ABSTRACT
This study investigated the effect of transformational leadership style on employees’ job satisfaction. It utilized the employees of Bosso and Minna Area Offices of Abuja Electricity Distribution Company Plc, as its target population. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) were administered to obtain primary data from the respondents. The sample size was determined using the Taro Yamene’s formula. 137 copies of the questionnaire were randomly distributed, out of which 112 were correctly filled and returned, showing 81.75% response rate. The data were analyzed by means of correlation and regression analyses using the SPSS version 20. The findings revealed that transformational leadership style has significant effect on employee job satisfaction and that, of the four dimensions of transformational leadership tested, only idealized influence has significant effect on employee job satisfaction
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INTRODUCTION

The human resource constitutes the most paramount asset of an organization. The human resource plays a major role in the progress of an organization and the society as a whole. Every other resource of an organization, finance inclusive, is also important but the proper management of these resources is dependent on the organization’s human resource.

The attainment of organizational goals and objectives can only be made possible by a satisfied workforce. The more satisfaction employees get from their jobs, the more efforts they are willing to exert toward the attainment of the organization’s goals and objectives. On the other hand, employee dissatisfaction tend to precipitate negative behaviours such as absenteeism, lateness to work, work to rule, insubordination, indiscipline, withdrawal behaviours, which would ultimately result in growing costs, lower profits and finally, customer dissatisfaction.

Although a number of factors such as wages, accomplishment, independence, acknowledgment, communication, working job conditions, co-workers, job security and team environment have been implicated in the prospects for employee satisfaction, the concept of leadership is believed to be a key force (Ogbeide, 2012). In today’s complex and dynamic business environment, leadership is a highly valued commodity because the effectiveness of a leader determines greatly the success or failure of the organization.

Leadership can be defined as a social process in which the superior seeks the participation of subordinates for attainment of organizational goals and objectives (Omolayo, 2000). The type of leadership style practiced in an organization affects, to a great extent, the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of employees. Leadership styles refer to the ways leaders behave towards the individuals they are achieving set objectives (Ehrhart, 2004). Leadership styles can vary from the classical autocratic approach to the very creative and participative approach (Mosadeghrad and Yarmohammadian, 2006). Leadership styles mostly studied include charismatic, participative, situational, transactional and transformational leadership (Mosadeghrad, 2003).

Transformational leadership is a modern approach to leadership that has captured the interest of many researchers in the field of organizational behavior over the past three decades. The theory driving the approach was developed by Burns (1978) and later modified by Bass (1985). The major idea of the transformational leadership theory is the leader’s ability to lead the followers to positive change and by extension, the organization (Akanwa, Nwebo and Ndu, 2009).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Leadership plays a very important role in determining employee job satisfaction. It extensively influences employees’ motivation and dedication. According to Mosadeghrad and Yarmohammadian (2006), employees’ job satisfaction refers to the attitude of employees toward their jobs and the employing organization. More satisfied and happy employees tend to be more productive; and more profitable for their employing organization (Saari and Judge, 2004).

The performance of satisfied employees may be linked to organizational goals. Leadership influence on employee job satisfaction, leading to improved work performance, is also well documented (Ogbeide, 2012; Anyaegbunam and Ogbeide, 2016; Ogbeide, 2017). Indeed numerous studies evidence the relationship between leadership, particularly transformational leadership and employee job satisfaction (Ayman, Nada & Yehia, 2014; Akinlolu & Zubair, 2015; Bushra, Usman & Naveed, 2011; Omar & Hussin, 2013; Alisa, Dzevad, Zijada & Jasmin, 2014). However, there is a dearth of research works emphasizing the impact of transformational leadership components on employee job satisfaction; especially in Nigerian work contexts.

This study thus sought to investigate possible effects of the transformational leadership style on prospects of job satisfaction (which has a strong nexus with performance) among employees in the Nigerian Power
Sector, with particular reference to the Abuja Electricity Distribution Company Plc., Bosso and Minna Area Offices.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
The general objective of the study is to investigate the effect of transformational leadership on employee job satisfaction in the Nigerian Power Sector. Other specific objectives include:

i. To examine the effect of intellectual stimulation on employees’ job satisfaction.
ii. To investigate the effect of individualized consideration on employees’ job satisfaction.
iii. To determine the effect of inspirational motivation on employees’ job satisfaction.
iv. To identify effect of idealized influence on employees’ job satisfaction.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS
This study aims at providing answers to the following research questions:

i. Does transformational leadership style influence employees’ job satisfaction?
ii. Does intellectual stimulation influence employees’ job satisfaction?
iii. Does individualized consideration influence employees’ job satisfaction?
iv. Does inspirational motivation influence employees’ job satisfaction?
v. Does idealized influence employees’ job satisfaction?

