satisfied with their leaders' style demonstrate greater morale and attachment with organizational goals and value which leads to greater efforts and better performance (Meyer et al., 1993; Portal Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). The connection between leadership and employee job satisfaction has therefore become a critical component of public safety. Most importantly, scholars are now interested in the types of leadership that will provide

desired outcome due to the complex and dynamic nature under which modern public safety organizations operate.

In this literature review, attention was focused on understanding the concept of leadership and job satisfaction as well as their relationship in promoting employee effectiveness. The review also focused on the following:

1   Leadership development;

2   Job satisfaction;

3   Influence of Leadership on Job Satisfaction;

4   Measuring Job Satisfaction; and

5   The Nigerian prisons

Leadership Development

Leadership as a concept is widely researched within public safety organizations and criminal justice agencies. Leadership has been defined by several authors in different ways. For example, Kouzes and Posner (2002) defined leadership as a process which models, inspires, questions an established authority, and empowers. De Charon (2003) noted that leaders are those that create unique vision for the future, inspire people to attain goals, offer personal encouragements to followers, garner dedication, and empower followers. Northouse (2001) added that leadership is a process whereby leaders influence followers to achieve common goals.

Anderson, Gisborne, and Holliday (2006), added that leadership constitutes five characteristics that must be present in a leader namely: understanding, caring, respect,

17

genuineness, and specificity. Schafer (2008) noted that leadership guides, motivates, and engage followers. In this context, Schafer associates trait and habit to leadership and argues that honesty, integrity, and trust are desirable qualities of effective leadership. Others still have conceptualized leadership from the personality perspective. For example, it has been suggested from the trait perspective that leaders possess special trait that allows them to influence others to accomplish task. From that dimension, leadership could be an element or behavior that leaders exhibit in other to bring about group or organizational change.

In spite of these disagreements in conceptualization, a common consensus of leadership is that it fast tracks the forces that assist individuals and organizations to attain a set goal (Northouse, 2007). The skill of personal mastery is the essence of leadership personality and it is very essential to leadership. This skill lays the necessary foundation needed for leadership to have a solid base.

Accordingly, Anderson et al. (2006), refers Personal Mastery Skill as "the discipline of continually clarifying and deepening our personal vision, of focusing our energies, of developing patience, and seeing reality objectively" (p. 57). The personal mastery skill impacts a leader positively while he/she is in the process of developing self and others. The competencies needed to be an effective leader in the ever changing public safety organization can be learned. Kouzes and Posner (2007) postulated that leadership is an observable set of skills and abilities that is useful whether one is in the executive suite or on the front line, on Wall Street or Main Street, in any campus, community, or corporation (p. 339-340).

Essentially, leadership is the ability of one to induce or inspire others through motivation for a common purpose. In the academic community, researchers believe that the origins of leadership transcends beyond genes, myth, and family to other sources. Leadership involves but not limited to work experiences, hardship, opportunity, education, role models and mentors all go together to mold a leader (Kotter, 1990). In discussing leadership, it is critical to make mention of trait, behavioral, contingent, and contemporary leadership development.

Trait Era

Trait theory is one of the earliest theories of leadership and it is believed to be inborn (Ortmeier & Meese, 2010). In other words, trait theory assumes that leaders are born with some unique and special gene that distinguishes them from the rest of the population. According to Ortmeier and Meese (2010), trait theory was primarily employed to study and identify the innate qualities and characteristics possessed by great military, political, and social leaders (p.46). In this instance, trait is grounded on the assumption that leaders have some genetic makeup that command subordinates loyalty (Nahavandi, 2003). Jago (1982) postulated that, personal characteristics and qualities immensely differentiate trait leaders from non-trait leaders (p. 317).

Several years of research has established difference in characteristic between leaders and subordinates. To this end, leaders' personal characteristic is said to have six elements namely: capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, status, and situation (Bass, 1990; Nahavandi, 2003). Similarly, Stogdill (1974) concurred; however, he stated that an individual does not need to be a leader by just virtue of trait possession rather by having the capacity to put those characteristics into some good use (p. 24).

Robbins (2005) on the other hand identified seven characteristics that differentiate trait leaders from non-trait leaders namely: ambition and energy, desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, intelligence, high self-monitoring, job relevant knowledge. However, the ability to use these characteristics to predict leadership continues to be a subject for debate.

Mann (1959) and Lord et al. (1986) contended that, trait characteristics such as, intelligence, masculinity, adjustment, dominance, extraversion, and conservatism can equally influence leadership performance and can be a guide to differentiate trait leaders from non-trait leaders. Studies have shown that trait factors may be related to a leader's effectiveness, however, these factors alone does not translate to a leader's success. To this end, kotter (1990) noted that some trait factors increases the probability of a leader's success, however, no single factor can guarantee success of a leader (p. 115). Equally, Nahavandi (2003) noted that no single trait have been found to correlate to leadership ability or proficiency (p. 34).

As noted by McElroy (1982), the attribution leadership theory reinforce the thinking that certain attributes do make a leader by indicating that leadership constitutes a set of personal characteristics. Bass (1977) equally observed that while reasonable evidence did not supports a correlation of trait relationship, all the same, a low positive correlation was perceived in terms of age, height, weight, physique, energy, appearance, dominance, and mood control. Though inconsistencies do exist in trait literatures, however, leader's trait exceeds the trait of his/her average subordinate in terms of intelligence, scholarship, sociability, popularity, adaptability, and verbal skills (Bass, 1990).

The trait leadership is not just based on intuitive appeal; it equally helps to focus attention of some essential components in leadership development (Robbins, 2005). Trait leadership serves as a start point for organizational leadership need. The trait approach can offer valuable guide to strengthen leaders towards improving overall effectiveness. As trait leadership importance becomes more deemphasized, researchers began to shift their focus on behavioral leadership.

Behavioral Era

Researchers in behavioral era attempted to distinguish between leaders with this quality and non-leaders with this quality. Contributing researchers in this model include Lewin and Ohio State, and University of Michigan studies. Lewin study pointed out three leadership styles to explain leaders' behavior which includes: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. According to Nelson and Quick (2003), autocratic style refers to a style that is direct, strong, and controlling, while democratic style is collaborative, responsive, and interactive in style, whereas laissez-faire leadership style offers non-leadership (p. 65).

The Ohio study developed a Leadership Behavior Questionnaire which describes leadership behavior as either initiating structure consideration (Nelson & Quick, 2003). Initiating structure in this sense refers to leaders setting deadlines and stipulating role expectation for subordinates, while consideration stresses relationship which a leader has with subordinates and respect with regard to subordinates ideas and feelings. The Michigan study identified two types of behavioral leadership namely: employee-oriented and production-oriented as cited in Nelson and Quick, (2003). Employee-oriented leaders stress interpersonal relationship with subordinates, while production-oriented leaders

stress rules/policies and regulations to exert control of subordinate behavior for higher productivity.

A major contribution to behavioral model is the development of a measuring methodology and the classification of leadership to include but not limited to task-oriented and people-oriented (Nahavandi, 2003). Bales (1950) equally laid the foundation for this classification by developing task-oriented and maintenance/interpersonal behavior. This was further reinforced by the Managerial Grid Developed by Blake and Monton (1969) that stresses the concept that leaders choose their functions as it pertains to tasks and relationships. Behavior theory also concerns itself with its followers on the one hand, productivity, and efficiency on the other. The behavioral leadership offers that need to become both high-task and high-relationship-oriented to further enhance their effectiveness. In addition, the leaders' behavior according to Zigarmi et al. (2005) "can influence the way leaders are perceived by others"(p. 57). For example, telling your followers that you want to empower them, but choosing not to consult them when developing a policy sends a confusing message.

In this context, leaders are encouraged to exhibit behaviors that facilitate goal accomplishment and relationship behaviors that assist others with the development of comfortable feeling about themselves, other people, and the situation they are in. In addition, leaders who consider the needs of and provide support for others tend to build follower satisfaction, trust, and loyalty, all of which enhance performance and goal achievement (Ortmeier and Meese, 2010, p. 47). This model of leadership, as a style, was unable to identify one universally acceptable behavior in all situations, which led to the development of contingency theory.

Contingency Era

Contingency era started during the decades of 1960-1980 and was developed to determine the relationship between leadership and situational elements. This model believes that leadership must be appropriate for certain situations. Fiedler (1981) was first to develop contingency leadership. This model emphasizes how a leader's personality impacts organizational performance. Its basic believe is that organizational productivity is a function of interplay among three interrelated variables namely: relationship, task, and position. Fiedler (1976) applied the least preferred coworker (LPC) scale to determine whether or not leadership was task-oriented or relation-oriented. Findings indicate that leaders with low LPC score was regarded task-oriented

The House path-goal model by House and Tosi (1976) indicates the relevance of leaders and subordinates mutuality in determining paths to follow in meeting goals. To this end, leadership role was set to a clear path for subordinates using one of the following categories of styles:

• Directives: This provides guidance and expectation to subordinates

• Supportive: This shows concerns and care for personal needs, especially as it pertains to friendship and supportive work environment for employee wellbeing

• Participative: This encourages subordinates to participate in decision making, developing their creativity, innovation, and empowering them to contribute meaningfully to organizational development.

- Achievement-oriented: This encourages excellent performance by setting high standards and building confidence in subordinates to meet targets.

Vroom and Yetton (1973) developed the decision tree model of leadership. This model stresses the extent to which leaders strengthen participation of followers in decision making process. Essentially, decision tree model requires that a leader analyze the criticality of a problem and determine the level and degree of involvement of followers prior to making appropriate decision. Accordingly, Peters (1997) listed three important factors that needed to be considered in determining a leader's decision namely:

1. The rational for the decision

2. Acceptance or commitment of subordinates to execute decisions effectively, and

 3. Time framework needed to make decisions.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) in their life cycle model postulated that leaders' behavior is in relation to followers' maturity. According to the authors, maturity is said to be in terms of independence, ability to take responsibility, and achievement driven motivation of individuals or groups. Essentially, the authors summed up by saying that an effective leader must be capable of analyzing situational demands in an attempt to adapt his/her style relative to the situation and develop means by which to affect changes that will impact decision. To this end, Nelson and Quick (2003) posited that leaders should adapt behaviors to fit followers contingency factors and to maximize subordinates job satisfaction. The need for deeper understanding of the leader-follower relationship coupled with constantly evolving conditions under which public safety organizations conduct their business brought about the emergence of contemporary leadership theory.

Contemporary Leadership Era

Previous scholars noted individual relationship and situational factors; however, contemporary leadership era is grounded on the premise of leader-follower relationship. This model emphasizes a leader's ability to influence followers' attitudes and behaviors as very crucial to organizational effectiveness and development. Specifically, contemporary researchers tend to focus attention on how leaders can provide vision, create culture, and assist organizational members to participate in organizational functions. The ever evolving modern day organizations occasioned by globalization demand that leaders be able to adapt strategies that bring about transformation in the development of organizations. Consequently, the apparent weakness of the contemporary leadership model led to the development of transactional leadership style.

Transactional leadership Style

Transactional leadership assumes that associates must be motivated by exchanging rewards for services. Indeed, transactional leadership is a diminished type of transformational leadership in that it does not favor the individual needs of followers. Rather than personal motivation and employee enhancement, transactional leadership favors the idea of exchange of valuables such as money and gifts to advance the goals of both the leader and the led. In this instance, followers do exactly what the leader wants for their own best interest (Northouse, 2001). For example, in a political setting, a leader must approach followers for their votes and campaign contribution in exchange for some rewards or service (Burns, 1978).

Transactional leadership style has three factors namely: contingent reward which involves active and positive exchange between the leader and the led; management by

25

exception (active) is a system whereby the leader evaluates followers' performance. This

system allows the leader to intervene where necessary (Bass & Avolio, 1995);

Management by exception (passive): the passive leaders tend to only intervene to correct

errors (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The measurement of contingent reward of transactional

leadership style involves active and positive exchange between a leader and his/her

follower. This essentially is based on a system of rewarding the follower according to

performance and emphasis is placed on facilitating the achievement of agreed upon goals

by the followers. Howell and Avolio (1993) noted that rewards to subordinates may

include but not limited to recognition, compensation with money, or other agreed upon

terms. This system of reward is similar to the carrot and stick approach in which the

leader provide support for efforts and also specify responsibilities for those responsible

for accomplishing the tasks as well as expected rewards for meeting set goals (Bass,

1997; Bycio et al., 1995). The saying that "if you do this for me, I will give you that"

captures the essence of this leadership characteristic (Northouse, 2001).

Management by exception occurs in the form of negative feedback and negative

reinforcement. It also involves a system in which the leader evaluates followers'

performance based on error made in the process of carrying out assigned duties. The

capacity to monitor allows the leader to intervene to correct actions as necessary.

According to Bass and Avolio (1995), management by exception enables a leader to

maintain status quo without the problem being addressed until things deteriorate before

intervening to make corrections (p. 97). The driving energy behind management by

exception includes correction, criticism, negative feedback, and negative contingent

reinforcement. Essentially, punishment operates in conjunction with   management by exception. Management by exception could be active or passive.

The difference between active and passive management by exception lies only on time of the leader's intervention. For example, an active management by exception leader will continue to evaluate performance to be able to intervene when things go wrong. In this instance, the standard for evaluation is stated clearly from the onset and deviations from the set standard are quickly corrected to keep subordinates on track. On the other hand, the passive leader only intervenes when errors occur and standards compromised. Thus, problems are brought to the knowledge of subordinates after tasks have been completed (Howell & Avolio, 1993).

