



Leadership Management

Elixir Leadership Mgmt. 73 (2014) 26513-26519

Elixir
ISSN: 2229-712X

Need for autonomy as moderator of relationship between leadership behaviors of principals and their faculty outcomes: a path-goal approach

Riffat-un-NisaAwan

University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 16 May 2013;

Received in revised form:

18 August 2014;

Accepted: 26 August 2014;

Keywords

Directive Leadership.

Participative Leadership,

Job Satisfaction,

Job Expectancies,

Acceptance of leader.

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to test the path-goal theory of leadership in an educational setting. It investigated the relationship among directive and participative leadership behavior of degree college principals, and faculty job satisfaction, acceptance of leader and job expectancies, moderated by teachers' need for autonomy. The questionnaire comprised of a combination of instruments measuring directive and participative leadership styles, need for autonomy and all three subordinate outcomes along with two scales for measuring role ambiguity and stress of the principals for controlling their affects. MANCOVA was used to know the moderating affect of need for autonomy on the relationship of leadership style and subordinates' outcomes controlling the effect of role ambiguity and stress of the principals. Findings indicated that the need for autonomy differentially affected subordinate outcomes relationships with directive and participative leader behaviors. Two out of six hypotheses were according to the predictions of theory. All the results of the study were discussed in relation to the path-goal theory.

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

Leadership is a process that can take place with the response of followers, and the follower response depends upon the leader's provision of an answer to a situational need (Jones, 2001). Path-Goal theory (House, 1971; House & Dessler, 1974) refers to followers' need for a sense of purpose toward the collective goal and focuses on the leader-follower relationship. It examines how a leader motivates a follower in order to accomplish a goal (Northouse, 2004).

Path-goal leadership theory (Evans, 1970; House, 1971) has existed for over four decades, and "it is currently one of the major approaches to leadership that is covered by virtually all basic textbooks on management and organizational behavior". (Schriesheim et al., 2006, p. 21) Path-goal leadership theory, suggest that circumstances have a significant impact on what the leader does and how effective the leader is in any given situation (House, 1971).

House (1996) advanced the theory's central or meta proposition as being that "leaders, to be effective, engage in behaviors that compliment subordinates' environments and abilities in a manner that compensates for deficiencies and is instrumental to subordinate satisfaction and individual and work unit performance" (House, 1996, p. 323). According to path-goal theory, as followers pursue goals it is the leader's responsibility to remove obstacles that would prevent the follower from attaining the goals (House, 1996). When the leader cannot remove obstacles, it is the leaders' responsibility to guide the followers on a path around the obstacles or to introduce skills and knowledge so the followers can overcome the obstacles. The leader must find a way to motivate and connect with followers to help them complete a task (Sudbrack and Trombley, 2007). Path-goal theory is predicated on the assumption that leaders will motivate subordinates if they satisfy subordinates' needs on condition of good performance, and if

they provide support for subordinates to perform effectively in the organization. (Richmon and Allison, 2003)

In House's (1971) initial formulation of Path-Goal Theory, he attempted to reconcile the inconsistent findings from research on the effects of leader Consideration and Initiating Structure. In the revision of the theory made by House and Dessler (1974), leader behavior was described in terms of three categories: Supportive Leadership (similar to Consideration), Instrumental Leadership (similar to Initiating Structure), and Participative Leadership. The next revision of the theory includes four categories of leader behavior (House & Mitchell, 1974) i.e. directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership behaviors. Path-goal theory is dependent on the leader's ability to use directive-path, goal-clarifying, (Ayman, 2004) supportive, participative, achievement-orientated tasks, and relationship-related behaviors (House, 1971; House, 1996). Path-goal theory holds that depending on subordinate characteristics, each of the four types of leader behavior will be used by an effective leader in different situations. This study involves directive and participative leadership behaviors to test the moderating effects of need for autonomy on the relationship of leadership and their subordinate outcomes.