HYPOTHESES

H₀ₐ: Transformational leadership style has no significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.
H₁ₐ: Transformational leadership style has significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.
H₀ᵢ: Intellectual stimulation has no significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.
H₁ᵢ: Intellectual stimulation has significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.
H₀ᵢₑ: Individualized consideration has no significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.
H₁ᵢₑ: Individualized consideration has significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.
H₀ᵢᵣ: Inspirational motivation has no significant effect on employee’s job satisfaction.
H₁ᵢᵣ: Inspirational motivation has significant effect on employee’s job satisfaction.
H₀ᵢₑᵢ: Idealized influence has no significant effect on employee’s job satisfaction.
H₁ᵢₑᵢ: Idealized influence has significant effect on employee’s job satisfaction.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY
It is a well-acknowledged industrial truism that the human resource is a very critical organizational asset as it significantly impacts the prospects of the firm’s health and effectiveness. Human Resource Managers and sundry significant workplace authorities thus often seek means of stimulating and sustaining the satisfaction of their employees. Many empirical studies concerning the effect of leadership styles on employee job satisfaction have actually been conducted in different overseas cultures and in such sectors as the banking sector (Awamleh & Al-Dmour, 2004; Belias & Koustelios, 2014) and the health sector (Kuzey, 2012; Lorber & Savic, 2012; Peltier & Dahly, 2009), but only scanty studies have attempted to investigate the effect of transformational leadership dimensions on employee satisfaction in the Nigerian Power Sector (Power Holding Corporation of Nigeria, PHCN); a National outfit that has persistently remained epileptic in its performance in spite of increasing humongous annual budgetary allocations by successive governments.

It is therefore expected that this study would be of immense utility to relevant authorities in Government, in availing plausible solutions to the challenges that have relentlessly hobbled the Nigerian Power Sector. Also, it is believed that it will not just contribute to advancing the epistemic frontiers, but will help bridge the identified research gap by broadening the depth and scope of the literatures in this domain of study.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
Several limitations exist in this study as is common and expected in empirical studies. First, the sample size of 137 may not be substantial for this kind of research work. The region where this research work was carried out could be another limitation as what may be satisfying to someone from the North may not be satisfying to someone from the South. Also, as for work related outcomes, only employees’ job satisfaction was considered; and this is believed to constitute a strong source of limitation. Other outcomes such as employees’ commitment, performance or organization’s performance were not taken into consideration. There is also the limitation of common method variance which is a problem of cross-sectional studies.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Fig. 2.1 Proposed Conceptual Framework

Source: Researchers Desk (2018)

The model attempts to depict the effect of transformational leadership style, and its dimensions (intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence) on employee job satisfaction. This study asserts that the overall effect exerted by the transformational leadership represents an aggregation of the respective impacts of its dimensions of intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence.

THEORETICAL REVIEW: THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

Various theories of leadership exist. The most prominent theories include The Great Man’s Theory, Traits Theory, Behavioural Theories, Contingency Theories, Transactional Leadership Theory and Transformational Leadership Theory. Although these theories have been mentioned, and they actually possess varying degrees of capacities at explaining the leadership phenomenon, the present study is anchored on the theory of transformational leadership.

Transformational Leadership Theory
The thrust of transformational theory is that leaders transform their followers through their inspirational nature and charismatic personalities. Rules and regulations are flexible, which are guided by group norms. These attributes provide a sense of belonging for the followers as they can easily identify with the leadership and its purpose.

The four major components of the theory are: Individualized Consideration (IC), representing the degree to which the leader attends to each follower’s concerns and needs and acts as a mentor or coach; Intellectual Stimulation (IS); indicating the degree to which the leader challenges assumptions, takes risks, and solicits followers’ endeavours to be innovative and creative; Inspirational Motivation (IM), validating the degree to which the leader articulates inspiring vision to followers; as well as Idealized Influence (II), underscoring
the degree to which the leader provides a role model for high ethical behaviour, instills pride, and gains respect and trust.

THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION
Job satisfaction theories have a strong overlap with theories explaining human motivation. The most common and prominent theories in this area include: Maslow’s Needs Hierarchy theory; Herzberg’s Motivator – Hygiene theory; and the Job Characteristics Models, among others.

Hierarchy of Needs Theory
Although commonly known in the human motivation literature, Maslow’s needs hierarchy theory was one of the first theories to examine the important contributors to job satisfaction. The theory suggests that human needs form a five-level hierarchy consisting of: physiological needs, safety, belongingness/love, esteem, and self-actualization. Maslow’s needs hierarchy was developed to explain human motivation in general. However, its main tenets are applicable to the work setting, and have been used to explain job satisfaction.

Financial compensation and healthcare are some of the benefits which help an employee meet his basic physiological needs. Safety needs manifest through employee feelings of job security, physical safety, and enabling company policies. When this is satisfied, the employee tends to perceive some sense of belongingness.

Motivator-Hygiene Theory
Herzberg’s motivator-hygiene theory suggests that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not two opposite ends of the same continuum, but instead are two separate and, at times, even unrelated concepts. ‘Motivating’ factors like pay and benefits, recognition and achievement need to be met in order for an employee to be satisfied with work. On the other hand, ‘hygiene’ factors (such as, working conditions, company policies and structure, job security, interaction with colleagues and quality of management) are associated with job dissatisfaction. This theory postulates that when hygiene factors are low, the employees are dissatisfied, but when these factors are high the employees are not dissatisfied (or neutral). Moreover, it is thought that when motivators are met, the employee tends to be satisfied.

Job Characteristics Model
The Job Characteristics Model (JCM) explains that job satisfaction occurs when the work environment encourages intrinsically motivating characteristics. Five key job characteristics: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback, influence three psychological states. Subsequently, the three psychological states then lead to a number of potential outcomes including job satisfaction. Therefore, from an organization’s point of view, it is thought that by improving the five core job dimensions, this will lead to a better work environment and increased job satisfaction.

EMPIRICAL REVIEW
Ayman et al. (2014) examined the relationship between transformational leadership style and job satisfaction of employees working in one of the biggest multinational FMCGs in the Egyptian context; and the findings showed that transformational leadership positively effects employees’ job satisfaction.

Akinlolu and Zubair (2015) conducted a study to investigate the effect of transformational leadership components (charisma, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation) on employee satisfaction in hotel industry in Malaysia. The study outcome showed that all the transformational leadership components were positively and significantly related to job satisfaction among workers in the hotel industry in Malaysia.

Bushra et al. (2011) investigated the relationship between transformational leadership, job satisfaction and organizational commitment among employees working in the banking sector in Lahore (Pakistan). A total of 200 copies of the study questionnaire were administered, out of which 133 were returned and correctly
filled. The study findings revealed that transformational leadership positively affected job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees.

Alisa et al. (2014) examined whether transformational leadership, in comparison with other contemporary leadership styles, contributed to higher employee satisfaction levels among 399 respondents in companies in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Germany (to identify the dominant leadership style in each of the two countries). Using a nonparametric Mann Whitney U test, the result indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in employee satisfaction under transformational leadership as opposed to the transactional and charismatic leadership styles.

METHODOLOGY
Research Design
The study was a survey design which investigated the effect of transformational leadership style on employees’ job satisfaction by means of a descriptive and analytical methodology. Quantitative design was adopted.

Area of Study
This study covered employees in the power sector of the Nigerian economy. It was conducted specifically in the Bosso and Minna Area Offices of the Abuja Electricity Distribution Company. The Bosso Area Office comprised of eight (8) Service Areas: Maikunkele Service Area, Bosso Service Area, Kpakungu Service Area, Barikin Sale Service Area, Dutsen Kura Service Area, Katereg Service Area, GRA Service Area and Wushishi Service Area. The Minna Area Office was made up of thirteen (13) Service Areas which included: Tunga Service Area, Urban Service Area, Metunbi Service Area, Cha-Chaga Service Area, GRA Service Area, Sokakawuta Service Area, Kuta Service Area, Gwada Service Area, Kafinkoro Service Area, Top Medical Service Area, Saki Power Service Area, Paiko Service Area and Shango Service Area. The Area Offices were headed by Area Managers and other departments, by Team Leaders.