Transformational Style of leadership

Transformational leadership style was first brought to public domain by Bass (1985a) and since then, several other scholars have expanded on it. As noted by Bass (1990), transformational leadership takes root when leaders broaden and elevate the passion of followers. In this instance, followers' high level of commitment can ultimately translate to greater productivity (Barbuto, 2005). Barbuto also added that transformational leadership emphasizes self-actualization of their followers. This involves leadership and followers raising each other's achievements, morality, and motivations to such a higher level that may otherwise result to job satisfaction (Barmett, 2003).

Transformational leadership style assumes that followers may follow leaders that can inspire and motivate them. The style also believes that followers that have passion and vision can ultimately achieve both the organizational goal and outcome. In general,

public safety organizations that apply transformational leadership style are better able to deal with changes in followers behaviors. In this context, Yukl (2002) noted that with transformational leadership, followers feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and total respect towards the leader which invariably translate to high level of productivity. Transformational leadership according to Homrig (2001) seeks to gain agreement by appealing to the values of the followers and inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the shared values.

This style of leadership empowers both the leader and the led to develop the capacity to achieve its plan by organizing and staffing jobs with qualified individuals, communicating plan of action effectively, delegating responsibility for carrying out plans, creating an organizational structure and set of objectives for accomplishing plan requirement, and devising system to monitor implementation (Homrig, 2001). Additionally, transformational leadership focuses on three behavioral patterns of charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Ortmeier & Meese, 2010). This model creates vision, mobilize people for commitment, and institutionalize all changes.

Transformational leadership enables leaders to focus efforts and makes choices based on goals, values, and ideals that the leader determines or organization want or ought to follow. Though, complex, but potent, the model recognizes and exploit the existing need or demand of potential followers. Further, transforming leader look for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engage the full person of the follower (Ortmeier & Meese, p. 52). This style of leadership passionately studies how strong leaders improve followers. Therefore, the model focuses primarily on developing

passion, enthusiasm, and energy in a team. In addition, it emphasizes   how leaders can develop a vision for their organization, sell the vision to employees, and then help them to carry the vision out successfully.

The ultimate outcome of transformational model is that it strives to create relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and converts leaders into moral change agents (Ortmeier & Meese, 2010). More so, transformational model is a process that impact strongly on internal values and motivate others to act above self-interest. This model is attractive to people in that it is easily understood. Leaders in this model are seen as providing vision for the future. It also meets leaders and followers needs, treats leadership as a process in which needs and growth of others are central, and places emphasis on values and morality (Ortmeier & Meese, 2010, p. 53). It also enables productive leaders to handle organizational transformations and change very efficiently despite the fact that organizational change is seldom easy (Collins & Powell, 2004).

Transformational model like any other leadership model also fail if not effectively applied. There are many factors that cause this model to fail in organizational transformational change efforts including public safety agencies. Among these factors is the overcrowding of the change process (Stone, 1995). This occurs when the degree to which leadership has to be multiplied and shared is not met, when change efforts often start with just one or two people, when leadership is very disruptive, when leadership fails to articulate a clear vision, when there is no common purpose around which an organization can cohere and move forward, and when leaders fail to challenge people, stretch them beyond the limits of what they have done before, and replace those who

refuse to rise to the imperative of the change regardless of their loyalty or competence (Stone, 1995).

Transformational leaders are always able to get their constituents to buy into organizational change for the efforts to be successful (Griffin, 2003). They equally understand that nothing much is done or accomplished without their constituents and change must not be shoved onto the faces of subordinates without clear explanations as to what is going on and ensuring commitment to the change efforts (Kotter, 2007). To this end, a clear explanation of purpose of change is what keeps all activities from degenerating into mere busy-ness (Kotter, 2007). Change for the sake of change is dangerous to organization growth and development (Stone, 1995).

The research conducted by Alarcon (2005) examined the type of leadership style that increases job satisfaction among officers. The author employed the use of MLQ and the JIG survey instruments to three hundred and seventy three (373) officers of the Bexar County Sheriff's Department. The study used a multiple regression for data analysis. The study findings showed that transformational leadership increased the level of the officers' job satisfaction. This result further showed that some aspect of job satisfaction such as, promotion opportunities, supervision, co-worker, and current job assignment have a high relationship with transformational leadership style.

In a study conducted by Dobby et al. (2004), one hundred and fifty police officers were asked to identify the type of leadership skill they want their leaders' to have. The officers' responses indicated that they preferred leaders to adopt transformational leadership because, transformational leadership style empowers and motivate employees; transformational leadership stimulates constant learning among

30

employees; transformational leadership increases effectiveness of both the leader and the led; and transformational leadership encourages employee job satisfaction (Bass, 1995; Dobby et al., 2004). In this instance, for the Nigerian prisons to achieve these goals, its leadership may need to adopt the leadership style that encourage and enhance job satisfaction of prisons officers.

In another study, Murphy and Drodge (2004) researched the leadership style of Royal Canadian Mounted Police (YCMP) managers and the impact they have on officers' motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The study included 28 officers. The finding showed that RCMP leadership exhibited mostly transformational leadership style in discharging their duties. The findings also indicated that job satisfaction of officers' level increased when working with managers who apply transformational leadership characteristics.

Indeed, when employees are not satisfied with leadership, it results to job dissatisfaction (Ogunsima, 2011). For example, Richardson (2011) surveyed Arizona public safety officers which was published in the East Valley Tribune indicates that leadership style can affect officers' job satisfaction. The findings from that study showed that 67% of the officers who reported dissatisfaction identified the director's leadership style as the reason for dissatisfaction, 79 % identified upper management leadership style as the reason for dissatisfaction, 27 % reported low and middle management leadership style, 19 % blamed line supervisors for the reason for dissatisfaction, while 17 % blamed outside factors such as budgetary issues among others.

Transformational leadership gets people to infuse their energy into strategies. This particularly occurs when people raise each other to higher level of motivation and

morality for the purpose which might have started out as separate, but related and has become fused and ultimately moral as it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both the leader and the led and thus has a transforming effect on both (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). When people are part of leadership or system that raises them to higher level of motivation and morality they develop a sense of belonging to something very special.

Laissez faire Leadership Style

The last leadership style articulated by Bass and Avolio (1995) is the laissez faire. This leadership style is generally regarded as the most inactive and ineffective type of leadership. According to Bass (1985c), laissez faire leadership style is actually no leadership. Leaders applying this style of leadership generally to avoid making decisions, ignore resolving problems, do not follow up on issues, and do not get involved in organizational administrations. Leaders with this type of leadership style do not provide direction to followers.

As observed by Avolio and Bass (1990), leaders in this category do not wish to be bothered and they care less about their followers. The authors stated that the laissez faire leaders leave their followers to resolve their own problems even when the leaders support is critically needed (Avolio & Bass, 1990). This current study will examined these leadership styles in relation to job satisfaction to determine which leadership style will account for the most variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

Job Satisfaction

According to Mosadegh and Yarmohammadian (2006), job satisfaction refers to the attitude of employees towards their jobs and the organization that hires them. The authors noted that job satisfaction is influenced by several factors which include: salary, job autonomy, job security, workplace flexibility, and leadership. Most importantly, Job satisfaction is a much researched subject (Olorunsola, 2010). However, there is no consensus in the definition of job satisfaction. Brayfield and Rothe (1951) defined job satisfaction as an attitude of an individual toward his/her work (p. 307). Smith et al. (1969) posits that job satisfaction is a feeling a worker has regarding his/her job (p. 100).

The use of feelings and attitude in defining job satisfaction seems to be a common theme. Job satisfaction according to Mullins (2005) is more of an attitude, an internal state of mind which could be linked to personal feelings of achievement in real life. Robins (2001) added that job satisfaction represents an individual's attitude towards his/her job. Riggio (2000) on the other hand noted that job satisfaction is a kind of feeling and attitude that people have regarding their job which may be good and bad, negative and positive and are likely to contribute to satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Weiss (2002) discovered from prior research that satisfaction as an influence and satisfaction as a feeling tend to be consistent. He further added that job satisfaction is a positive (or negative) evaluative judgment which individuals make regarding job situations (Weiss, 2002, p. 175). Clearly, there has not been a generally accepted definition of job satisfaction.

In this context, Locke, as cited in Green and Reese (2006), a known researcher on job satisfaction published a paper titled "What is Job Satisfaction". In that paper, Locke stated that job satisfaction is a pleasurable emotional state which is as a result of one's appraised achievement of one's job values. He further added that job satisfaction is also a function of perceived relationship between what an individual want out of his/her job and what the job is perceived to offer to him/her (p.316). The term "appraisal" is crucial to the definition in the context of the current literature. According to Locke, as cited in Green and Reese (2006), there are three factors that are associated with appraisal namely: (a) the perception of an aspect of a job, (b) the implicit or explicit of the value, and (c) how both the relationship and perception of the value are judged.

Administrators in correctional setting found themselves increasingly under pressure attempting to provide various stakeholders with measurable outcomes regarding job satisfaction. Studies have found that satisfied workers including correctional officers live longer, healthier lives, happier, more cooperative, more dependable, less likely to quit their jobs (Whiteacre, 2006, p. 70). Job satisfaction reduces absenteeism and turnover. Job satisfaction can affect other behaviors, such as, compliance, altruism, dependability, punctuality, complaints, waste, cooperation, criticism, and arguing among employees (Whiteacre, 2006). This research is in support of what correctional administrators have already recognized that a healthier and satisfied workforce increases productivity.

Just as there is no universally accepted definition of job satisfaction, its research and methods are not either.

As important as Job satisfaction is to researchers and employees, both are looking for ways to better attract and maintain the best out there. The study of job satisfaction came to light back in the 1920s and 1930s with the Hawthorn experiment of Elton Mayo, who decided to study whether or not altering the work environment would increase or decrease productivity (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1973). He in effect proceeded to alter physical structural factors such as lighting, temperature, and humidity which he compares to production level of workers. Upon the conclusion of the experiment, it was determined that increased or decreased lightening has no effect on productivity hence the term "Hawthorn effect", because workers were made aware of the experiment, so they improved their performance (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1973). This serves as the foundation for later studies.

Following the "Hawthorn" experiment was the Hoppock, as cited in Green and Reese (2006) work on job satisfaction. He equally discussed the Hawthorn experiment. Hoppock was first to employ the use of survey on job satisfaction in New Hope Pennsylvania. He distributed job satisfaction questionnaires to 309 workers. In all, 69% of the respondent rated job satisfaction to be important to employees. The factors measured in the Pennsylvanian study include: family relationship, health, relative social status in the community among others factors. He also used this surveyed on teachers. About 500 teachers were surveyed. He compared 100 most satisfied and 100 least satisfied teachers and found that job satisfaction has several factors. He also correlates job satisfaction to mental health, emotional adjustment, religion, family influence, and overall life satisfaction (Green & Reese, 2006; Lawler, 1973).

Building on the prior studies, Maslow (1943) added a psychological aspect which he coined, "Hierarchy of Needs" aspect onto job satisfaction literature. According to Maslow (1943), individuals strive to meet needs as they fulfill or meet the preceding needs. The hierarchy of needs indicates that individuals are motivated by five basic factors. The first set of needs is termed the lower level needs while the fifth is the highest level needs. The first level of needs is physiological requirements of food, water, and air to sustain life. The second level of need is security namely: physical protection and shelter. The third level of needs includes: social needs for love, friendship, acceptance among others. The fourth level of needs includes: esteem or need to achieve recognition and self-respect. The fifth need includes: self-actualization, need to live up to individual potential, personal fulfillment, growth, and development (Poist & Lynagh, 1976). The last three levels of needs clearly show what job satisfaction students and researchers should focus on when investigating job satisfaction based on Maslow's model.

Herzberg (1957) on the other hand developed a two-factor theory of job satisfaction. In this regard, the author states that an individual can be satisfied or dissatisfied. In general terms, job satisfaction is not a single continuum rather two independent facets that coexist with each other (Herzberg et al., 1959; Lawler, 1973). The first scale runs from satisfied to neutral which includes the motivators or others, while the second scale runs from dissatisfied to neutral, which includes hygiene factors or other factors that relate to jobs that are humans in nature (Herzberg et al., 1959; Lawler, 1973). In this process, Herzberg found facets that can be separated into the motivation/satisfying or hygiene/dissatisfying facets. In this context, achievement, recognition, work itself, advancement opportunity, and work responsibility were found to be factors satisfying to

individuals, while organization policy and administration, supervision, salary, inter personal relations, and working conditions were dissatisfying to individuals (Portis, 1969; Timmreck, 2001).

Based on the foregoing, Herzberg showed that in organizations where facets such as, achievement, work itself, and responsibility are more common, workers tend to be satisfied. Conversely, where facets such as, work condition, inter personal relations, supervision, and organization policy exists, there tend to be more dissatisfied workers. Therefore, striking a balance between these facets creates the required outcome in any organization including public safety.

Smith et al. (1969) proposed a different model of job satisfaction. In this model, Smith et al. (1969) argued that job satisfaction as articulated by Herzberg does not have a single continuum rather each factor has the potential to satisfy, dissatisfy, or still be irrelevant giving the circumstances. Smith et al. (1969) therefore proposed four independent factors that constitute job satisfaction namely (1) satisfaction with actual work, (2) satisfaction with pay and promotion, (3) satisfaction with supervision (4) satisfaction with coworkers. Upon further research, Smith et al. (1969) separated the second factor so that pay and promotion became distinct factors (Smith et al., 1969). This was the process that resulted to the five facets of job descriptive index (JDI).