Directive leader tends to let subordinates know what is expected of them. The leader gives structure to the work situation by establishing specific expectations for the subordinates, such as what, how, and when a task should be performed. He gives specific guidance, asks subordinates to follow rules and procedures, maintains performance standards, schedule and coordinate the work (same as Instrumental Leadership). Directive leadership is telling employees exactly what they should do and how they should do it by preparing detailed work assignments and schedules and by defining specific standard of performance (same as initiating structure). Melcher, (1999) says that directive leader behavior is directed at

Tele:

E-mail addresses: riffarukh@gmail.com

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved

clarifying expectations, assigning specific tasks, and specifying procedures to be followed.

Participative leader consults with subordinates about work related matters and uses their suggestions, opinions and ideas before reaching a decision. House (1996) stated that participative leader behavior is behavior directed toward encouragement of subordinate influence on decision making which means consulting with subordinates and taking their opinions and suggestions into account when making decisions. Participative leaders typically encourage their people to play an active role in assuming control of their work.

Wehrich and Koontz (1993) assert that the technique that has been given strong support as a result of motivation theory and research is the increased awareness and use of participation. People are always more motivated by being consulted on action affecting them. In addition, most people in the center of an activity have knowledge both of problems and of solutions. As a consequence, the right kind of participation yields motivation and gives people a sense of accomplishment. According to Yukl (1971) preference levels for Decision-Centralization, i.e., the subordinate's desire for participation in decision-making may be partially determined by their need for independence/autonomy. When subordinates identify with a decision, they become motivated to help make the decision successful. Yukl also asserts that most studies of the relation between leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with the leader have not measured subordinate preferences or the personality variables which determine these preferences.

Need for Autonomy

Path-goal theory provides for the addition of an array of personality and situational variables in determining appropriate leadership strategies (Richmon and Allison, 2003). Need for autonomy is one of the personal characteristics or personality variables which are considered as moderators of leadership and subordinate outcomes (House, 1970). Oh, Kim, and Lee, (1991) assert that for providing direction and stimulating motivation, leaders must attend not only to the needs of the organization but also to individuals' needs as well. Human needs are not universal; different people have different needs and the same person has different needs at different times. To discover someone's needs, a leader must improve his abilities to perceive those needs and to facilitate the means by which the individual can fulfill both his own and the organizational needs simultaneously (Oh, Kim, and Lee, 1991). Need for autonomy also called need for independence/self control is one of many pressing personal needs of human being.

The subordinates who want to be independent and prefer self control have high need for autonomy. Often the professionals and competent person in their respective field do not want to be directed by others. According to Kerr, (1973) need for autonomy refers to "respondent satisfaction with opportunities for independent thought, for deciding on appropriate course of action." The people with high need for autonomy do not feel satisfied under close supervision and their performance is always low when strictly directed. The variable, need for autonomy has received little research attention. Hypotheses, however, have been generated. The theory hypothesize that the subordinates with high need for autonomy and self control will prefer participative leader behavior and will be less satisfied under the supervision of directive leader. In the situation where subordinates have a high need for autonomy and achievement, participation in decision making tend to increase the intrinsic valence of the work for these subordinates, resulting in greater effort and higher satisfaction. These hypotheses are

the focus of this study with the purpose of fulfilling the gap in theory testing efforts.

Outcome variables

Job satisfaction can be referred to as the feelings a worker has about his job and can be distinguished as the five dimensions of work, supervision, pay, promotions, and co-workers (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969; Smith, et al., 1987; Stanton, et al., 2001). Job satisfaction is a function of the difference between a person's preferences and his actual experience. The less the discrepancy between preferences and experience, the greater the satisfaction (Yukl, 1989). For decades, hundreds of studies have examined the effects of leader behavior on subordinate satisfaction and have reported consistently that subordinate satisfaction is significantly influenced by initiating structure and consideration of leader behavior, though the relationship may be contingent on many situational factors such as subordinate characteristics, task structure, and time pressures of work (House and Dessler, 1974; Kerr et al., 1974; House et al., 1971; Bass, 1981).

