Distance Leadership Use and Faculty Members Job Satisfaction l at Sultan Qaboos University During Pandemic Covid-19

Professor Aieman Al-Omari & Dr. Aisha Al-Harthi & Dr. Khalaf Alabri & Dr. Omer Hashim

Distance Leadership Use and Faculty Members Job Satisfaction at Sultan Qaboos University During Pandemic Covid-19

Professor Aieman Al-Omari

College of education, Dept. of Educational Foundations and Administration, Sultan Qaboos University, Oman

a.alomari@squ.edu.om

Dr. Aisha Al-Harthi,

College of education, Dept. of Educational Foundations and Administration, Sultan Qaboos University. Oman

asa@squ.edu.om

Dr. Khalaf Alabri

College of education, Dept. of Educational Foundations and Administration, Sultan Qaboos University. Oman

kabri@squ.edu.om

Dr. Omer Hashim

College of education, Dept. of Educational Foundations and Administration, Sultan Qaboos University. Oman

omerhi@squ.edu.om

Abstract: The aim of this study was to assess faculty members' perceptions of their current department chairpersons' leadership frame use as it relates to their self-reported job satisfaction at Sultan Qaboos University in Sultanate of Oman. An online survey involving 128 faculty members was conducted. The questionnaire consists The Leadership Orientations (Other) Survey instrument with 32 questions, and Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale with 8 questions. Of the participants, 68.8% were males, and 31.3% were females. About 49.2% were in Humanities colleges, and 50.8% were in scientific. The predominant leadership frame for the department chairpersons was "human resources" (M=4.53, SD=.67). Intrinsic job satisfaction

(M=4.13, SD=.60), was higher level than extrinsic job satisfaction (M=3.91, SD=.62). The correlation test showed that there was significant positive correlation between intrinsic, extrinsic job satisfaction and leadership frames. High level of correlation was between Intrinsic job satisfaction and Human leadership frame (r=.781).

Keywords: Distance leadership, faculty members, job satisfaction, Sultan Qaboos University, COVID-19.

Introduction

Leadership is not a static concept; it evolves as society, technology, and the environment grow and change. Leaders are agents of change-persons whose acts affect other people more than other people's acts affect them. Higher education in the 21st century facing a crisis of academic leadership, requiring new paradigms of virtual entrepreneurial agility so that colleges and universities can become the right-sized, results-oriented, consumer-focused learning organizations (Birnbaum, 1999).

Rapidly changing technologies have driven the expansion of online education (Irlbeck, 2002). However, higher education leadership are being challenged by pandemic covid-19, these challenges and technological developments make it imperative for college leaders and the policymakers who govern them to make digital transformation and technology much more central strategic priority (Gallagher & Palmer, 2020). Also, leadership in the 21st century is evolving as a response to the economic and societal demands that are changing rapidly with the technology of computers, Internet, and the globalization of business (Kanter, 1999). Beaudoin (2002) noted that there is an absence of research and lack of understanding of the leadership models needed to support distance leadership in education. Lee (2001) stated that there are no studies have investigated the perceptions of faculty with regard to instructional support, and whether their perceived organizational support has a relationship to faculty motivation, commitment, and satisfaction in relation to distance technology. Spodark's (2003) research identified a lack of distance leadership in education.

Distance leadership distance is defined as the physical, structural, and/or functional separation between leaders and their followers (Napier & Ferris, 1993). Greater reliance on technology to communicate across physical distances combined with perceived cross-cultural dissimilarities, or social distance, may weaken leader-follower relations, dilute leadership influence, or significantly reduce leaders' abilities to detect organizational problems.

A more recent survey conducted in 2013 reveals that 88% of organizations offer some form of telework to their employees (WorldatWork, 2013). Although the

estimated proportion of employees working remotely full-time is less than 10% (Davenport, 2005), this figure is expected to 9 increase, as is the number of part-time telecommuters. Telecommuting reduces employees' physical commuting costs, creates a better work-life balance, and generates higher morale, job satisfaction, and productivity (Brownson, 2004; McCloskey & Igbaria, 2003; Nickson & Siddons, 2004; Vega, 2003).