Vroom (1974) proposed the expectancy when referencing to job satisfaction. He stated that workers prefer increase in pleasure over decrease in pain. He argued that job satisfaction is dependent upon the expectancy outcome of each worker (Vroom, 1974). Based on this assumption, Vroom concluded that an individual need and want is different thereby making job satisfaction different for each person. Maximizing pleasure while

minimizing pain may appear simplistic, it is generously supported by knowledge of existing literature on job satisfaction. Vroom further argued that it is improper to compare each individual job satisfaction research of each worker population as it would limit comparing job satisfaction studies across other population (Vroom, 1974).

Some job satisfaction facets stated earlier that affect satisfaction include: compensation, organization, and work (Christen et al., 2006). The facets were defined in more general terms with specificity. For example, compensation was defined to include pay or salary, promotion, and social climate, while defining work to include attractiveness of the job, role conflict, and role overload. Organization was defined to consider potential role ambiguity and supervisor involvement. Lund (2003) in his research found that employees who are satisfied with their work are more likely to have better attendance record than with those who are not satisfied. Glisson and Durick (1988) pointed out that skill type and role ambiguity are two predictors of job satisfaction. Accordingly, the less confused an employee is about his/her work the more satisfied he/she is with his/her job.

Ohiwere (2011) study examined the motivation and job satisfaction of business education teachers and observed that salary, money, staff training, information availability, and communication are the strategies for motivating workers. To this end, the author concluded that management should have good relationship with workers and that challenging work should be more valuable than resource adequacy or financial rewards. In addition, good working environment, morale, and excellent communication pattern should be encouraged to boost job satisfaction. The author further stated that there

should be clear job duties, policy responsibilities in administrative structures, and all facets of job satisfaction should be addressed (p. 22).

Elsenman (1995) conducted a study on job satisfaction-dissatisfaction on correctional officers and psychotherapists. The result showed that in correctional setting, it is not the rewards of money and status that motivate job satisfaction. If it were so, the author continued, the correctional therapists should have been the least dissatisfies. Rather, being in agreement with the authoritarian leadership is more valued than money in terms of enchasing workers satisfaction. Reacting to these findings, Miller et al. (1995) argued that dissatisfaction may serve as a push for the individual to think about what he/she does not like to provide an honest response. In addition, it may also be that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not direct opposite end of the continuum, rather may represent different continua. In that case, an individual could correctly respond being satisfied about his/her job in general, but also report dissatisfied as well if specific aspect of the job were perceived as worrisome (Miller et al., 1995).

Job satisfaction is so critical such that its absence results to reduced productivity and absenteeism (Levinson, 1997; Moser, 1997). In addition, the absence of job satisfaction usually is a strong predictor of quitting a job (Alexander, Lichtenstein, & Hellmann, 1997; Jamal, 1997). Most often workers may leave one organization to another and other times, workers may move from one profession to another that is considered better or greener pasture. The latter is very common in countries dealing with economic issues such as poor salary and late payment of workers (Nwagwu, 1997). In such countries including Nigeria, people tend to frequently move to better paying jobs (Fafunwa, 1971). Clarifying this trend, Armentor & Forsyth, 1995; Flanegan, Johnson, &

Berret, 1996; Kadushin & Kulys, 1995) concur that job satisfaction is indeed controlled by factors external to workers. From this view point, satisfaction may be motivated by the nature of the work, the pervasive social climate, and the extent to which workers peculiar needs are met.

Studies of job satisfaction have been extensive in the field of psychology and other organizations. However, in the public safety, studies of job satisfaction have been minimal at best to capture data. As observed by Mire (2005), law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies who have a high level job satisfaction are often more enthusiastic to perform their duties. The existing public safety job satisfaction literature shows that there are factors that cause dissatisfaction among officers. Zhao et al. (1999) study examined the effect of environment and demographic variables have on job satisfaction among officers. The authors used the entire Spokane WA Police Department as their sample. A total of 199 officers completed three survey instruments, including the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), and the demographic survey questionnaire. In addition, the authors used the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) statistical model for their analysis. The results showed that job satisfaction has a positive correlation with the work, type of tasks, and that the relationship between officers' demographic variables and job satisfaction is of no effect.

In another study, Mire (2005) studied 87 officers from Lafayette, Louisiana to determine the correlates of their job satisfaction. The author's goal was aimed at enhancing the theoretical extent of job satisfaction research within public safety. Mire (2005) used self-report for data collection. In addition to demographic variables, the author included organizational variables such as task identity, skill variety, autonomy,

task significance, and feedback, while the personality variables included neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and consciousness.

The study findings showed that age, years of service, and rank correlated with job satisfaction. Similarly, the five organizational variables have a significant correlation with job satisfaction with a 13% variance. Further, the five personality variables with exception of openness were significantly correlated with job satisfaction, with 10% variance (Mire, 2005). Koslowksy, Caspy, and Lazar (1991) work was on Israeli police officers to examine the causal relationship between job satisfaction and commitment. Commitment in this context was operationalized as a consequence of perceived cost/benefits and it consisted of four facets namely: job rewards, job costs, investment size, and perceived alternatives. The authors used a longitudinal approach for data from the Central Command Unit in Tel-Aviv. The authors job satisfaction and commitment questionnaires were administered to 63 police officers two times in a six months interval. The result showed no cost and benefit relationship between job satisfaction and commitment.

Another study that examined the correlation between stress, critical incidents, and officers perceived relationship satisfaction with their job satisfaction in Southern California. This study used a multiple regression for its analysis. It also used Police Stress Survey (PSS) to measure job stress among officers. In addition, the study also used a Double ABCX Model of Stress (McCubbin & Figley, 1983) which assessed a pre-crisis and post crisis behavior of families and individuals focusing on family coping ability strategy to recover overtime. The study findings showed that in times of job stress, relationship with job satisfaction decreased. Findings also indicated that relationship with

job satisfaction equally increased during extreme critical incidents such as officer's death in line of duty.

Study by Mclntyre et al. (1990) examined the factors that affect officers' decision to quit their department. The authors used a mix methodology. A total of 152 officers who left their jobs were administered the survey and also interviewed. The multiple regression analysis was utilized and the authors found that officers left because they were dissatisfied with their job benefits, opportunities for promotion, wage rates, and retirement packages. The authors equally found that the style of leadership lowered job satisfaction level among officers.

According to Johnson (2012), studies of job satisfaction in public safety/law enforcement always have been focused on officers' demographic characteristics. It's only but recently that some studies showed that job task variables are the main source of Job satisfaction. Johnson (2012) conducted a research in which he analyzed three dimensions of correlates of job satisfaction namely: officers' demographic characteristics, officers' job task characteristics, and officers' organizational environment characteristics. The sample included patrol officers from 11 public safety agencies from the Southern United States. The findings from this study showed that officer's job task characteristics were the main source of job satisfaction, while organizational environment characteristics played a minor role in determining officer's job satisfaction.

Lim et al. as cited in Ozbaran (2010) conducted a research in Singapore to examine whether or not job satisfaction of officers was related to how officers perceive their job image. In this study, perceived job image has four facets namely: prestige, integrity, competence, and non-routine job nature. The authors used a mix study in which

surveys were administered to 467 officers and interviewed 28 officers. A regression

analysis was used for the analysis. The result of the study showed that the four

dimensions of perceived job image, especially the prestige dimension affected the job

satisfaction of the officers. To this end, the authors noted that job satisfaction is strongly

associated with perceived job image of the officers.

Similarly, Yim and Scafer (2009) conducted a research to show how officers'

public perception affected their job satisfaction. The authors drew their sample from

metropolitan agencies in the Midwestern States of the United States. A self-administered

questionnaire was utilized to obtain officers data. Findings from the study showed that

officers believed public perception of them is less favorable. The findings also revealed

that officers' perceived image in most non-enforcement situations was strongly related to

their job satisfaction. Morrrale (2002) researched the relationship between public safety

leadership styles and officers willingness to exert extra effort for their job satisfaction.

The result showed that officers are more satisfied with their work and more willing to

exert when they work with managers who demonstrate transformational leadership style.

Similarly, Harris (1998) research examined the relationship between job satisfaction and

turnover. The author identified eight factors that may cause an officer to quit his/her job

which includes: opportunity for advancement, general benefits, retirement package,

salary, position, department's personnel policies, leadership style, and administrative

policies of the department. The study included a total of 232 officers who had resigned or

quit their jobs to work for other agencies. The result showed a negative correlation

between officer's turnover and satisfaction with opportunities for promotion, job realities

and job expectations. The author noted that most of the participants showed dissatisfaction with pay and advancement opportunities.

Kung (2004) study examined the job satisfaction among women officers. The study consisted 101women officers. The variables that had significant effect on job satisfaction for women officers were perceived organizational support, task significance, and autonomy. The findings for the study showed that job satisfaction increased when organization in which they work for value their contribution and well-being as individuals. The study further revealed that women officers were satisfied due to the fact that organization granted them some measure of independence which enabled them to make sound judgments while doing their work.

Stress has also being found to impact job satisfaction in public safety organizations. Getaham et al. (2008) study indicates that parole and probation officers who report less stress are more likely to equally report high level of job satisfaction. Martelli et al. (1989) reported that officers with high level of stress do have low job satisfaction with their job. Violanti and Arin (1993) on source of public safety officers' stressors found organizational stressors, such as, the fear of being jammed in the course of discharging their duties to significantly impact job satisfaction. To this end, organizational stressors were found to be six times more than inherent stressor on public safety officers (Violanti & Arin, 1993). The author concluded that individuals with higher level of job satisfaction were shown to have much lower stress level (Violanti & Arin, 1993).

The attempt to understand the determinants of job satisfaction among public safety officer was by Ozbaran (2010) who examined the relationship between leadership

styles of Turkish Traffic management and the job satisfaction of traffic officers. The

author utilized the bivariate correlation and multiple regressions for analysis. The result

of the study showed a positive relationship between leadership characteristics of the

managers and job satisfaction of traffic officers. The results also showed that when

officers perceive their managers to demonstrate transformational leadership style and

behavior, they are more likely to be satisfied with supervision, present work, and their

overall jobs.

Influence of Leadership on Job Satisfaction

Essentially, the relationships between leadership style, job satisfaction, and work

performance have been adequately researched (Bass, 1990a; Collins & Porras, 1996; &

Manz & Sims, 1991; all cited in Ozbaran, 2010). In addition, Joseph (1998) concurred

with the fact that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and style of

leadership that enhances employee job satisfaction. Equally, Riaz and Haider (2010)

conducted a study which determined the impact of leadership style on job satisfaction and

career success. The result of the study further showed a positive relationship between

leadership style, job satisfaction, and career success. This result is consistent with other

studies (Berson & Linton, 2005; Wiratmadja, Govindaraju, & Rahyuda, 2008).

Certainly, factors such as pay, race, and promotion opportunities may be

associated with job satisfaction (Lim & Teo, 2000; Buzawa, 1984), other studies show

that job satisfaction has a positive relationship with leadership style (Brunetto &

Wharton, 2003; Barnes & Sheley, 2004). This position is collaborated by Chiok (2001)

study that examined the effect of leadership behavior on job satisfaction, productivity,

45

and organizational commitment among nurses. The author concluded that job satisfaction was mostly influenced by a manager's style of leadership (Chiok, 2001).

Another variable related to job satisfaction is the supervision component (Barnes & Sheley, 2004). Equally, Bass (1985) examined leadership in different environment and came to a conclusion that leadership style of managers is a critical factor for employee job satisfaction. Bass (1985) strongly maintained that workers are more likely to feel better with their task when they work with managers whose style of leadership enhances their satisfaction.

Another study conducted by Emery and Baker (2007) determined the effect of leadership style on organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The study population consists of 77 branch managers from three regional banking industry and 47 store managers from a national food chain industry. The authors utilized the abridged version of MLQ instrument. They also used the modified version of JDI which included items that the researchers felt was directly affected by supervisor style. The data were analyzed using correlation analysis with Cohen and Cohen formulae for comparing the size of dependent correlation (Emery & Baker, 2007). The study findings showed that employees whose managers' style of leadership empowers and motivate enjoyed high levels of job satisfaction. The authors also found that the factors of charisma and intellectual stimulation correlated with job satisfaction of food employees at $r = .212$ and $r = 322$ respectively. This study provided support for the use of leadership style that increases job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Emery & Baker, 2007).

Measuring Job Satisfaction

Numerous job satisfaction measurements have been developed over the years. There are so many to list in the present study, however, a few will be mentioned. For example, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969); the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was developed by Weiss, Davis, England, and Lofquist (1967); the Porter Need Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Porter (1962); Brayfield-Rothe Index was developed by Brayfield- Rothe (O'Connor et al., 1978). These measurements of job satisfaction instruments have been widely utilized by researchers in quantitative studies. However, for the present study, a Single-Item Global Job Satisfaction Measure developed by Wanous et al. (1997) will be used.

Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997) published a paper in which they demonstrated that single-item measures of overall job satisfaction correlates highly with multiple items (or scale) measures of overall job satisfaction (uncorrected correlation of .63 corrected only for reliability, r=.67). Wanous et al. (1977) concluded that single item measures of overall satisfaction are more robust than the scale measures of overall job satisfaction (p. 250). Wanous et al. equally listed conditions upon which a single item measure may be preferred. These conditions includes: (1) single item measures may take less space than scale measures, (2) single item measures may be more cost effective, (3) single item measures may contain more face validity, more so when an organization has poor employee relations such as negative reaction to perceived repetition questions from scale measures, and (4) single item measures may be better to measure changes in job satisfaction (Wanous et al., 1977).