The empirical field studies which path-goal theory has stimulated over the years, have dealt with propositions about the effects of the moderators of leader structuring and consideration. Some have investigated organizational variables (Awan, et al., 2011; Dessler, 1973) while others have focused on personal characteristics of employees as moderators of leadership styles and outcomes (Awan, and Zaidi, 2009; Keller, 1989). Some studies have tested the theory predictions concerning the moderation of leader participativeness. While many studies have produced evidence concerning the effects of leader behavior on satisfaction, (Awan, Zaidi & Bigger, 2008; Oh, Kim, & Lee, 1991; Romeo, 1992; Szilagy, & Sims 1975) relatively few have addressed subordinate motivation or performance (Moss & Ritossa, 2007). Considering all the evidence, it appears that the path-goal theory scores well in predicting the situational factors that interact with leadership to determine satisfaction.

Job Expectancies: Expectancy I is defined as an employee's psychological state where the employee expects that effort expended will lead to effective performance. Expectancy II is defined as an employee's psychological state where the employee expects that effective performance will lead to rewards. In other words, Expectancy II refers to "the degree to which high quality, quantity, and timely performance lead to extrinsic rewards such as increased pay, promotion, recognition, or security" (House and Dessler, 1974).

Researchers have only minimally examined the impact that different leader behaviors have on expectancy I and II, and in the past they have not examined the moderating effects of expectancies I or II on job satisfaction at all. Recently, researchers have begun to emphasize the need for the examination of subordinate expectancies from a moderating perspective. For example, what affect does a specific leader behavior have on job satisfaction when the leader behavior is being moderated by expectancy I or II. Indvik (1985) concluded a meta-analysis research on path-goal theory by stating that further research in path-goal theory is essential, especially in the areas of subordinate expectancies and role clarity. Indvik concluded that since subordinate expectancies are the cornerstones of path-goal explanation, their absence indicates a dearth of complete tests of path-goal hypotheses.

Acceptance of leader: This concept refers to acceptance of leader by the subordinate. The subordinate complies with the directives and orders of his leader. He is always ready to accept the decisions made by the leader. He is comfortable with his leader and feels easy while working with him. Participation in

decision-making always increases acceptance of leader. Although allocating problem-solving and decision-making tasks to entire groups, as compared with the leader or manager in charge of the groups, requires a greater investment of man-hours but produces higher acceptance of decisions and a higher probability that the decision will be executed efficiently.

The subordinates' acceptance of orders depends upon the conditions that increase or decrease such compliance. Orders will be complied with to the extent they are understood, are consistent with the purpose of the organization, and are compatible with the personal interests of the subordinate and to the extent the subordinate is physically and mentally able to comply with them. The effective administrative authority involves willing rather than forced compliance. Indeed, a basic characteristic of authority is the willingness of subordinate to comply with directives from superior. But each subordinate has a "zone of indifference" within which orders are acceptable without the conscious questioning of authority. These zones of indifference are maintained by the interests of the group. Johnson (1982) found that the zone of acceptance was increased more by the extent to which the principals granted the teachers professional autonomy than by rational discipline and rule enforcement.

Reviews of the empirical literature are available in reports by House and Dessler (1974) and House & Mitchell (1974). Both these reviews tended to confirm the theory. Earlier, House (1971) found support in a priori tests of the theory, House found that the satisfaction of subordinates was associated with the extent to which the leader's initiation of structure reduced role ambiguity. House had also studied the correlates of leader behavior with the motivation of subordinates through a test of eight hypotheses applied in three different business organizations (House and Dessler 1974).

There are a number of concerns about how the theory has been tested. One issue is the often poor quality of the measures that have been used in previous path-goal theory tests. A second concern is that most researchers have tested only a few aspects of the theory while ignoring other aspects (Yukl, 1998, p. 269). Moreover, it is also stated that "scholars generally feel uncomfortable in refining, extending, and testing the path-goal framework, partly because the easiest relationships have already been tested... and partly because of the difficulty of developing meaningful extensions of or modifications to the theory" (Schriesheim & Neider, 1996, p. 319). Many researchers are of the opinion that the theory has been poorly tested which lead to the conflicting and non-supportive results. But to be on the safe side researchers need to know the strength and weakness of the theory as presently constituted before moving on to alternative formulations (Schriesheim and Glinow 1977).