Technology has changed the education institutional model (Poscente, 2004). In this model, both faculty members and students become virtual and therefore the leadership no longer has the traditional environment in which to function. Shnitzer and Crosby (2003) addressed administrative organization and the need to create virtual teaching communities. It remains unknown how college presidents and academic leaders are providing leadership to academic communities that have virtual faculty members spread across the community during the pandemic covid-19. Concerns may arise as to whether faculty members feel a part of academia without the close social contact of the academic community.

As administrators of their units, department heads must lead through times of upheaval and crisis. As mid-level administrators they may not be directly involved in the examination and revision of university policies and procedures that have unfolded. Yet, heads typically engage in sensemaking (Weick et al., 2005) as they lead equitable implementation of revised policies, consider their effects on faculty, staff, and students, and determine modes of communicating with relevant stakeholders.

Heads of departments play key roles in the administration and governance of higher education institutions, making decisions that influence faculty careers, curriculum, student enrollments, and department budgets (Berdrow, 2010; Gmelch et al., 2017). Thus, heads are leaders and key decision makers, particularly with regard to procedures within their own departments. It is expected that heads lead and manage the totality of the day-to-day work of the faculty and staff who form the unit.

Despite this important organizational role, research (Dopson et al., 2019) suggests many heads receive inadequate training for the position. The leadership of

these faculty members presents many questions regarding the ability of leadership to provide job satisfaction and professional development and to motivate and sustain quality faculty with limited personal contact (Parker, 2003). Researchers have not determined the style or styles of leadership that are most effective during the pandemic covid-19 in a virtual organizational structure. In addition to that, the growth of online education has generated little research into the leadership of virtual faculty members since many faculty members have taught distance education classes from the campus environment. Distance leadership in education is rapidly changing and the truly virtual faculty members, which are geographically may separate, are forming new communities (Puzziferro-Schnitzer & Kissinger, 2005; Tompkins et al., 2002) with needs for a new leadership paradigm. Leonard (2003) commented that the requirements for leadership change in contemporary organizations have changed significantly in the past several decades.

Bower (2001) indicated that institutional support for faculty members' involvement in distance education is essential and should take a variety of forms to recognize the range of motivations and needs of faculty members. Suggestions included upgraded faculty office computers, adjusted salary and course-load, public recognition, notes of appreciation and parking privileges, enhanced faculty development programs, and increased student support services (O'Quinn & Corry, 2002). Yet, no studies have investigated the perceptions of faculty with regard to instructional support, and whether their perceived organizational support has a relationship to faculty motivation, commitment, and satisfaction in relation to distance leadership. According to Lee (2001) posited that distance education leaders must be transformational, Beaudoin (2002) noted they must be situational, Pahal (1999) reported they must be self-achievers and proactive.

The role of the administrator or department chairperson of faculty members requires not just academic leadership but attention to the technical support for faculty members, which has also been a concern and a factor affecting faculty satisfaction with teaching in the online environment. As more distance education courses are being

incorporated into higher education institutions (Sloan-C, 2005), Lee (2002) noted that successful online-education require harmonious operations with many different elements including instructional support.

Burtha and Connaughton (2004) suggested that leaders who lead from afar already understand that achieving the same performance in a dispersed environment as in a proximate one can be extremely difficult. Faculty members consider the lack of face to-face contact with students as a concern as they cannot read the students' facial expressions or hear voice intonations that signal the need for faculty interaction. When a leader is initially building a relationship with those they will lead from afar, it is important to orchestrate a face-to-face meeting with the members of the team. This can be achieved in person or through the use of videoconference technology. Leaders at a distance are also urged to communicate frequently to combat the out-of-sight, out-of-mind syndrome and to counteract feelings by distant employees of being alienated from the main hub of the business.