The Nigerian Prisons

The first Nigerian prison was built in 1872 and was located in Lagos (Enuku, 2001). Thereafter, in 1910, more prisons were built in Degema, calabar, Onitsha, Benin, Ibadan, Sapele, Jeba, and Lokaja (Orakwe, 2013). The Nigerian prisons began not as ultimate institution for punishment and correction, but rather for custody of persons caught up in the web of the criminal justice systems waiting trials or execution of their punishment, such as whipping, banishment, and death (Alemika, 1987). In the mid nineteenth century, the functions of the Nigerian prisons as a short-term custodial facility changed to an institution for ensuring punishment, penitence, and correction of an offender (Enuku, 2001).

The establishment of the Nigerian prisons is rooted in several statutes from the colonial era to present which includes the Prisons Ordinance of 1916; Laws of Nigeria (1948-1958), and the prisons Decree No. 9 of 1972 (Enuku, 2001). The functions of the Nigerian prisons as outlined by the Government White paper in 1971 includes; custody, diagnosis, correction, training, and rehabilitation of offenders (Enuku, 2001). The prisons was then ran to serve the interest of the colonialist which includes ensuring law and order, collection of taxes, and providing labor for the public works (Orakwe, 2013).

However, the 1972 decree spelt out the goals and orientation of the Nigerian prisons to oversee staff deployment, training, discipline, promotion, and recruitment (Orakwe, 2013). In addition, the prisons functions will also include custody of the legally detained, identifying causes for their behavior, and retraining incarcerated offenders to become better citizens upon release into the society (Orakwe, 2013). As stated, the decree

essentially make secure custody the first role of the prisons, it also make it explicit that reform and rehabilitation are added goals of the prison.

The prisons then under a director also had additional three principal agencies namely: Technical, Inspectorate, and Welfare with each unit under a deputy of prisons director performing different roles to enable expeditious execution of programs. The technical division was charged with the responsibility of general administration and the provision of logistics in addition to supervising the farms and industries. The inspectorate and the welfare division were charged with prisons order which includes prisons inmate treatment, training, rehabilitation, and medical needs.

To this end, the need to employ skilled manpower became crucial. In 1974 and 1980, a group of welfare officers were recruited to take on the adjustment-related programs and rehabilitation of inmates. In addition, nurses and doctors were also recruited to strengthen the medical staff unit. Furthermore, over three hundred university graduates were recruited in the service as general duty officers to see to the running of the prisons. It was hoped that their enlightenment will direct other staff towards achieving the leadership goals of the prisons (Orakwe, 2013).

There has been massive reformation in the Nigerian prisons since 1972. For example, the prisons have been reorganized from its modest three directorates in 1980 to six directorates in 1993. Presently, the Nigerian prisons has eight (8) zonal command structures, thirty six (36) state command structures, and one (1) FCT command. Presently, there are one hundred and forty-four (144) prisons including farm centers and 83 satellite prisons. It also has four training schools, and a staff college and two (2) Borstal Institutions. On manpower, the Nigerian prisons now boast of more professionals

than any other time in its history. For example, it has among its officers, medical environmental health officers, sociologists/psychologists, lawyers, general administrators, and engineers among others (Orakwe, 2013).

Despite the changes in the Nigerian prisons organizational structure, leadership and job satisfaction of officers have witnessed little changes. The system has not been responsive to leadership advancement in criminology, penology, and policies (Alemike & Alemike, 1994). Furthermore, the problems of the Nigerian prison lies in unstable leadership and job satisfaction of the prison officers. In this regard, if the Nigerian prisons are to be relevant in this modern era, then business as usual must cease (http://www.thenationonline.net). It is against this background that the need to address the Nigerian prisons leadership style that will promote job satisfaction among officers becomes imperative. In doing so, this study will examine the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perceptions of job satisfaction among the Nigerian prison officers.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will describe the study design and the instruments that were used in analyzing the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style, and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The study focused on leadership variables as defined by transformational, transactional, and laissez faire in MLQ full range by Avolio and Bass (1985) and its relationship with the Single Item Global Measures of job satisfaction.

In this regard, the effects of transformational leadership variables of idealized influence (attributed/behavior), motivational inspiration, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, as well as transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management-by exception (active) and management-by-exception (passive) were examined in relation to job satisfaction. The study also used officers' personal bio data as a background in providing insights to the quality of responses to the survey. In this study, transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles are the independent variables; while job satisfaction is the dependent variable. Factors such as

age, educational level, gender, experience as a prison officer, and marital status constitutes the demographic variables that were included in the study.

The main purpose of the present study is to identify those qualities that workers look for in their leaders and how these qualities influence workers job satisfaction. By assessing the employees perception of leadership, the study was able to isolate the effects of transformational leadership qualities such as idealized influence (attribute) idealized influence (behavior), intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individual consideration; transactional leadership variables of contingency, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive); and laissez faire on employee job satisfaction.

The study utilized the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X rater form) to capture employees perception of transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and relate them to Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997) Single-Item Global Measures of overall job satisfaction to establish linkage between leadership and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. To link the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction, the person's product correlation coefficient was used to test the independent leadership variable and the dependent variable job satisfaction to see how leadership correlate with job satisfaction of the Nigerian prison officers.

The finding of this proposed study will assist policy formulators and implementers in designing comprehensive leadership and reorientation policies that will position the Nigerian prisons to be more responsive and capable of meeting the changing organizational demands, complex modern work environment, and high technological advancement under which modern public safety organizations operate.

Research Design

The present research study used a quantitative correlational research design to investigate the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles, and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The study employed the use of survey. The use of survey allowed the researcher to generalize from a sample to a population in order to make an inference about some characteristic of that population. The use of survey was preferred for this study because of its effectiveness, easy to administer, and cost effectiveness (Creswell, 2009).

Specifically, quantitative correlational design was a perfect fit for the present inquiry in that the researcher assessed the relationship between measurable variables on instruments in order that data can be analyzed statistically (Creswell, 2008; Fowler, 2002). This design is best to examine the relationship (if any) between leadership and the job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The study focused on leadership characteristics as defined by transformational variables of idealized influence, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation as well as transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive); and laissez-faire leadership styles and relate them to job satisfaction.

Sample Population

The sample population for the study was drawn from junior officers of the Nigerian prisons located in Eastern part of Nigeria. Participants were included in the

53

study if they are 18 years and above, males and females, and are junior officers who are residents of the Eastern part of Nigeria. Any participant who does not meet the above criteria was excluded from the study. In all, 160 survey packets were mailed out to the Nigerian prison junior officers.

Participants who do not live in the Eastern part of Nigeria were excluded. Nigerian prison officers who were visiting the Eastern part of Nigeria during the study were equally excluded from the study. Senior officers were considered to be leadership and were also excluded from the study.

Participants for the study were selected using convenience sampling. This is due to having a specific group that the researcher was seeking to understand, the Nigerian prison junior officers. The expected sample size for the study was about one hundred and sixty (160). This sample size was adequate to meet saturation point. The sample size was determined by conducting a power analysis from a sample size calculator surveysystem. According to this sample size calculator and analysis, the confidence interval was determined to be 6.00, the confidence level was 95%, and the population size was 400 (www.surveysystem.com). Based on this calculation and analysis, the sample size for the study was determined to be 160.

After approval was obtained from Capella University Institutional Review Board and the Administrative Authorities of the Nigerian prisons, the researcher posted flyers inside the prisons facility including but not limited to cafeteria, notice boards, and other strategic locations within the prisons facility advertising the study and soliciting for volunteers. The flyers contained the research information, researcher's phone number,

email address, and contact address for interested participants to contact the researcher to ask questions regarding the study.

Instrumentation

The study used the quantitative methodology to investigate the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles, and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. Specifically, questionnaires were used to collect information from Nigerian prison junior officers' perception of their leaders' style as well as the leadership style that accounts for most variance in perception of job satisfaction among the Nigerian prison officers. The questionnaires consisted of three parts:

1.   The first instrument consisted of officers' bio data reflecting their personal characteristics

2.   The second instrument used was the MLQ 5X rater form developed by Avolio and Bass (1985) to collect information on transformational, transactional as well as laissez faire leadership styles.

3.   The third instrument used was the Single-Item Global Measure on Job Satisfaction developed by Wanous et al. (1997).

The bio data information summarized the personal characteristics of the participants to provide the background information on their perceptions to leadership factors. The bio data equally reflected the quality and degree of understanding of participants' ability to assess leadership functions.

The MLQ 5X, developed by Avolio and Bass (1985) consist of 45 items. This instrument was used to rate the frequency of observed leaders behavior on a 5-point Likert scale of 0-4. The MLQ 5X contains 45 items key measures of leadership factors and organizational effectiveness outcome variables. The nine components of leadership measured transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style, while the remaining four components measured performance outcomes. The averages of the participants rating were taken for all the variables for analysis.

The third instrument used was the Single-Item Global Job Satisfaction Measure by Wanous et al. (1997). The Single-item Global Job Satisfaction Measures is a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5, with 1=*strongly disagree*, 2=*disagree*, 3=*neutral*, 4=*agree*, and 5=*strongly agree*. Respondents will be asked to respond to the statement, "Considering everything, I am satisfied with my job". Respondents will choose from items (1) *strongly disagree to item* (5) *strongly agree* that represents the level of their job satisfaction. Responses were summed up, with highest score indicating a high level of job satisfaction while a low score indicated low level of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

Permission to use the MLQ 5X questionnaires came from Mind Garden for Avolio and Bass (1985), while permission to use the Single-Item Global Job Satisfaction (1997) came from Professor Wanous.

Measures

The present study investigated the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X) by Avolio

56

and Bass (1985) and the Single-Item Global Job satisfaction Measure (Wanous et al., 1997) questionnaires were used to measure the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among the Nigerian prison officers.. The demographic questionnaire was also prepared by this researcher to capture participants' demographic data.

The MLQ 5X developed by Bass and Avolio is a Likert-type scale to assess the full-range of leadership models. It has 12 scales of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. It also has extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction which have been used in several countries and different languages (Avolio & Bass, 2002). The MLQ 5X consist of 45 statements and 36 of the statements measures leadership styles. Respondents rate the MLQ 5X from zero to four, with (0 = *not at all*), (1 = *once in a while*), (2 = *sometimes*), (3 = *fairly often*), and (4 = *frequently, if not always*). Each question selected by the respondent will be summed up. Higher scores will indicate a relationship toward the leadership style while a lower score will indicate no relationship towards the leadership style being measured.

The MLQ 5X, with 20 questions including 5 leadership behaviors scales includes the idealized influence (attributes), idealized influence (behavior) scales, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. This is measured by 12 questions and 3 scales including: contingent reward, management by exception (active), and management by exception (passive). The laissez-faire leadership style is measured with 4 questions and 1 scale.

Idealized influence (attribute): Leaders in this category behave in a manner that engages followers emotionally (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The willingness of the followers to emulate the leader is measured by items 10, 18, 21, and 25 on the MLQ 5X form. Idealized influences (behavior): Leaders in this category align their ethics and values with that of the organization. These kinds of leaders care about values, beliefs, strong sense of purpose, and collective sense of mission (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 97), measured by items 6, 14, 23, and 34 on the MLQ 5X form.

Inspirational motivation: Leaders in this category express organizational vision to followers and they also stress team. Leaders in this category motivate people around them by challenging them to higher heights (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 97), measured by items 9, 13, 26, and 36 on the MLQ 5X form.

Intellectual stimulation: Leaders in this category encourage followers to seek innovative ways of problem resolution (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 98) and are measured in items 2, 8, 30, and 32 on the MLQ 5X form.

Individual consideration: Leaders in this category care for followers' needs and concerns. These categories of leaders teaches, coaches, treats people as individuals rather than member of a group, and assist followers to develop their strength (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 98). This is measured by items 15, 19, 29, and 31 on the MLQ 5X form.

Contingent reward: Leaders in this category uses necessary rewards to obtain efforts from followers. Such leaders discuss in clear terms as to who is responsible for achieving set targets and also specify rewards and when rewards can be received upon achieving set targets (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 98), measured in items 1, 11, 16, and 35 on the MLQ 5X form.

Management by exception (active): Leaders in this category expect to be watched constantly for errors and comply with standards. These types of leaders focus their attention to keep track of mistakes. When a mistake is dictated, the leader immediately ensures that the mistake is promptly corrected (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 98), measured by items 4, 22, 24, and 27 on the MLQ 5X form. Management-by-exception (passive): Leaders in this category want compliance with standards. However, they play passive roles until standards deteriorate or not met (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 98) and this style of leadership is measured by items 3, 12, 17, and 20 on the MLQ 5X form.

Laissez-faire Leadership: leaders in this category do not meddle with followers. In this instance, these types of leaders rather avoid decision making, they do not take responsibilities, and are mostly absent when needed (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 98). This type of leadership is measured by items 5, 7, 28, and 33 on the MLQ 5X form.

Validity/ Reliability of the MLQ 5X form: The MLQ 5X was developed by Avolio and Bass in 1985. Several studies have supported its reliability, validity, and consistency (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Oshagbemi & Gill, 2004). The internal consistency of its 36 items has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.64 to 0.92 (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Two validity tests were carried out by Avolio and Bass. First, they looked at nine data sets with sample size of 2,154. Second they tested five data sets with a sample size of 1,706. The test results showed that both convergent and discriminate validity coefficients were 0.91. This result equally shows a reliability coefficient of 0.74 to 0.94. This means that the instrument has a high reliability.