Population of Study
The population of this study comprised the total employee population of the Bosso and Minna Area Offices of the Abuja Electricity Distribution Company Plc. The population comprised a total of 208 employees; 89 from Bosso Area Office and 119 from Minna Area Office. The employees in Bosso Area Office are distributed among five (5) departments in the following order: Administration department – 2, Distribution department – 40, Commercial Services department (Marketing) – 35, Billing Operations department (Computer Unit) – 3, Finance and Accounts department – 9. The employees in the Minna Area Office are distributed in the following five (5) departments: Technical Services department – 50, Human Resource department – 2, Finance and Accounts department – 11, Commercial Services department – 54, Computer Centre Unit (CCU) – 2.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique
The sample size for this study was determined using the Taro Yamane’s formula. Thus;

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \]

Where \( N = 208; \ e = 0.05 \) or 5% 

\[ n = \frac{208}{1 + 208(0.05)^2} \]

\[ n = \frac{208}{1 + 0.52} \]

\[ n = \frac{208}{1.52} \]

\[ n = 137 \]

The sample distribution for the two Area Offices was determined using the Bowler’s Method:

Bosso Area Office: \( 89 \times 137 = 59 \)
Simple random sampling technique was thereafter used to distribute copies of the questionnaires.

**Instruments**
The instruments used in collecting data for this study are the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), developed by Avolio and Bass, and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), developed by the University of Minnesota’s Vocational Psychology Research program.

**Validity of Instruments**
The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire are well established instruments for respectively measuring the leadership and satisfaction constructs; and have been extensively used in numerous settings in Nigeria.

**Method of Data Analysis**
The data was analyzed by means of correlation and regression analysis, using the SPSS version 20. The transformational leadership style and employees’ job satisfaction variables were correlated while the dimensions of transformational leadership – idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration – were regressed against employees’ job satisfaction.

**HYPOTHESES TESTING**

Hypothesis 1

H_{0a}: Transformational leadership style has no significant effect on job satisfaction.

H_{1a}: Transformational leadership style has significant effect on job satisfaction.

**Table 1: Correlation between Transformational Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trans. Leadership</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Model summary, Regression of Transformational Leadership on Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>5.368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Transformational leadership
Table 3: Table for the Regression of Transformational Leadership on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>113.334</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113.334</td>
<td>3.933</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3169.942</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3283.277</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: Dependent variable: Satisfaction; b: Predictors: (Constant), Transformational leadership

Table 4: Coefficients\(^a\) Table, Regression of Transformational Leadership on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>80.789</td>
<td>-.498</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>5.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>-.989</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>-1.983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent variable: Satisfaction

From the correlation table above, transformational leadership has a very low, indeed, negative relationship \((r = -.186)\) with satisfaction. However, the regression showed a significant relationship between transformational leadership and satisfaction, \(f(1,110) = 3.933, P = 0.050\). In the ANOVA table, the adjusted R Square showed that 2.6% of the variance in satisfaction can be explained by transformational leadership. From the findings above, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. That is, transformational leadership style has significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2

\(H_{0b}\): Intellectual stimulation has no significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.

\(H_{1b}\): Intellectual stimulation has significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.

Table 5: Model Summary, Regression of Intellectual Stimulation on Employee Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.067 (^a)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>5.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Intellectual Stimulation

Table 6: Table for the Regression of Intellectual Stimulation on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>14.641</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.641</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.484 (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3268.636</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29.715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3283.277</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: Dependent variable: Satisfaction; b: Predictors: (Constant), Intellectual Stimulation
Table 7: Coefficientsa Table, Regression of Intellectual Stimulation on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>53.152</td>
<td>5.342</td>
<td>9.950</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.397</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent variable satisfaction

The tables above showed no significant relationship between intellectual stimulation and satisfaction, f (1,110) = 0.493, P = 0.484. P is greater than 0.05 (P> 0.05). From the findings above, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. That is, intellectual stimulation has no significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3

H0c: Individualized consideration has no significant effect on employee’s job satisfaction.

H1c: Individualized consideration has significant effect on employee’s job satisfaction.

Table 8: Model Summary, Regression of Individualized Consideration on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.134a</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>5.414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Individualized consideration

Table 9: Table for the Regression of Individualized Consideration on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>58.784</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.784</td>
<td>2.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3224.493</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29.314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3283.277</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: Dependent variable: Satisfaction
b: Predictors: (Constant), Individualized consideration.

Table 10: Coefficientsa Table, Regression of Individualized Consideration on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>40.845</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>6.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.077</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent variable: Satisfaction

The tables above showed no significant relationship between Individualized consideration and satisfaction, f (1,110) = 2.005, P = 0.160. P is greater than 0.05 (P> 0.05). From the findings above, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. That is, Individualized consideration has no significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.