Bock (2004) provided similar insights into the strategies for leading virtual teams, by putting virtual teams together and managing them for results are still basically the same. They have more to do with how human beings interact than they do with technology. This raises an important issue relative to what type of faculty will find extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction from teaching not only in the online environment but also as a part of a virtual academe supported by a distance leadership.

Meyer (2002) suggested that those faculty members best suited to online learning are viewed as having the following characteristics: They enjoy new things, have high tolerance levels for frustration, are willing to experiment, are positive in their approach to online delivery systems, they are intrinsically motivated, are impervious to negative external influences, are unfazed by the online workload and their satisfaction is tied to seeing students learn in the online environment.

Mathis' (1999) study of the relationship of leadership frame use of departmental chairs to faculty members job satisfaction concluded that several differences were found in relation to faculty members job satisfaction and a chair's leadership frame use.

Faculty members with the symbolic predominant frame expressed higher intrinsic and overall job satisfaction than faculty members with any other frame. The human resource and symbolic frames were both superior to the structural predominant frame when considering extrinsic job satisfaction. Faculty members with department chairperson using multiple frames expressed significantly higher intrinsic and extrinsic, and overall job satisfaction.

Bolman and Deal's Leadership Frames Theory

Bolman and Deal (2003) introduced one comprehensive leadership model based on four frames of leadership: the structural, the human resource, the political, and the symbolic.

The structural frame emphasizes the relationship and formal roles found within an organization. Structural leaders described as "doing their homework" and "rethinking the relationship of structure, strategy and environment"; they "focus on implementation" and "experiment, evaluate and adapt". The human resource frame is the second of the leadership frames, leaders need to know and understand the people who work within the organization. Human resource leaders described as "believing in people and communicating their belief," as being "visible and accessible" and "empowering others" Bolman and Deal (1997). The political frame is the third frame that views organizations as arenas of scarce resources where power and influence are constantly affecting the allocation of resource among individuals and groups" (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Bolman and Deal (1997) posited that political leaders "clarify what they want and what they can get," "assess the distribution of power and interests," "build linkages to key stakeholders," and "persuade first, negotiate second, and use coercion only if necessary". The symbolic frame is the fourth frame considers the culture and values of the organizations more than the goals, policies, and procedures as being key to cementing the organization together (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Symbolic leaders are described as "interpreting and reinterpreting experience"; they "use symbols to capture attention," "frame experience," and "communicate a vision" (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Leaders in higher education must possess the agility, artistry, skill, and ability to face the challenges of the rapidly changing world of education and academia. Sullivan (2001) noted that whatever the frame or combination of frames, however, leaders in the 21st century will have to inspire trust in their followers to move forward during a period in which higher education is recreating itself. From Bolman and Deal's (2003) perspective, task and relations oriented leadership relates to the structural and human resource frames. The online environment is growing in a turbulent time of technological change, which Bolman and Deal (1997) suggested requires more complex and flexible structures.

Higher education leaders may need to address not only the challenges to leadership roles in the changing student world but also in the arena of faculty leadership, where growing numbers of faculty have forsaken the traditional roles and traditional classroom for the virtual world of Internet-based distance education teaching (Spodark, 2003). There is little research available to answer the questions regarding leadership in a virtual environment. What has been determined is that specific frames of faculty leadership have a significant influence on faulty job satisfaction in a campus setting (Mathis, 1999).

Job Satisfaction

Bateman and Organ (1983) contended that since it reflects the emotional satisfaction received from an individual's work experience, job satisfaction is shaped by the variables of each individual's established beliefs, values, and prior socialization experience. Frye and Lovas (1991) indicated that morale is a key factor in whether an employee feels a commitment to work and the degree of job satisfaction. In their investigation of higher education faculty, they found that faculty morale results from the perceptions faculty have of their dean or department chair. Faculty members will be motivated (a) when their work provides for intellectual and emotional challenge, (b) when they believe they have opportunities for personal and professional growth, (c) when they can participate in decisions that affect their own development, (d) when they consider themselves part of an important organization, and (e) when faculty are visibly

recognized for and know that they are making a difference (Lucas, 1994; Crawford & Gannon Cook, 2002; Woods & Weasmer, 2004).