Single-Item Global Job Satisfaction Measure (Wanous et al., 1997): This is the second instrument used to measure job satisfaction of Nigerian prison officers. The

Single-Item Global Job Satisfaction Measure was adapted from Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy (1997) for a single item overall job satisfaction. The average correlation between a single-item measure and a scale was .63 (when corrected for unreliability, the measure is .67) for all scales, and .67 (when corrected for unreliability, the measure is .72) for the "best" scales. These correlations are considered as the "convergent validity" of the single-item which is based on 28 samples with 7,682 people (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997).

The Single-Item Global Job Satisfaction Measure is a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5, with 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree. Respondents will be asked to respond to the statement, "Considering everything, I am satisfied with my job". Respondents will choose from items (1) *strongly disagree* to item (5*) strongly agree* that represents the level of their job satisfaction. Responses will be summed up, with highest score indicating a high level of job satisfaction while a low score will indicate low level of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

Data Collection

The study investigated the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. Upon obtaining approval from Capella University Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Administrative Office of the Nigerian prisons, participants were contacted through flyers that were posted on the notice board of the prisons facility.

The flyers contained the research information, researcher's phone number, and contact address for interested participants to contact this researcher to ask questions

regarding the study. The flyers also contained information assuring participants of their confidentiality, anonymity, deadlines, and duration of the study. Furthermore, the flyer advised the participants that participation is voluntary as there will be no compensation.

From the administrative office of the Nigerian prisons, the researcher obtained contact information and screened participants to ensure they meet eligibility criteria for recruitment for the study. Participants who met the inclusion criteria were mailed the survey packet that also contained the waiver of signed consent form and a stamped self-addressed return envelops to complete and mail back to the researcher within the time stipulated to the address indicated on the self-addressed envelopes. The researcher will be the only person to have access to the collected data. At the end of the study, the data will be kept in a lock box. Participants' names will not be identified on the survey instruments.

The informed consent was written at an eighth grade level English. In addition, participants were allowed to ask questions before, during, and after the study. The researcher's e-mail/phone number was listed on the flyer should any participant have any concerns. Furthermore, informed consent was obtained, but signed consents were not obtained. Participants could withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty because participation was voluntary.

Data Analysis

The study investigated the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The survey instruments used for the study were the Multifactor Leadership

Questionnaire (MLQ 5X) and the Single-Item Global Job Satisfaction Measure to measure the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. A demographic questionnaire was prepared by this researcher to capture participants' data was the third instrument. These instruments were used to collect data from RQ1 to RQ3 as stated below.

RQ1. What is the relationship (if any) between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

RQ2. What is the relationship (if any) between transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management by exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

RQ3. What is the relationship (if any) between laissez-faire leadership and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

Ordinal data analysis procedure was used (RQ1-RQ4). The MLQ 5X measures the transformational leadership style, 20 question items, five leadership behavior scales which includes: idealized influence (attribute), measured by items (10, 18, 21, and 25) on the MLQ 5X form; idealized influence (behavior) as measured by items (6, 14, 23, and 34) on the MLQ 5X form; inspirational motivation measured by items (9, 13, 26, and 36) on the MLQ 5X form; intellectual stimulation as measured in items (2, 8, 30, and 32) on the MLQ 5X form; and individualized consideration, measured by items (15, 19, 29, and 31) on the MLQ 5X form. The MLQ 5X is a Likert-type scale. Where, 0 is (*not at all*) and 4 is (*frequently if not always*). Scores from the 20 question items will be summed up to yield a total score that reflects not at all or frequently, if not always. Higher scores will

indicate that a relationship exist between the leadership style being measured and the officers job satisfaction on the Single-Item Global Job satisfaction Measure scale, while a lower score will indicate no relationship. The data was organized in an (SPSS) file. The analysis utilized descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics allows data obtained to be structured, accurate, and in a cohesive manner (Huysamen, 1990).

This statistics was used to analyze the demographic data which includes: age, education, gender, time at present work, and marital status. The statistics equally measured the mean, frequency, percentages, and standard deviation. As noted by Sekaran (2000), inferential statistics allowed this researcher the capacity to infer based on the analysis between and among variables of different subgroups, and how independent variables explained the variance in dependent variable (p. 401).

The Pearson product correlational coefficient (r) guided the measurement of the associations of two variables characterized by a linear relationship (positive or negative). This statistics guided the investigation of the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership, and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. Analysis was equally employed in the present study using linear regression, which took into account the relationship between two or more variables by applying linear equation to observe data (Sekaran, 2000). Essentially, the linear regression analyzed the relationship between dependent and independent variables and the extent of their relationship.

Ethical Considerations

The present study investigated the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. This research involved minimal risks as officers of the Nigerian prisons were requested to rate their perception of leaders styles on a Likert scale. Generally, workers as research subjects are however, a vulnerable population and adequate measures were put in place to ensure the protection and confidentiality of all participants in the course of data collection.

To ensure that participants were protected from harassment and intimidation, the researcher put the following protection in place.

• The first step taken was the approval of all survey instruments used in the study by Capella University Institutional review Board (IRB).

• The researcher minimized the risks by requiring participants to mail in their completed surveys using a stamped self-addressed return envelope without having to show up at the prisons facility. This will protect participants from any possible harassment and intimidation from their leadership. In addition, mailing in completed surveys also assured participants of both their privacy and anonymity.

• Participants were provided with lists of legal councils to contact if needed.

• Participants could withdraw from the study at any time without negative consequences. No names or any personal identifiable markings were written on the surveys.

The researcher ensured that participation in the study was voluntary. Informed consent was obtained, but not a signed consent form as there was IRB waiver for the signing of the form to ensure anonymity of the participants and to protect them from harassment and intimidation from their leaders (Supplemental Form F was completed). The informed consent was written at an eighth grade level English. In addition, participants were allowed to ask questions before, during, and after the study. The researcher's e-mail and phone number were listed on the flyer should any participant have any concerns. Participants could withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty because participation was voluntary.

The study did not examining vulnerable population as all participants were adults, 18 years and above. Participants were asked to rate their perception of the transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. Participants' information will be kept strictly confidential. The researcher personally collected all completed surveys in order to protect the privacy of participants.

The researcher was the only person to access participants' information during recruitment and screening process. The researcher will not share survey responses with anyone to include anyone who might be connected with the Nigerian prisons authorities. All research data will be safely kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher's home for 7 years. All survey documents will be maintained in accordance with the Capella IRB regulations and will be destroyed after 7 years following the study and in accordance with the Capella IRB regulations.

The participants were asked not to share information from the survey with any other person or persons. In addition, all the collected data will be coded and used in statistical analysis. The researcher will be the only person to review the survey answers and this information will not be shared with the Nigerian prisons officials. All research data will be safely kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher's home for 7 years, after which it will be destroyed by shredding. During the process of destroying the surveys, the researcher will account for all surveys by checking each folder. The researcher will have a witness to verify the destruction.

Summary

The sample for this study was drawn from the Nigerian prisons. The purpose of the study was to investigated the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The study focused on prisons officers' perceptions of their leaders' styles and qualities as measured by the factors of transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and its effects on job satisfaction. The MLQ 5X and the Single item job satisfaction measures were the instrument used to assess the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers job satisfaction.

A demographic data which summarized the personal characteristics of the participants to provide the background information on their perceptions to leadership factors was prepared by this researcher. The bio data equally reflected the quality and degree of understanding of participants' ability to assess leadership functions.

66

The analysis utilized descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics allows data obtained to be structured, accurate, and in a cohesive manner (Huysamen, 1990). This statistics was used to analyze the demographic data which includes: age, education, gender, time at present work. The statistics equally measured the mean, frequency, percentages, and standard deviation. In addition, the inferential statistics was utilized for the analysis of this study. As noted by Sekaran (2000), inferential statistics allowed this researcher the capacity to infer based on the analysis between and among variables of different subgroups, and how independent variables explained the variance in dependent variable (p. 401). Analysis was equally employed in the present study using linear regression, which took into account the relationship between two or more variables by applying linear equation to observe data (Sekaran, 2000). Essentially, the linear regression analyzed the relationship between dependent and independent variables and the extent of their relationship.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. A total of 160 survey packages were mailed out to the Nigerian prisons junior officers stationed in the Eastern part of Nigeria. Of the 160 surveys mailed out, 115 completed surveys were returned, representing 71.9% of the total numbers mailed out. This level of return rate could be attributed to the mail in approach that was adopted. Three research questions were posed in Chapter 1.

RQ1. What is the relationship (if any) between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

RQ2. What is the relationship (if any) between transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management by exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

RQ3. What is the relationship (if any) between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

In the current chapter, the results of the statistical analyses performed to achieve this purpose are presented. Initially, descriptive statistical results are presented for the sample demographic characteristics and the composite variables used as measures of leadership and job satisfaction. The, the results related to each of the three research

questions are presented including Pearson correlations and linear regression results. The

chapter ends with a summary of the key findings from this study.

Descriptive Statistical Results

Table 1 contains descriptive statistics for the sample demographic characteristics

of age, gender, education, marital status, and years of experience as a prison officer.

Most of the participants were either between 31 and 40 years of age (36.5%) or 41 and 50

years of age (39.1%), and most (54.9%) were male. Most of the participants had a

bachelor's degree (73.0%) with 14.8% having only a high school education and 12.2%

having a master's degree. Most of the participants were married (68.7%), 31.3% were

single, and none were divorced. There was wide variation in years of experience as a

prisons officer with the most common levels of experience being between 6 and 10 years

(20.9%), between 21 to 25 years (20.0%), and between 16 to 20 years (19.1%).

Descriptive statistics for the nine leadership scales and the job satisfaction

measure are shown in Table 2. Among the leadership scales, the highest means were for

the Intellectual Stimulation scale (M = 8.55, SD = 2.80), the Management-by-Exception

(Active) scale (M = 8.50, SD = 3.27), and the Idealized Influence (Attribute) scale (M =

8.31, SD = 3.06). The lowest means were for the Inspirational Motivation scale (M =

7.71, SD = 2.69) and the Idealized Influence (Behavior) scale (M = 7.95, SD = 2.74).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Sample Demographic and Background Characteristics (N = 115)

	n	%
Age group		
18 to 30	22	19.1
31 to 40	42	36.5
41 to 50	45	39.1
51 to 65	6	5.2
Gender		
Male	62	54.9
Female	51	45.1
Missing	2	1.7
Highest level of education		
High school diploma	17	14.8
Bachelor's degree	84	73.0
Master's degree	14	12.2
Doctorate	0	0.0
Marital status		
Single	36	31.3
Married	79	68.7
Divorced	0	0.0
Years of experience as a prison officer		
1 to 5	18	15.7
6 to 10	24	20.9
11 to 15	13	11.3
16 to 20	22	19.1
21 to 25	23	20.0
26 to 30	11	9.6
31 or older	4	3.5

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Leadership and Satisfaction Scales (N = 115)

Scale	Items	Min.	Max.	*M*	*SD*
Transformational Leadership Scales					
Idealized Influence (Attribute)	4	1.00	15.00	8.31	3.06
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	4	2.00	14.00	7.95	2.74
Inspirational Motivation	4	.00	15.00	7.71	2.69
Intellectual Stimulation	4	2.00	14.00	8.55	2.80
Individualized Consideration	4	.00	15.00	8.10	3.35
Transactional Leadership Scales					
Contingent Reward	4	.00	14.00	8.06	2.80
Management-by-Exception (Active)	4	.00	15.00	8.50	3.27
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	4	.00	15.00	8.08	2.97
Laissez Faire Leadership	4	1.00	14.00	8.30	2.91
Job Satisfaction	1	1.00	5.00	3.77	.99

Inferential Statistical Results

Research Question 1

The first research question of this study was: What is the relationship (if any) between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction related to Idealized Influence (Attribute) scores, $r = -.09$, $p = .359$, Idealized Influence (Behavior) scores, $r = -.02$, p = .801, Inspirational Motivation scores, $r = .00$, $p = .959$,

Intellectual Stimulation scores, *r* = -.01, *p* = .953, or Individualized Consideration scores,

r = -.02, *p* = . among Nigerian prison officers?

Table 3 shows the Pearson correlations among the transformational leadership

scales and job satisfaction. Job Satisfaction scores were not significantly 833.

Table 3

Pearson Correlations between Transformational Leadership Scales and Job Satisfaction (N =

115)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. Idealized Influence (Attribute)	1.00					
2. Idealized Influence (Behavior)	.55*	1.00				
3. Inspirational Motivation	.62*	.68*	1.00			
4. Intellectual Stimulation	.39*	.53*	.46*	1.00		
5. Individualized Consideration	.54*	.57*	.56*	.57*	1.00	
6. Job Satisfaction	-.09	-.02	.00	-.01	-.02	1.00

p < .01.

The results of a linear regression analysis with the five transformational

leadership scale as predictors of job satisfaction scores are shown in Table 4. Overall, the

regression model was not statistically significant, R^2 = .01, $F(5, 190)$ = .26, *p* = .936.

This indicated that the transformational leadership scales were not predictive of Job

Satisfaction scores.