Keeping in view the criticism by Schriesheim and Glinow (1977) and Yukl, (1998) this research was designed to test the path-goal theory with an entirely different population as no test of the theory have been conducted with Pakistani population. The main purpose of the study was to test the path-goal theory in educational setting. The general objectives was to find out the interaction between leadership style, need for autonomy and subordinates' outcomes after controlling stress and role ambiguity of the principals working in degree colleges of the Punjab.

Method

For the present study data was collected from thirty four districts of Punjab. Two degree colleges (1 male, 1 female) from each district were selected randomly and consequently the sample size was 68 colleges. From each college 3 teachers were

selected conveniently. In this way 204 teachers (lecturers, Assistant professors, Associate professors, and professors) were the part of study. All the principals of 68 colleges were involved in this study. Finally, 171 questionnaires were analyzed after excluding non-respondents and incomplete questionnaires for teachers and 63 for principals. The tool used for the data collection was a self-administered questionnaire which consisted of a combination of instruments. There were two sets of questions that measured the directive and participative leader behaviors (House and Dessler, 1974; House and Mitchell, 1974). The second combination of questions measured job expectancies (House & Dessler, 1974) and the third which was Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969; Smith, et al., 1987; Stanton, et al., 2001) for measuring Job Satisfaction. The questionnaire, which was administered to the principals, was role ambiguity scale (Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman, 1970) and anxiety and stress scale. These two variables were included in the design of study as covariates. For measuring acceptance of leader and need for autonomy, items were developed by the researcher herself after consultation of related literature. A pilot study was conducted using a total of 31 college teachers as the sample. The reliability coefficient ranged from 0.72 to 0.91 for all the instruments used in this research.

Multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) and univariate analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) at .05 level of significance, were used to test the hypotheses of this study. Scatter grams were also visually examined on SPSS to determine linearity between variables. Before conducting an ANCOVA, the homogeneity-of-slopes assumption was first tested. Wiersma, (1995) explains that if the interaction between factor and covariate is significant, the results from an ANCOVA are not meaningful, and ANCOVA should not be conducted. This assumption was observed in this study and the tests of homogeneity-of-slopes were conducted on all possible combinations of variables. The covariate that came up with non-significant interaction was included in data analysis.

Results

H_{01} . There is no relationship between directive leader behavior and subordinates' acceptance of leader, who prefer autonomy and self-control, holding constant the effect of principals' stress.

It is clear from the above table that the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between directive leader behavior and subordinates' acceptance of leader, who prefer autonomy and self-control, holding constant the effect of principals' stress, is rejected since ANCOVA was significant, $F(2,171) = 22.21$, $P = .000$. It means that principals' leadership style has significant effect on subordinates' acceptance of leader when their need for autonomy was high. Since F -ratio was significant, so it was decided to run LSD Post Hoc test of multiple comparison. However, only significant difference between low directive and high directive was discussed here.

After this test the researcher concluded that low directive leadership had positive effect on subordinates' acceptance of leader, who prefer autonomy and self-control. So the null hypothesis was rejected. This result is consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control do not accept directive leaders

H_{02} . There is no relationship between participative leader behavior and subordinates' acceptance of leader, who prefers autonomy and self-control, holding constant the effect of principals' stress.

The above Table shows that the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between directive leader behavior and

subordinates' acceptance of leader, who prefer autonomy and self-control, holding constant the effect of principals' stress, is rejected since ANCOVA was significant, $F(2,171) = 43.606$, $P = .000$. It means that principals' leadership style has significant effect on subordinates' acceptance of leader when their need for autonomy was high. Since F-ratio was significant, so it was decided to run LSD Post Hoc test of multiple comparison.

After this test the researcher concluded that low participative leadership has positive effect on subordinates' acceptance of leader, who prefer autonomy and self-control. The null hypothesis was rejected and the researcher concluded that low participative leadership had positive effect on subordinates' acceptance of leader, who prefer autonomy and self-control. This result is not consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control prefer participative leaders.