H0d: Inspirational motivation has no significant effect on employee’s job satisfaction.

H1d: Inspirational motivation has significant effect on employee’s job satisfaction.
Table 11: Model Summary, Regression of Inspirational Motivation on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.180a</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>5.374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Inspirational motivation.

Table 12: ANOVA*a Table, Regression of Inspirational Motivation on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>106.538</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106.538</td>
<td>3.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3176.739</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28.879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3283.277</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: Dependent variable: Satisfaction
b: Predictors: (Constant), Inspirational motivation

Table 13: Coefficients° Table, Regression of Inspirational Motivation on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>63.324</td>
<td>7.257</td>
<td>-.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>-1.417</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent variable: Satisfaction

The tables above showed no significant relationship between inspirational motivation and satisfaction, f (1,110) = 3.689, P = 0.057. P is greater than 0.05 (P> 0.05). From the findings above, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. That is, inspirational motivation has no significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4
H0e: Idealized Influence has no significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.
H1e: Idealized Influence has significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction.

Table 14: Model Summary of the Regression of Idealized Influence on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.208a</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>5.344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Idealized Influence

Table 15: ANOVA*b Table for the Regression of Idealized Influence on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>141.856</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141.856</td>
<td>4.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3141.421</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28.558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3283.277</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: Dependent variable: Satisfaction
b: Predictors: (Constant), Idealized influence
Table 16: Coefficients Table for the Regression of Idealized Influence on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>56.695</td>
<td>3.303</td>
<td>-.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>-.807</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent variable: Satisfaction

The tables above showed a significant relationship between idealized influence and satisfaction, \( f (1,110) = 4.967, P = 0.028, P<0.050 \). In the ANOVA table, the adjusted R Square showed that 3.5% of the variance in satisfaction can be explained by idealized influence. The equation can be written as: \( y = 56.695 - 0.807x \).

From the findings above, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. That is, idealized influence has significant effect on employees' job satisfaction.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

Discussion

The findings revealed a negative and low correlation between transformational leadership and satisfaction (\( r = -.186 \)). It also showed significant effects of transformational leadership and idealized influence on satisfaction (\( f (1,110) = 3.933, P= 0.050 \) and \( f (1,110) = 4.967, P = 0.028 \) respectively). However, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration and inspirational motivation, all had no significant effect on satisfaction \( f (1,110) = 0.493, P = 0.484; f (1,110) = 2.005, P = 0.160; \) and \( f (1,110) = 3.689, P = 0.057 \) respectively). In the case of transformational leadership and idealized influence on satisfaction, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. For the impacts of intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration and inspirational motivation on satisfaction, we accept the null hypothesis.

Conclusion

The findings of this study are consistent with those of Ayman et al. (2004) and Bushra et al. (2011) that revealed that transformational leadership has significant effect on employees' job satisfaction. Meanwhile, for the dimensions of transformational leadership – intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation and idealized influence, they do not follow the findings of past studies. The reason for these differences in findings may be due to the differences in the cultures of the people in the regions these studies were conducted. As what may be seen as normal and expected in some regions, may be rejected in some other regions. Also, differences in individual preferences may be another reason for the differences in findings. What may be seen as satisfaction to an individual may not be a source of satisfaction to another individual. The sample size may have been another reason for these differences as a different result could have been gotten from a larger sample size.

Recommendations

From the findings of this study, it is recommended that the management capitalize on its strength in idealized influence and improve on its weakness in intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration and inspirational motivation. That is they should challenge assumptions, take risks, solicit followers’ ideas, attend to each follower’s concerns and needs, act as mentors, and articulate visions that are appealing and inspiring to the followers. They should also seek to improve on other conditions that affect employees’ job satisfaction like working conditions, security, and employees’ co-relation, among others.

Suggestions for Further Studies

In as much as only idealized influence out of the four dimensions tested proved to have a significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction, the aggregate of the transformational leadership variable also proved to have
significant effect on employees' job satisfaction. This could have been as a result of the effects of the other three (3) dimensions not tested in this study – contingent rewards, management by exception and laissez-faire. It is suggested that future researchers consider these three dimensions when conducting another research. It is also suggested that they consider other variables apart from transformational leadership that effect employees' job satisfaction. They can also make use of a larger sample size and research on employees in a different region.
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