Based on the fact that the Pearson correlation analysis indicated that none of the

correlations between the transformational leadership scales and Job Satisfaction scores

were statistically significant, and that the regression model was not statistically significant, the answer to the first research question of this study was that there were no relationships between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

Table 4

Results from Linear Regression Analysis with Transformational Leadership Scales as Predictors of Job Satisfaction (N = 115)

	B	SE_B	β	t	p
Constant	3.90	.36		10.96	<.001
Idealized Influence (Attribute)	-.04	.04	-.14	-1.08	.283
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	-.01	.05	-.01	-.10	.917
Inspirational Motivation	.03	.05	.08	.54	.587
Intellectual Stimulation	.00	.04	.01	.10	.920
Individualized Consideration	.00	.04	.01	.09	.925

Notes. Model R^2 = .01, $F(5, 109)$ = .26, p = .936.

Research Question 2

The second research question was: What is the relationship (if any) between transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive), and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

Table 5 shows the Pearson correlations between the three transactional leadership scales and Job Satisfaction scores. Job Satisfaction scores were not significantly related to Contingent Reward scores, r -.05, p = .582, Management-by-Exception (Active) scores, r = .13, p = .159, or Management-by-Exception (Passive) scores, r = -.10, p = .267.

Table 5

Pearson Correlations between Transactional Leadership Scales and Job Satisfaction (N = 115)

	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. Contingent Reward	1.00			
2. Management-by-Exception (Active)	.30*	1.00		
3. Management-by-Exception (Passive)	.64*	.52*	1.00	
4. Job Satisfaction	-.05	.13	-.10	1.00

*p < .01.

Table 6 shows the results from the linear regression analysis with the three transactional leadership scales as predictors of Job Satisfaction scores. The regression model as a whole was not statistically significant, Model R2 = .06, F(3, 111) = 2.34, p = .077. However, the Management-by-Exception (Active) scale was statistically significant as a predictor of Job Satisfaction scores, β = .26, p = .019.

Based on the Pearson correlation and linear regression results, the answer to the second research question of this study was that one of the transactional leadership variables, management by exception (active), had a positive relationship to Job

Satisfaction scores among Nigerian prison officers. Specifically, participants who rated their leader as exhibiting a management by exception (active) leadership style tended to have higher levels of job satisfaction.

Table 6

Results from Linear Regression Analysis with Transactional Leadership Scales as Predictors of Job Satisfaction (N = 115)

	B	*SEB*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Constant	3.71	.33		11.41	<.001
Contingent Reward	.01	.04	.04	.33	.745
Management-by-Exception (Active)	.08	.03	.26	2.39	.019
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	-.09	.04	-.26	-1.97	.052

Notes. Model R^2 = .06, $F(3, 111)$ = 2.34, p = .077.

Research Question 3

The third research question was: What is the relationship (if any) between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers? The Pearson correlation between Laissez Faire Leadership scores and Job Satisfaction scores was not statistically significant, r = .08, p = .387. No linear regression analysis was performed because with only one predictor variable the results would be the same as the Pearson correlation results. The answer to the third research question of this study was that there was no relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. In this chapter, the results for the three research questions posed in Chapter 1 were presented.

The first research question was: What is the relationship (if any) between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers? The results showed that there were no relationships between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

The second research question was: What is the relationship (if any) between transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive), and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers? The results for this research question showed that one of the transactional leadership variables, management by exception (active), had a positive relationship to Job Satisfaction scores among Nigerian prisons officers. Thus, Nigerian prison officers who rated their leader as exhibiting a management by exception (active) leadership style tended to have higher levels of job satisfaction.

The third research question was: What is the relationship (if any) between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers? The results

showed that there was no relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and job

satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. In the next chapter, these results are

discussed in the context of past research and recommendations are offered for criminal

justice policy and future research.

CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study set out to examine the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. Specifically, the study investigated the relationship between transformational, transactional, laissez faire leadership styles and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. Using the MLQ factors as developed by Avolio and Bass (1985) and the Single-Item Global Job Satisfaction Measures developed by Wanous et al. (1977), the study established a correlation between employee perception of leadership factors and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The study used regression analysis to determine the level of prediction of leadership style that could be attributed to transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership factors. The findings are as follows.

Summary of Findings and Discussions of Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. In order to establish the relationship between leadership factors and employee job satisfaction, research questions were posed to guide this research in arriving at empirically tested answers. Answers to these research questions formed the basis for the following findings.

The first research question (RQ1) was: What is the relationship (if any) between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration,

78

intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

The summary of the analysis showed that Job Satisfaction scores were not significantly related to Idealized Influence (Attribute) scores, $r = -.09$, $p = .359$, Idealized Influence (Behavior) scores, $r = -.02$, $p = .801$, Inspirational Motivation scores, $r = .00$, $p = .959$, Intellectual Stimulation scores, $r = -.01$, $p = .953$, or Individualized Consideration scores, $r = -.02$, $p = .833$. The results of a linear regression analysis with the five transformational leadership scale as predictors of job satisfaction scores are shown in Table 4. Overall, the regression model was not statistically significant, $R^2 = .01$, $F (5, 190) = .26$, $p = .936$. This indicated that the transformational leadership scales were not predictive of Job Satisfaction scores.

Based on the fact that the Pearson correlation analysis indicated that none of the correlations between the transformational leadership scales and Job Satisfaction scores were not statistically significant, and that the regression model was not statistically significant, the answer to the first research question of this study was that there were no relationships between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. Furthermore, transformational leadership style does not account for most of the variance in determining the perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. It is critical to note that transformational leadership generally influence, arouse, and develop subordinates. However, in this study, the non-correlation of transformational leadership variables with job satisfaction is

surprising. This essentially symbolizes low morale and a psychological detachment of employees to their organization.

The non-correlation between transformational leadership variables and job satisfaction of the Nigerian prison officers indicates poor responses of officers in this category to their leadership actions and styles. Indeed, officers with low job satisfaction only stay in their job because they are compelled to remain. In this regard, employees with low job satisfaction are not prepared to develop their potential and may not contribute to the accomplishment of organizational vision and mission. The finding of this study is not consistent with Bass and Avolio (1999), Bass (1990), Idris and Ali (2008), and Yukl, (1999) studies that linked transformational leadership style to higher organizational performance. Their findings are not relevant to the Nigerian prisons because it is critical to define factors that affect the quality of leadership practices that satisfies organizational performance and job satisfaction. In this context, transactional leadership variable of management-by-exception (active) was found to be the only leadership style that most positively affects quality of work practices which ultimately impact officers' job satisfaction in the Nigerian prisons.

The second research question (RQ2) the present study sought to answer was : What is the relationship (if any) between transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

Table 5 shows the Pearson correlations between the three transactional leadership scales and Job Satisfaction scores. Job Satisfaction scores were not significantly related to Contingent Reward scores, r -.05, p = .582, Management-by-Exception (Active)

scores, $r = .13$, $p = .159$, or Management-by-Exception (Passive) scores, $r = -.10$, $p = .267$.

Table 6 shows the results from the linear regression analysis with the three transactional leadership scales as predictors of Job Satisfaction scores. The regression model as a whole was not statistically significant, Model $R2 = .06$, $F (3, 111) = 2.34$, $p = .077$. However, the Management-by-Exception (Active) scale was statistically significant as a predictor of Job Satisfaction scores, $\beta = .26$, $p = .019$.

Based on the Pearson correlation and linear regression results, the answer to the second research question of this study was that one of the transactional leadership variables, management-by-exception (active), had a positive relationship with Job Satisfaction scores among Nigerian prison officers. Indeed, participants who rated their leader as exhibiting a management-by-exception (active) leadership style tended to have higher levels of job satisfaction.

The positive correlation between management-by-exception (active) leadership style and job satisfaction showed that prison officers are prepared to abide by the constructive criticisms and corrective measures put in place by their leaders in order to retain their jobs. This positive relationship between management-by-exception (active) and job satisfaction is particularly very important in an economy such as Nigeria where according to World Bank Development Indicators, the rate of unemployment is as high as 23.90% and the level of poverty is about 62.6% of the total population (data.worldbank.org). In this instance, an officer losing his or her job under these harsh conditions could create personal crisis for that officer, hence their readiness to abide by whatever corrective measures and constructive criticism put in place by leadership to

81

achieve organizational goal. This finding is not equally consistent with Avolio (1994), Avolio and Bass (2004), and Sosik and Dionne (1997) that the corrective actions of leaders in transactional leadership management-by-exception (active) is not a good practice in supporting organizational effectiveness, performance and ultimately job satisfaction.

The negative correlation between contingent reward and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers showed that these officers do not value reward and exchanges that occur with their leadership. This indicates that officers view reward as temporary or artificial in that it does nothing to assist them perform their jobs more effectively. The negative relationship between contingent reward and job satisfaction collaborated Bass (1985a). As noted by Bycio et al. (1995), the non-correlation occurred because job satisfaction does not translate to potential rewards an employee may expect to accumulate from his or her leader who relies entirely on contingent reward. The findings also supported Berson and Linton (2005), Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990), Yukl (1999) that transactional leadership contingent reward style only reward followers who participate in accomplishing tasks and punish those who do not participate, a technique which results only to short term objectives and does not impact job satisfaction.

The last research question which the present study considered was: What is the relationship (if any) between laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers?

The Pearson correlation between Laissez Faire Leadership scores and Job Satisfaction scores was not statistically significant, $r = .08$, $p = .387$. To this end, no

linear regression analysis was performed because with only one predictor variable, the results would be the same as the Pearson correlation results. Therefore, the answer to the third research question of this study was that there was no relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The negative relationship between laissez faire leadership style and job satisfaction confirms Bass (1990), Sosik, and Dionne (1997, and Vouzas and Gotzamani (2005) that laissez faire leadership style is incompatible with the leadership behaviors which are critical for effective performance and job satisfaction.

Policy Implications of the Findings

The analysis of the findings indicated a positive relationship between management-by-exception (active) leadership variable and job satisfaction. Transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, had negative relationship with job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. With respect to transactional variables, management-by-exception remains the most important factor in influencing Nigerian prison officers as it correlated very strongly and positively with job satisfaction. This indicates that prison officers value constructive criticisms and corrective measures put in place by leadership. The negative correlation between contingent reward and job satisfaction indicated that officers of the Nigerian prisons considered the costs associated with leaving the service or cost of securing another employment more than rewards that can be offered by their leaders.

The study also showed that transformational leadership variables do not augment transactional leadership factors in determining outcome variables of extra effort,

83

leadership effectiveness, and job satisfaction in the Nigerian prisons. This clearly shows that exchanges between leaders and their subordinates are not particularly important in determining employee job satisfaction in the Nigerian prisons hence the non-correlation shown by transformational factor of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation in predicting outcome variables. In this context, only management-by-exception (active) factor aspect of the transactional leadership style has the predicting outcome variables and also the only leadership style that accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among the Nigerian prison officers.

<div align="center">**Recommendations for Future Research**</div>

The already stated facts indicate the significance of leadership factors in enhancing job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. The present study has provided the framework on which future research on the Nigerian prisons could be based. There is no doubt that for Nigerian prisons to attain its developmental goals there is a great need for purposeful leadership and employee job satisfaction. Future research could as well focus on the following areas in order to improve the quality of the present findings.

The need to widen the scope of the present study to cover the entire Nigerian prisons is encouraged. The present study was based on 115 (71.9%) officers of the Nigerian prisons residing in the Eastern part of the country who returned their completed surveys. A larger sample size that would involve larger number of the Nigerian prison officers might yield different results than the present study. Indeed, such study would enable researchers to involve a more diversified number of officers thereby improving the

level of generalization than the present study. In addition, there is also the need to study the perceptions of the Nigerian prisons leadership to understand how they conform to the ratings of their subordinates. It is in this context that this researcher recommends a study of leadership and subordinates perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership styles and their impact on Nigerian prisons effectiveness. This recommendation is particularly critical in two ways. Firstly, it will accord leaders to mirror themselves on performance scales to assess their weakness and strength. Secondly, it will enable leaders to embark on a training and motivation program that would improve both leadership and subordinate performance. It also recommended that an integrated approach in relation to leadership and subordinate job satisfaction be explored to enable a comprehensive policy that will address human resources challenges of the Nigerian prisons.

It is recommended that future research address in detail the issue of employee wellbeing in the Nigerian prisons. The present study dealt with one aspect of leadership; job satisfaction. Other studies could focus on Nigerian prisons environment, policies, officers' intention to quit, and officers' personal attributes as it relates to job satisfaction for future studies. These additional studies could reinforce some of the findings of the present study. Further, the recommended studies could also provide very useful insights into leadership as it relates to employee job satisfaction in the Nigerian prisons setting.

Finally, the need to undertake similar studies in other African countries, especially the Sub-Saharan African countries to compare and contrast the present findings is equally important. This would provide greater insight and views on the linkage between leadership and job satisfaction among prison officers.

Conclusions and recommendations for Policy Implications

From the findings of this study, the need for policy recommendations that will guide the present Nigerian leadership in mobilizing the human resources of the prisons towards accomplishing its agenda is critical. It is important to note that the Nigerian prisons leadership cannot rise above its officers and human resources capabilities. This is essential to the Nigerian prisons which despite the resources abound remains at the bottom of leadership development. It is in recognition of the crucial role of the Nigerian prisons as a platform of implementing public safety programs that the findings of this study could be vital to the strategic roles which leadership could play in promoting Nigerian prisons officers job satisfaction.