H_{o3} . There is no relationship between directive leader behavior and subordinates' job expectancies, which prefer autonomy and self-control, holding constant the effect of principals' role ambiguity and stress.

After this test the researcher concluded that high directive leadership had positive effect on subordinates' job expectancies, which prefer autonomy and self-control.

The null hypothesis was rejected and the researcher concluded that high directive leadership had positive effect on subordinates' job expectancies, which prefer autonomy and self-control. This result is not consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control do not prefer directive leaders.

H_{o4} . There is no relationship between participative leader behavior and subordinates' job expectancies, which prefer autonomy and self-control, holding constant the effect of principals' role ambiguity and stress.

MANCOVA was conducted to determine the effect of the participative leadership styles on the job expectancies when the subordinates prefer autonomy and self-control, holding constant the effect of principals' role ambiguity and stress. Significant differences were found among the directive leadership styles on the dependent measures, Wilks' lambda $\Lambda = .815$, $F(4,330) = 8.893$, $P = .000$, was significant. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) on each dependent variable was conducted as follow up tests to the MANCOVA. The ANCOVA on Expectancy I and Expectancy II was significant, $F(2,171) = 13.019$, $P = .000$, $F(3,171) = 17.729$, $P = .000$. It means that significant differences were found among the three dimensions of participative leadership style on the dependent measure of Expectancy I and Expectancy II. To see which leadership style is more effective LSD post hoc test of multiple comparison was conducted.

After this test it was concluded that high participative leadership had positive effect on subordinates' job expectancies, which prefer autonomy and self-control.

The null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that high participative leadership had positive effect on subordinates' job expectancies, which prefer autonomy and self-control. This result is consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control are more motivated when they work under participative leaders

H_{o5} . There is no relationship between directive leader behavior and subordinates' job satisfaction, who prefer autonomy and self-control, holding constant the effect of principals' role ambiguity.

A multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of directive leadership styles on the six dependent variables when the subordinates prefer autonomy and self-control holding constant the effect of principals' role ambiguity. Significant differences were not found among the directive leadership styles on the dependent measures, Wilks' Lambda $\Lambda = .940$, $F(12,324) = .852$, $P = .597$, was not significant. So the null hypothesis was accepted.

H_{o6} . There is no relationship between directive leader behavior and subordinates' job satisfaction, who prefer autonomy and self-control, holding constant the effect of principals' role ambiguity.

A multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of participative leadership styles on the six dependent variables when the subordinates prefer autonomy and self-control, holding constant the effect of principals' role ambiguity. Significant differences were not found among the participative leadership styles on the dependent measures, Wilks' Lambda $\Lambda = .911$, $F(12,322) = 1.277$, $P = .231$, was not significant. But ANCOVA on pay and job in general was significant, it means that significant differences were found among the three participative leadership styles on the dependent measure of pay and job in general.

After this test it was concluded that high participative leadership had negative effect on subordinates' satisfaction with job in general, who prefer autonomy and self-control.

The null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that high participative leadership had negative effect on subordinates' satisfaction with job in general, who prefer autonomy and self-control. This result is not consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control are more satisfied when they work under participative leaders.

Results Supporting Path-Goal Theory

Low directive leadership had positive effect on subordinates' acceptance of leader, who prefer autonomy and self-control. This result is consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control do not accept directive leaders

High participative leadership had positive effect on subordinates' job expectancies, which prefer autonomy and self-control. This result is consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control are more motivated when they work under participative leaders.

Results Contradictory to Path-Goal Predictions

High participative leadership had negative effect on subordinates' acceptance of leader and job satisfaction, which prefer autonomy and self-control. This result is not consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control prefer participative leaders and are more satisfied when they work under participative leaders.

High directive leadership had positive effect on subordinates' job expectancies, which prefer autonomy and self-control. This result is not consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control do not prefer directive leaders.