The job satisfaction theories of Herzberg (1957), Bateman and Organ (1983), Frye and Lovas (1991), and Olson (1996) clearly identify not only the relationship between employee job satisfaction and leadership but also the relationship between an academic department chairperson's and dean's leadership and faculty satisfaction. The MCMJSS, which has been used in several educational research studies (Hitt, 2003; Mathis, 1999; Creech 2005), was designed to measure the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction, and has as its theoretical foundation the two-factor theory of Herzberg. Herzberg (1957) identified two factors relating to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, which he called motivators and hygiene's. Motivators are factors such as achievement, recognition, growth and advancement and job interest. Hygiene's include supervision, work environment, salary, status, security, and administration and policies.

Operational definitions:

Leadership frames: Cognitive maps of the way individuals view and understand the world. Designed by Bolman and Deal (2003), they identify four distinct frames of leadership: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic.

Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

The immediate impact of COVID-19 on the department head role focused work on managing instructional change from traditional in-person lectures, seminars, and in the case of professional credentialing programs for school teachers and other educator preparation, practica, and clinical experiences (Kruse, Hackmann, & Lindle, 2020). The online courses have outgrown on colleges and universities (Schnitzer & Crosby, 2003). At the same time, a result, educational institutions developed online education programs. Academic leadership in the transformational climate of higher education has failed to address the leadership needs of online distant faculty members geographically separated from the campus (Beaudoin, 2002).

Leadership in the online environment is a little known quantity that is supported in the literature by conjecture and opinion, and lacks research to support many of the opinions (Lee, 2001). Faculty members plays such a primary role in the success of distance education students (Smith, 2006) that determining what style of leadership is used and how that leadership style relates to the faculty's job satisfaction level is of importance for educational institutions. The significance of faculty members job satisfaction and distance leadership is relevant to leadership hiring, leadership development programs, and the retention and success of both faculty and students (Schnitzer & Crosby, 2003). There are many possible factors contributing to the problem of how distance leadership relates to faculty members job satisfaction during pandemic covid-19.

Previous research studies in college settings have suggested that a leader who is perceived to use multiple frames of leadership provides leadership that is more satisfactory to faculty members (Chang, 2005) and promotes intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction (Mathis, 1999; Sullivan, 2001). Similarly, a leader who is perceived to use one or none of the frames will be perceived less favorably by faculty and provide less faculty members job satisfaction.

This study first explored the four frames of leadership to determine if faculty members perceived their department chairperson to adopt a predominant frame. Second, the study examined faculty members self-reported intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction. Previous studies of the relationship of faculty job satisfaction to faculty perceptions of leadership (Mathis, 1999) posited that deans who are perceived to predominantly use the symbolic frame create greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction in faculty. This quantitative research study surveyed faculty members to assess their perceptions of their current department chairpersons' leadership frame use as it relates to their self-reported job satisfaction at Sultan Qaboos University in Sultanate of Oman.

These research aims are expressed in the following:

1. The predominant leadership frame that faculty members perceive department chairperson to use?

2. The levels of intrinsic, extrinsic, and overall job satisfaction reported by faculty members supervised by department chairperson.

3. Are there significant differences in the levels of intrinsic, extrinsic, and overall job satisfaction reported by faculty members supervised by department chairperson preferring different leadership frames?