There is also the need for training, retraining, and in-service training of prison officers and human resources both at leadership and subordinate levels. For the Nigerian prisons leadership to be responsive to the complex needs of prisons officers and the dynamic environment under which it operates, the need for concerted efforts to develop intrinsic values associated with efficient leadership is crucial. For example, this study has shown that leaders applying management-by-exception (active) characteristics in which subordinates are continually evaluated based on the utility of corrective actions and constructive criticisms put in place by leadership to enable officers perform their assigned tasks are particularly valued in the Nigerian prisons setting.

Therefore, efforts should be made to incorporate management-by-exception (active) leadership values and qualities into the Nigerian prisons leaders in order for them to be more conscious of their actions, attitudes, and behaviors. The values of

accountability, transparency, honesty, and discipline should also be put in place in the Nigerian prisons leadership to further enhance officers' job satisfaction. The high correlation between management-by-exception (active) leadership style and job satisfaction among officers of the Nigerian prisons is an indication that leadership must exhibit and institute performance improving corrective actions and criticisms which will impact officers' job satisfaction.

To promote creativity, innovations, and efficiency in employee job satisfaction, leadership must place high emphasis on high order of needs such as, opportunity for personal growth, training, and retraining. The positive correlation between management-by-exception (active) and job satisfaction indicates that promoting corrective measures and high order of needs would definitely enhance leadership effectiveness. Furthermore, there is need for the Nigerian prisons to design and implement efficient corrective actions that would incorporate fairness and equity.

The result of this study showed that management-by-exception (active) factor was very significant in promoting officers job satisfaction which impacted the outcome variable of the Nigerian prisons leadership effectiveness. The fact that officers value the system of corrective measures and constructive criticism put in place by their leaders indicate that they are satisfied and would abide by that system to keep their jobs. Furthermore, the present system of control in which conditions of service is determined by the government should be replaced by management-by-exception (active) corrective actions, constructive criticism, and immediate intervention which will continually evaluate officers' job performance to enhance productivity and ultimately promotes job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

87

The Nigerian prisons leadership needs to be reoriented to refocus officers towards new developmental goals and directions. The Nigerian prisons have been plagued by massive corruption, inefficient leaders, and a generally inept workforce. In effect, it will need a radical reformation to refocus it toward higher performance and efficiency. Consequently, the right time has come for the emergence of management-by-exception (active) leaders who will radically change the orientation of the Nigerian prisons for result oriented corrective measure performance.

As pointed out by Bass (1985), an active management-by-exception leader continuously evaluates subordinates performance to be able to intervene immediately in the event of errors or problems. In such instance, the standards for evaluation are clearly set from the onset and any deviations are quickly corrected to ensure that employees are on track and set goals are achieved. According to Peters (1991), bold times calls for bold leaders and bold ideas. The present global security challenges in addition to prisons population explosion in Nigeria offer unique opportunities for the Nigerian prisons leadership to change the ways it conducts its business over the years.

In addition, the current democratic dispensation calls for both leaders and the followers to abide by professional dictates and adopt the management-by-exception leadership style which will promote best practice and enhance job satisfaction among prison officers in Nigeria.

Based on the findings of this study, it can therefore be concluded that the transactional leadership variable of management-by-exception (active) accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers. Furthermore, with purposeful leadership as exemplified by management-by-exception

(active), the Nigerian prisons could be made effective and efficient to provide the much needed platform for successful implementation of developmental programs and practices. The Nigerian policy makers and implementers are encouraged on the basis of the findings of this study, to develop strategies that will enhance, reorient, and promote effectiveness of the Nigerian prisons leadership as well as increasing performance and ultimately ensure job satisfaction among Nigerian prison officers.

REFERENCES

Adamolekun, L., & Ayeni, V. (1990). Nigeria. In V. Subramanian (Ed.), *Public Administration in the World* (pp. 48-85). New York: Greenwood Press.

Alabi, T. & Alabi, S. O. (2011). The pains of imprisonment: a sociological analysis of the experiences Inmates in Ilorin and Kirikiri prisons. *Journal of Research in Peace, Gender Development*, 1 (8), 235-241.

Alarcon, R. R. (2005). An investigation of the relationship between officers' ratings of their leaders leadership style and officers' ratings of job satisfaction in a law enforcement environment. Doctoral dissertation, Our Lady of the Lake University, San Antonio, Texas.

Alemika, E. E. (1987). Organizational management and leadership behavior in environmental turbulence. A paper presented at a seminar organized by the Prisons Staff College, Kaduna, Nigeria.

Alemika, E. O. & Alemika, E. I. (2002). Penal policy, prison conditions and prisoners right in Nigeria. *Lawyers Bi Annual* 1(2), 108-121.

Alexander, J. A., Lichtenstein, R., Daunno, T. A., McCormick, R., Mutamatsu, N., & Ullman, E. (1997). Determinants of mental health providers expectations of patients improvement. *Psychiatric Services*, 48(50), 671-677.

Anderson, T. D., Gisborne, K., & Holliday, P. (2006). Every officer is a leader. *Coaching Leadership, Learning, and Performance in Justice, Public safety, and Security*

Operations (2nd ed.). Victoria: Trafford Publishing.

Armentor, J., & Forsyth, C. J. (1995). Determinants of job satisfaction among social

    workers. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 25(20), 51-63.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). *The range of leadership development. Binghamton,*

    NY: Center for Leadership Studies.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Identifying common methods

    variance with data from single source: An unresolved sticky issue. *Journal of*

    Management, 173, 571-587.

Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Total quality and leadership*. In B. M. Bass & B. J. Avolio (Eds.),

    Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership

    (pp. 121-145). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004b). *Multifactor leadership Questionnaire, third edition*

    manual and sampler set. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Bales, R. F. (1950). *Interactive process analysis reading*. Boston: Addison Wesley.

Baltzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C.

    (2000). *Users' manual for the job descriptive index* (JDI: 1997 revision) *and the*

    job in general scales. In J. M. Stanton & C. D. Crossley (Eds.).

Barbuto, J. E. (Jnr) (2005). Motivation and transactional, charismatic, and

    transformational leadership: A test of antecedents*. Journal of Leadership and*

    Organizational Studies, 11(4), 26-40.

Barnett, A. (2003). The impact of transformational leadership style of the school

    principal on school learning environments and selected teacher outcome: A

preliminary report. Paper presented at NZARE AARE, Auckland, New Zealand. Manuscript available from the author.

Barnett, K., McCormick, J., & Conners, R. (2001). Transformational leadership in schools-panacea, placebo or problem? *Journal of educational Administration, 39(10, 24-46.*

Barnett, T., McCormick, J. & Conners, R. (2001). Transformational leadership in schools-panacea, placebo or Problems? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39 (1) 24-46.

Barnes, C., & Sheley, J. (2004). *Stress and job satisfaction in an urban sheriff's department: Contributions of work and family history, community-oriented policing and job assignment*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice Publication.

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

Bass, B. M. (1985b). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13 (Winter), 26-40.

Bass, B. M. (1990a). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13, 26-40.

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

Bass, B. M. (1990b). *Bass & Stogdill handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1995). Transformational leadership redux. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6 (463-

477).

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional/transformational leadership paradigm
transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52,
130-130.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Training and development of transformational
leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. In R. W.
Woodman & W.A. Passmore (Eds.), *research in organizational change and
development* (pp. 125-172). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (form R,
(revised) Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1999). *Training full range leadership: A resource guide for
training with the MLQ* . Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *MLQ sampler set technical report and scoring key
for MLQ form 5X short*. Redwood City, CA: Birmingham University, center for
Leadership studies.

Berson, Y., & Linton, J. (2005). An examination of the relationship between leadership
style, quality, and employee satisfaction in R & D versus administrative
environment. *R and D Management*, 35(1), 51-60.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1969). *Building a dynamic corporation through grid
organization development*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Bono, J. E. & judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional
leadership: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (5) 901-910.

93

Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35(5), 307-311.

Brunetto, Y., & Wharton, R. F. (2003). The commitment and satisfaction of lower-ranked police officers. Policing: *An International Journal of Police Strategies & management*, 26, 43-63.

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

Buzawo, E. S. (1984). Determining officers job satisfaction: The role of selected demographic   and job specific attitudes. *Criminology*, 22, 61-81.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) Conceptualization of transactional and Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 468-478.

Chiok, F. (2001). Leadership behavior: Effects on job satisfaction, productivity, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 9(4), 191-200.

Christen, M., Iyer, G., & Soberman, D. (2006). Job satisfaction, job performance, and effort. A reexamination using agency theory. *Journal of Marketing*, 70, 137-150.

Chukwuemeka, E. M. (2010). Institutional reforms and the development of Nigerian Prison Service 1999-2007. *Journal of African Studies and Development* 2 (5), 114-121.

Collier, P. & Hoeffler, A. (1998), "*On Economic Causes of Wars*", in M. Berdal and D.M.

Collins, J., & Porras, J. (1996). Building Your Company's Vision. *Harvard Business Review,* 74 (5) 65-77.

Collins, J. & Powell, S. (2004). The characteristics of level 5 leadership. *Management Decision*, 42(5), 709-716. doi: 10.1007/s10551-010-0489-y.

Cox, P. L. (2001). Transformational leadership: A success story at Cornell University. Proceedings of the ATEM/aappa 2001 conference. Retrieved February 20, 2013, from http://anu.edu.au/facilities/atem-aapaa/full_papers/Coxkeynotes.html.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Third edition. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publication inc.

DE Charon, L. (2003). A transformational leadership development program: Jungian psychological types in dynamic flux. Organizational Development Journal. Retrieved from ttp://findarticles.com/p/articles/miqa5427/is200310/ain21335881/

Dobby, J., Anscombe, J., & Tuffin, R. (2004). *Police leadership: Expectations and impact*. Retrieved February 19, 2013, From www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/rdsoir2004.

Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in a revolutionary process.* New York: Free press.

Elsenman, R. (1995). Job satisfaction-dissatisfaction prison guards & psychologists. Online *Journal of Psychology,* Vol. 1 No. 1.

Emery, C., & Barker, K. (2007). The effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications,*

*and Conflic*t, 11, 77-90.

Enuku, U. E. (2001). Humanizing the Nigerian prison through literacy education:

echoes from afar. *JCI* 52 (1), 18-23.

Fafunmwa, A. B. (1971). *New perspective in education*. London: Macmillan Education

Limited.

Fiedler, F. D. (1981). *Leader attitudes and group effectiveness*. Westport, CT:

Greenwood Press.

Flanegan, T. J., Johnson, W. W., & Berret, K. (1996). Job satisfaction among correction

executives: *A Contemporary Portrait of Workers of State Prisons of Adults*

Prison Journal, 76(4), 385-397.

Fowler, F. J, Jr. (2002). *Survey research methods. Applied Social Research Methods*

Series, Volume 1 (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: sage Publications, Inc.

Gellis, Z. D. (2001). Social work perceptions of transformational and transactional

leadership in health care. *Social Work research*, 25 (1) 17-25.

Getaham, S., Sims, B., & Hummer, D. (2007). *Job satisfaction and organizational*

commitment among probation and parole officers: A case study. Retrieved May

15, 2013 from http;//www.picj.org/docs/issue5.Vol: 13(1).

Glisson, C., 7 Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational

commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,

33(1), 61-81.

Green, G., & Reese, S. (2006). Job satisfaction among high school athletic

administrators. *Education*, 127 (2), 318-320.

Griffin, N. S. (2003). Personalize your management development. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(3), 113-120. Retrieved from

http://www.thelearningevent.co.za/uploads/3/135.pdf.

Harris, L. M. (1998). Turnover: A comparative analysis of why some police officers voluntarily leave while others stay: Doctoral Dissertation. *University of Alabama. Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 13-30.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Paterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). Job attitudes: review of research and opinion. PA: Psychological Service of Pittsburg.

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

Homrig, M. A. (2001). *Transformational Leadership*. Retrieved 8/913 from

 http://leadership.au.af.mil/documents/homrig.htm.

House, R. J., & Tosi, H. L. (1967). *Management development: Design, evaluation and implementation.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Bureau of Industrial relations.

Hughes, R. L.; Ginnett, R. C.; & Murphy, G.J. (1990). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Huysamen, G.K. (1990). *Introductory statistics and research design for the Behavioral sciences*. Bloemfontein: Van Schaik.

Idris, F., & Ali, K. (2008). The impacts of leaderships styles and best practices on company performance: Empirical evidence from business firms in Malaysia. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 19(1), 165-173.

Ikuteyijo, O. L. & Agunlade, M. O. (2008). Prison Reform and HIV/AIDS in Selected

    Nigerian Prisons. *The Journal of International Social research* 1, 279-289.

Illadi, B. C.; Leon, D.; Kansser, T.; & Ryan, M. (1983). Employee and supervisor's

    ratings of motivation: main effects and discrepancies associated with job

    satisfaction and adjustment in factory setting. *Journal of Applied Social*

    Psychology, Vol 23, 1789-1805.

Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspective in theory and research. *Management Science*,

    28(3), 315-336.

Jamal, M. (1997). Job stress, satisfaction and mental health: An empirical examination of

    self-employed and non-self-employed Canadians. *Journal of Small Business*

    Management, 35(4), 48-57.

Johnson, R. R. (2012). Police officers job satisfaction: A multidimensional analysis.

    Police Quarterly, 15(4), 157. DOI: 10.1177/1098611112442809.

Joseph, M. (1998). The effect of strong religious beliefs on coping with stress. *Stress*

    Medicine, 14(4), 219-224.

Judge, T A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a

    meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 89 (5)

    755-768.

Kadushin, G., & Kullys, R. (1995). Job satisfaction among social work discharge

    planners. *Health and Social Work*, 2093, 174-186.