High participative leadership had negative effect on subordinates' satisfaction with job in general, who prefer autonomy and self-control. This result is not consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control are more satisfied when they work under participative leaders.

Significant differences were not found among the directive leadership styles and job satisfaction. This result is again not consistent with path-goal theory, which states that people with high need for autonomy and self-control are less satisfied when they work under directive leaders.

Conclusion

In the situation where subordinates have a high need for autonomy, participation in decision making tends to increase the intrinsic valence of the work for these subordinates, resulting in greater effort and higher satisfaction (Yukl, 1989). Directive leader behavior is resisted by the subordinated that have high need for self-control. This study gave confirmation that subjects with high need for independence had high means on acceptance of leader scale when their leaders were low directive. But this was not true for job expectancies and satisfaction. Participative leadership was positively effecting subordinates' job expectancies, which prefer autonomy and self-control. This result is consistent with path-goal theory, which states that

people with high need for autonomy and self-control are more motivated when they work under participative leaders.

The findings from this study did not support path-goal predictions on relationships of participative leadership with acceptance of leader and job in general and directive leadership with subordinates' job expectancies and satisfaction when examined through the moderating variable subordinates' need for Independence. It was found out that four out of six results were against the predictions of theory. There appears to be a definite need for further research in the field of higher educational leadership and its relation to job satisfaction and other faculty outcomes. Although this study did not identify strong support for path-goal theory, still there is need of further research to support or refute these findings.

Table 1. N, Mean, Adjusted Mean, Standard Deviation, and ANCOVA for Directive Leadership Style and Acceptance of Leader with Subordinates' high Need for Independence

Sources of variance	df	F	P	η^2
Between groups(adjusted)	2	22.21	.000	.210
Within groups	167			
Total	171			

	N	Adjusted Mean	Mean	SD
Directive 0	21	24.213	24.33	5.60
Directive(low)	137	29.539	29.53	4.30
Directive(high)	13	22.514	22.46	7.26

Table 2. LSD Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparison

DV	Comparison	Mean difference(I-J)	Sig.
Acceptance of leader	Low Directive Vs high Directive	7.025	.000

Table 3. N, Mean, Adjusted Mean, Standard Deviation, and ANCOVA for Participative Leadership Style and Acceptance of Leader with Subordinates High Need for Independence

Sources of variance	df	F	P	η^2
Covariate	1	.244	.622	.001
Between groups(adjusted)	2	43.606	.000	.344
Within groups	166			
Total	171			

	N	Adjusted Mean	Mean	SD
Participative-o	39	27.095	27.13	4.05
participative -low	87	31.250	31.22	3.30
participative -high	45	23.833	23.87	5.87

Table 4. LSD Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparison

DV	Comparison	Mean difference (I-J)	Sig.		
Acceptance of leader	Low participative Vs high participative	7.418	.000		
Expectancy I	Directive-0	21	8.898	8.86	3.79
	Directive -low	137	6.443	6.45	2.44
	Directive -high	13	11.958	12.00	6.68
Expectancy I	Directive -0	21	9.586	9.67	3.90
	Directive -low	137	7.568	7.55	2.70
	Directive -high	13	12.375	12.38	6.04

Table 5. N, Mean, Adjusted Mean, Standard Deviation and MANCOVA for Directive Leadership Style and Job Expectancies, with high Need for Autonomy

<i>Multivariate Results</i>					
Test	<i>Λ</i> value	<i>F</i> -Ratio	Hypothesis <i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	η -Square
Wilks' lambda	.782	10.781	4.00	.000	.116
<i>Univariate F- Tests</i>					
DVs		<i>F</i> -Ratio	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	η -Square
Expectancy I		22.224	(2,170)	.000	.211
Expectancy II		15.910	(2, 170)	.000	.161
		<i>N</i>	Adjusted Mean	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Expectancy I	Directive-0	21	8.898	8.86	3.79
	Directive -low	137	6.443	6.45	2.44
	Directive -high	13	11.958	12.00	6.68
Expectancy I	Directive -0	21	9.586	9.67	3.90
	Directive -low	137	7.568	7.55	2.70
	Directive -high	13	12.375	12.38	6.04

Table 6. LSD Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparison

DV	Comparison	Mean difference (I-J)	Sig.
Expectancy I	High Directive Vs low Directive	5.516	.000
Expectancy II	High Directive Vs low Directive	4.807	.000

Table 7: N, Mean, Adjusted Mean, Standard Deviation and MANCOVA for Participative Leadership Style and Job Expectancies with high Need for Autonomy

<i>Multivariate Results</i>					
Test	<i>Λ</i> value	<i>F</i> -Ratio	Hypothesis <i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	η -Square
Wilks' lambda	.815	8.893	4.00	.000	.097
<i>Univariate F- Tests</i>					
DVs		<i>F</i> -Ratio	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	η -Square
Expectancy I		13.019	(2,171)	.000	.143
Expectancy II		17.738	(2, 171)	.000	.176
		<i>N</i>	Adjusted Mean	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Expectancy I	Participative-o	39	7.098	6.95	2.24
	Participative -low	87	6.070	6.13	2.28
	Participative -high	45	7.799	9.36	5.05
Expectancy I	Participative-o	39	8.661	8.18	2.70
	Participative -low	87	7.434	6.95	2.50
	Participative -high	45	9.973	10.56	4.42

Table 8. LSD Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparison

DV	Comparison	Mean difference (I-J)	Sig.
Expectancy I	High Participative Vs low Participative	3.238	.000
Expectancy II	High Participative Vs low Participative	3.564	.000

Table 9. N, mean, adjusted mean, standard deviation and mancova for participative leadership style and job satisfaction when the subordinates have high need for independence

<i>Multivariate Results</i>					
Test	<i>Λ</i> value	<i>F</i> -Ratio	Hypothesis <i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	η -Square
Wilks' lambda	.911	1.277	12.00	.231	.045
<i>Univariate F- Tests</i>					
DVs		<i>F</i> -Ratio	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	η -Square
Pay		3.496	(2,171)	.033	.040
Job in general		3.355	(2,171)	.037	.039
		<i>N</i>	Adjusted Mean	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Pay	participative -low	87	12.137	12.16	6.94
	participative -high	45	10.046	10.09	7.05
Job in general	participative -low	87	29.642	29.56	5.26
	participative -high	45	26.477	26.76	8.56

Table 10. LSD Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparisons

DV	Comparison	Mean difference (I-J)	Sig.
Pay	High participative Vs low participative	-2.091	.126
Job in general	High participative Vs low participative	-3.164	.011

Reference:

- Awan, R. N. & Zaidi, N. R. (2007). A Study of the Stress of Teachers as a moderator for Path-Goal Relations. *Journal of Education and Research*, 10 (1), 83-95.
- Awan, R. N., Zaidi, N. R & Bigger, S. (2008). Relationships between Higher Education Leaders and Subordinates in Pakistan: A Path-Goal Approach. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 30 (2) 29-44.
- Ayman, R. (2004). Situational and contingency approaches to leadership. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 148–170). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dessler, G. (1973). An investigation of a path-goal theory of leadership. City University of New York. Dissertation Abstract International, Vol. 34-02A.
- Evans, M.G. (1970). The effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 5, 277-298.
- House, R. J. & Baetz, M.L. (1979). Leadership: Some empirical generalizations and new research directions. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 341-423.
- House, R. J. & Dessler, G. (1974). Path goal theory of leadership: Some post hoc and a priori tests. In *Contingency approaches to leadership*, JG Hunt and L.L. Larson (Eds.), Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University. pp. 29-55
- House, R. J. & Mitchell, T.R. (1974). Path goal theory of leadership in Fred Luthans (ed.) *Contemporary Readings in Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- House, R. J., (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory, *Leadership Quarterly*, 7 (3), 323-325.
- House, R.J., (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16: 321-338.
- House, R.J., Filley, A.C. and Kerr, S., (1971). Relation of leader consideration and initiating structure to R&D subordinates satisfaction. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16: 19-30.
- Indvik, J. (1985). A path-goal theory: Investigation of superior-subordinate relationships (Leadership, Downward communication, Supervision). The University of Wisconsin-Madison. Dissertation Abstract International, Vol. 46-12A.
- Johnson, J. V. E. (1982). Participative employee evaluation and job satisfaction: a quasi-experimental approach. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The Catholic University of America: Dissertation Abstract International, Vol. 43-05b.
- Jones, H. B. (2001). Magic, meaning and leadership: Weber's model and the empirical literature *Human Relations*; 54; 753
- Keller, R., (1989). A test of the path-goal theory of leadership with need for clarity as a moderator in research and development organizations. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 74 (2): 208-212.
- Keller, R., 1989. A test of the path-goal theory of leadership with need for clarity as a moderator in research and development organizations. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 74 (2): 208-212.
- Kerr, S. (1973). Ability- and Willingness to Leave as Moderators of Relationships between Task and Leader Variables and Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Research*, 1, (2). 115-128
- Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C.A., Murphy, C.J. and Stogdill, R.M., (1974). Toward a contingency theory of leadership based upon the consideration and initiating structure literature. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 12: 62-82.
- Malcolm J. Richmon and Derek J. Allison (2003). Toward a Conceptual Framework for Leadership Inquiry. *Educational Management & Administration*, 31 (1) 31–50.
- Melcher, (1999). Melcher's analysis: A critique on path-goal theory of leadership. Retrieved April 2, 2009 from <http://www.cba.siu.edu/faculty/melcher/graduate/ba.../htmMoss>
- S. A. and Ritossa, D. A. (2007). The Impact of Goal Orientation on the Association between Leadership Style and Follower Performance, Creativity and Work Attitudes. *Leadership*, 3; 433
- Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Oh, K., Kim, Y. and Lee, J. (1991). An empirical study of communication patterns, leadership styles, and subordinate satisfaction in R&D project teams in Korea. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 8 15-35
- Richmon, M. J. and Allison, D. J. (2003). Toward a Conceptual Framework for Leadership Inquiry. *Educational Management & Administration*. 31(1) 31–50
- Rizzo, J. R., R. J. House, and S. E. Lirtzman. (1970). Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organizations, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150-163
- Romeo, C. C. (1992). A test of path- goal theory: the effects of leadership and faculty satisfaction in public baccalaureate nursing programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland College Park.
- Schriesheim C. A. and Neider, L.L. (1996). Path-Goal Leadership Theory: The Long And Winding Road. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 317-321.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S.L., Zhou, X., and DeChurch, L.A. (2006). An investigation of path-goal and transformational leadership theory predictions at the individual level of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly* 17: 21– 38
- Schriesheim, C. and Glinow, M. A. V. (1977). The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 20, (3), 398-405
- Smith, P. C., Balzer, W., Brannick, M., Chia, W., Eggleston, S., Gibson, W., Johnson, B., Josephson, H., Paul, K., Reilly, C., & Whalen, M. (1987). The revised JDI: A facelift for an old friend. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 24, 31-33.
- Smith, P.C., L.M. Kendall, and C.L. Hulin (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Stanton, J.M., Sinar, E.F., Balzer, W.K., Julian, A. L., Thoresen, P., Aziz, S. Fisher, G. And Smith, P.C. (2001). Development of a compact measure of job satisfaction: the abridged job descriptive index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 61(6). 1104-1122.
- Sudbrack, B. and Trombley, (2007). *Lost: A Survival Guide to Leadership Theory*. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9; 251
- Szilagy, A. D., and H. P. Sims. (1975). Leader structure and subordinate satisfaction for two hospital administrative levels: A path analysis approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 2 pp. 194-197
- Weihrich, H. and Koontz, H. (1993). *MANAGEMENT: A global perspective*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Wiersma, W. (1995). *Research methods in education*. 6th Ed. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Yukl, G. (1971). Toward a Behavioral Theory of Leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 6, 414-440
- Yukl, G. (1989). *Leadership in organizations*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, INC
- Yukl, G. (1998). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285–305