Kanungo, R.N. (1998). Leadership in organizations: Looking ahead at the 21st century.

    Canadian Psychology, 39 (1), 71-82.

Kinicki, A.J., McKee-Ryan, F.M., Schriesheim, C.A., & Carson, K.P. (2002). Assessing

    the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis.

    Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(1), 14-32.

Koslowsky, M., Caspy, T., & Lazar, M. (1991). Cause and effect explanations of job

    satisfaction and commitment: the case of exchange commitment. *The Journal of*

    Psychology, 125(3), 153-162.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenges* (3rd ed). San Francisco:

    CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenges* (4th ed). San Francisco:

    John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*.

    New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J. (2007). Leading change. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(1), 96-103. Retrieved

    from http://web.ebscohost.com.library.capella.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer.

Kung, W. (2005). *Examination of job satisfaction: A relational culture perspective*

    among women in law enforcement [Thesis]. Alliant International University,

    Fresno, CA.

Lawler, E. E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole

    Publishing Company.

Leedy, P. and Ormrod, J. (2010). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. Upper

    Saddle River,   New Jersey: Pearson.

Levinson, E. M. (1997). Differences in desired role functioning and job satisfaction

    between doctoral and nondoctoral school psychologists. *Psychological Reports*,

99

81(2), 513-514.

Lim, V. K., Teo, S. H., & See, S. K. (2000). Perceived job image among police officers in Singapore: factorial dimensions and differential effects. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(6), 740-750.

Lord, R. G., De Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perception: An application of validity generation procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 402-409.

Lok, P.; & Crawford, J.. (1999). The relationship between commitment and organizational culture, subculture, leadership style and job satisfaction in organizational change and development. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, Vol. 20 (7), 365-373.

Lok, P.; & Crawford, J.. (2001). Antecedent of organizational commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of management Psychology*, Vol. 16 (8), 594-613.

Lund, D. B. (2003). Organizational culture and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 18(2/3), 219-236.

Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 241-270.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (2001). *The new Super leadership: Leading others to lead themselves.:* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Martelli, T. A., Walters, L. K., & Martelli, J. (1989). The police stress survey: Reliability and relation to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Psychological*

Reports, 64, 267-273.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*,

    50(4), 370-396.

Mass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share

    the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18 (3) 19-36.

McIntyre, R. W., Stageberg, P., Repine, S. K., & Mernard, D. R. (1990). *Why police*

    officers resign: A look at the turnover of police officers in Vermont. Montpelier,

    VT: Vermont Criminal Justice Center.

McCubbin, H. I., & Figley, C. R. (Eds.) (1983). *Stress and the family, Volume 1: Coping*

    with Normative Transitions. In the Psychosocial Book Series. New York:

    Brunner/Mazel.

McElroy, J. C. (1982). Attribution Theory: *A Leadership theory for Leaders,*

    Leadership & organization Development Journal, Vol. 3 (4), 27-30.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of

    organizational commitment. *Human Resources Management Review*, 1, 61-89.

Miller, H. A., Mire, S., & Kim, B. (2009). Predictors of job satisfaction among officers:

    Does personality matter? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37, 419-426.

Mire, S. M. (2005). *Correlates of job satisfaction among police officers (Doctoral*

    dissertation, San Houston State University, 2005).

Morrrale, S. A. (2002). *Transformational leadership in law enforcement, employment*

    practices, and principles. AEPP, New York.

Mosadegh Rad, M.A.; & Yarmohammadian, M. H. (2006). A study of relationship

    between managers leadership style and employees job satisfaction. *Leadership in*

Health Services, Vol. l, 19 (2), xi-xxviii.

Moser, K. (1997). Commitment in organizations. *Psychologies*, 41(4), 160-170.

Mullins, L. J. (2005). *Management and Organizational behavior* (7th ed.). New Jersey

 Prentice Hall.

Murphy, S. A. & Drodge, E. N. (2004). The four Fs of police leadership: A case study

 heuristic. *International Journal of Police Science and management*, 6 (1), 1-15.

Nahavandi, A. (2003). *The art and science of leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ:

 Pearson.

Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. 92003). *Foundations, realities and challenges of*

 organizational behavior. Mason, OH: South-Western.

Nigeria/Data: *World Developmental Indicators*. Retrieved October 4, 2013 from

 Data.worldbank.org/country/Nigeria.

Northouse, P. G. (2001). Leadership: *Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

 Sage Publications, Inc.

Nigerian Prison Service (2008). *Protect society: Reform the prisoner*.

 Prisons Headquarters, Abuja, Nigeria.

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

 Sage Publications, Inc.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

 Sage Publications, Inc.

Nwagwu, C. C. (1977). The environment of crisis in the Nigerian education system.

 Journal of Comparative Education, 33(1), 87-95.

Obioha, E. E. (2011). Challenges and reforms in the Nigerian Prison System.

    Journal of Social Science 27 (3), 95-109.

O'Connor, E. J., Peters, L. H., & Gordon, S. M. (1978). The measurement of job

    satisfaction: Current practices and future considerations. *Journal of Management*,

    4(2), 17-26.

Ogunsina, S. O., & Adebayo, S. O. (2011). Influence of supervisory behavior and job

    stress on job satisfaction and turnover intention of police personnel in Ekiti State.

    Journal of Management and Strategy, Vol. 2, No. 3: 1-8.

Ohiwerei, F. O., & Emeti, I. C. (2011). Motivation and job satisfaction in Nigeria public

    service: Problems, issues, and challenges. *Journal of Business and*

    Organizational Development, 3, 22-35.

Olorunsola, E. O. (2010). Job Satisfaction and Gender factor of Administrative Staff in

    South West Nigerian Universities. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*

    3, 51-56.

Omotola, S, J. (2007). From the OMPADEC to the NDDC: An Assessment of State

    Responses to Environmental Insecurity in the Niger Delta, Nigeria.

    Africa Today 54 (1), 73-89.

Onwuka, E. C. (2005). World Bank Development policies and Poverty Alleviation in

    Africa. *International Journal of Social Sciences* 4(1), 265-282.

Onyishi, I. E., Okongwu, O. E., & Ugwu, F. O. (2012). Personality and Social Support as

    Predictors of Life Satisfaction of Nigerian Prison officers. *European Scientific*

    Journal, 8 (20), 1857-7881.

Orakwe, I. W. (2013). *Origin of prisons in Nigeria: Nigerian prisons service*. Retrieved

January 25, 2013 from http://prisons.gov.ng/about/history.php.

Ortmeier, P. J. & Meese III, E. (2010). *Leadership, ethics, and policing: challenges for the 21st century* (2nd ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Oshagbemi, T., & Gill, R. (2004). Differences in leadership styles and behavior across hierarchical levels in UK organizations. *Leadership and Organization Development Journa*l, 25, 93-106.

Owulu, D., Otobo, E., & Otokoni, M. (1977). *The role of civil service in enhancing development and democracy: An evaluation of the Nigeria experience*. Paper presented at the Civil service System in Comparative Perspective. School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University. Retrieved February 19, 2013, from http://www.indiana.edu.esrc/olowu/html.

Oyeka, C. A. & Eze,I. I (2007). Fungal skin infection among prison inmates in Abakaliki, Nigeria. *Journal Compilation, Blackwell Publishing* 51, 50-54.

Ozbaran, Y. (2010). *The relationship between Turkish traffic enforcement officers' job satisfaction and officers' perception of their leaders' leadership styles*. UMI number: 3421480.

Phillips, A. O. (1991). Institutional reforms in Nigeria. *Public Administration and Development,* 11, 229-232.

Peters, T. (1991). Excellence in government: I'm all for it, May be. *The Bureaucrat* (spring): 3-6, p19.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers trust in leaders,

satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, (1),

107-142

Poist, R. F., & Lynagh, P. M. (1976).Job satisfaction and the P. D. manager: An

empirical assessment. *Transportation Journal*, 16(1), 42-51.

Porac, J. F.; Ferris, G. R.; & feder, D. B. (1983). Job satisfaction and performance.

Academy of Management Journal, Vol 26, 285-296.

Portal, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational

Commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 603-609.

Porter, L W. (1962). Job attitudes in management: Perceived deficiencies in need

fulfillment as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46, 375-384.

Portis, B. (1969). Experiments in worker motivations. *Business Quarterly*, 34(2), 53-58.

Riaz, A., & Haider, M. H. (2010). Role of transformational and transactional leadership

on job satisfaction and career satisfaction. *Business Economy Horizon*, 1, 29-38.

Richardson, B. (2011). Poor leadership morale at DPS-East Valley Tribune. Retrieved

February 19, 2013, from

www.eastvalleytribune.com/...article_36d292d8-8d611e0-8823-

001cc4c002e0.html.

Riggio, R. E. (2000). *Introduction to industrial organizational psychology*. New Jersey:

Prentice Hall.001cc4c002e0.html.

Roethlisberger, F., & Dickson, W.. (1973). *Management and the worker*. Chicago:

Harvard University Press.

Robbins, S. P. (2001). *Organizational behavior*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall.

Robbins, S. P. (2005). *Organizational behavior* (11th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice hall.

Ross, M, 2003, "*Nigeria's Oil Sector and the Poor*", paper prepared for the UK Department for International Development "Nigeria: Drivers of Change" Program. DFID.

Saane, N., Sluiter, J., Verbeek, & Frings-Dresen, H. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction: A systematic review. *Occupational Medicine*, 53, 199-200.

Sample Size calculator- Confidence Level: The survey system. Retrieved February 4, 2013 from www.surveysystem.com/sscal.htm.

Schafer, J. A. (2009). Developing effective leadership in policing: Perils, pitfalls, and paths forward policing. *An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 32(2), 238-260.

Sekaran, U. (2000). *Research methods for business: A skill building-approach* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Sekwat, A. (2001). Civil service reform in post-independence Nigeria: issues and challenges. *Public Administration Quarterly* Retrieved February 19, 2013, from http://www.highbeam.com/DocPrint.aspx?Doc1d=1P3:298490801.

Sieber, J. (1998). *Planning Ethical Responsible research*. Thousand Oaks. CA; Sage.

Singer, M.S., & Singer, A.E. (1990). Situational constraints on transactional versus transformational leadership behavior, subordinates' leadership preference, and satisfaction. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 130, 385–396.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. C. (1969). *The Measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement.* Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Sosik, J. J., & Dionne, S. D. (1997). Leadership styles and Deming's behavior factors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 11(4), 447-462.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership*. New York: The Free press.

Stone, N. (1995). Changing Leadership. *Harvard Business Review*; Vol. 73 Issue 2 (16).

Timmreck, T. C. (2001). Managing motivation and developing job satisfaction in the health care environment. *The Health Care Manager*, 20(1), 42-59.

Ukiwo, U. (2005). The study of ethnicity in Nigeria. *Oxford Development Studies*, 33(1).

Violanti, J. M., & Aaron, F. (1993). Source of police stress, job attitudes, and psychological distress. *Psychological Reports*, 72, 899-904.

Voon, M.L.; Lo, M.C.; Ngui, K.S.; Ayob, N.B. (2011). The influence of leadership styles on employees job satisfaction in public sector organization in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business Management and Social Sciences,* Vol. 2(1), 24-32.

Vroom, V. H. (1974). *Work and Motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision making*. PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Wanous, J.P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1977). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 247-252.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota

Industrial relations Center.

Weiss, M. J. (2003). Great expectations. *American Demographics*, 25(4), 26-36.

Weiss, H. M. (2002).Deconstructing job satisfaction: separating evaluations, beliefs, and
    affective experiences. *Human Resources Management Review*, 12, 173-194.

Whiteacre, K. W. (2006). Measuring job satisfaction and stress at a community
    corrections center: An evidence-based study. *Corrections Today*, 70-73.

William, L. J.; & Hazer, J. T. (1986). Antecedent and consequence of job satisfaction and
    commitment in turnover models; A reanalysis using latent variable structural
    equation models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71, 219-231.

Wiratmadja, I. I., Govindaraju, R., & Rahyuda, A. G. (2008). *The influence of
    transformational leadership style and compensation system on the performance of
    university lectures*: A case at a State University of Indonesia, proceeding of the
    9th Asia Pacific Industrial Engineering and management System Conference,
    Indonesia.

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluative essay on current conceptions of effective leadership.
    European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8(1), 25-32.

Yim, Y., & Schafer, B. D. (2009). Police and their perceived image: How community
    influence officers job satisfaction. *Police Practice & Research*, 10(1), 17-29.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizational* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ:
    Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Zhao, J. S., Thurman, Q. C., & He, N. (1999). Source of job satisfaction among police
    officers: A test of demographic and work environment models. *Justice Quarterly*,

16, 153-173.

Zigarmi, D., Blanchard, K., O'Connor, M., & Edeburn, C. (2005). *The leader within: learning enough about yourself to lead others.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

APPENDIX . STATEMENT OF ORIGINAL WORK

Statement of Original Work and Signature

I have read, understood, and abided by Capella University's Academic Honesty Policy (3.01.01) and Research Misconduct Policy (3.03.06), including the Policy Statements, Rationale, and Definitions.

I attest that this dissertation or capstone project is my own work. Where I have used the ideas or words of others, I have paraphrased, summarized, or used direct quotes following the guidelines set forth in the APA *Publication Manual*.

Learner ID and e-mail	Richard OK Nwankwoala
Mentor name and school	Kevin Beaver, PhD: School of Public Safety Leadership
Learner signature and date	Richard OK Nwankwoala, January 2014