Significance of the Problem

The significance of a study of online leadership and online distant faculty job satisfaction is that it may identify current leadership frames that appear to be successful within the virtual distance education environment. With the increase in online courses at colleges and universities throughout the United States, online distant faculties face unique challenges related to teaching in the online environment (Gary, 2005). Online faculties have expressed concerns related to student learning in the online learning environment, such as student isolation, a lack of the traditional social dimension of the classroom, and student engagement (Johnson, 2003; Howell, Williams & Lindsey, 2003). Isolation, a lack of the traditional social dimension of academe, and a potential absence of engagement in the virtual learning environment may also be factors for leadership to assist distant online faculty to overcome (Howell, et al., 2003).

The current study has led to a new understanding of faculty leadership satisfaction in the online environment and has provided a sound research base for future studies to determine leadership structures that support this new and rapidly growing educational paradigm. High faculty turnover is associated with low job satisfaction, and stress among employees (Olsen, 1993).

Methodology

Research Design

A descriptive survey design was used.

Population and sample size

The participants for this research study were members of Faculty members at Sultan Qaboos University. Random sample approach was adopted. A total of 128 faculty members completed the questionnaire; of them 88(68.8%) were males, and 40(31.3%) were females. About 63(49.2%) were in Humanities colleges, were 65(50.8%) were in scientific colleges.

Settings

This survey was conducted on faculty members within Sultan Qaboos University which is a governmental university (SQU). SQU has a round 1500 faculty members. This study utilized an online survey form, the link of the survey combined with an invitation letter were sent to the faculty members through faculty members' email portal.

Instrumentation

The current study used two survey instruments combined into a single form to gather data. Self-perceived faculty member job satisfaction was measured by the MCMJSS, and the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations (Other) Survey instrument measured faculty member's perceptions of their department chairpersons of distance leadership frames. These two instruments are appropriate for this study in that they have been used in the past in social and educational research Cantu, 1997; Hitt, 2003; Mathis, 1999; Russell, 2000, Creech, 2005, Chang, 2005), and similar research designs have been used successfully to measure one or both of the variables of faculty leadership and job satisfaction (Cantu, 1997; Hitt, 2003; Mathis, 1999; Russell, 2000, Creech 2005; Chang, 2005; Liu, 2005).

Leadership Orientations (Other) Survey: The Leadership Orientations (Other) Survey instrument was developed to be self- administered and to identify participants'

perceptions of their supervisor's use of the Bolman and Deal four frames of leadership. Each of the four frames of leadership are represented on the survey by eight 5-point Likert-type scale questions; 32 questions comprise the first part of the survey. The structural frame is represented in Questions 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, and 29. The human resource frame is represented in Questions 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30. The political frame questions are Questions 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31. The symbolic frame is represented by Questions 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, and 32. Subscales within each frame include analytic descriptor questions 1, 9, 17, and 25; supportive descriptor questions 2, 10, 18, and 26; powerful descriptor questions 3, 11, 19, and 27; inspirational descriptor questions 4, 12, 20, and 28; organized descriptor questions 5, 13, 21, and 29; participative descriptor questions 6, 14, 22, and 30; adroit descriptor questions 7, 15, 23, and 31; and charismatic descriptor questions 6, 16, 24, and 32. The 5-point Likert-type scale that was used to allow respondents to rate the degree to which their supervisors exhibited the leadership behaviors characterized in the four frames was scaled from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always), where 2 is Occasional, 3 is Sometimes and 4 is Often. Analytic and organized are descriptors of the structural frame of leadership that is characterized by stability, problem solving, and attention to detail. Participative and supportive are dimensions of the human resource frame of leadership and are characterized by concern for employee feelings, empowerment, support, and responsiveness. Powerful and adroit are dimensions of the political frame characterized by persuasiveness, relationship networking, and effective negotiation. The symbolic frame is represented by the dimensions inspirational and charismatic, which describe the leader who creates a vision, builds loyalty, and develops values and culture.

Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Job Satisfaction Scale: The MCMJSS was developed to measure intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction and was designed to be self-administered. The eight-item instrument was designed with two subscales: intrinsic and extrinsic. The theoretical basis for the two dimensions relate to Herzberg's two-factor theory in which intrinsic satisfiers are related to the job itself—its rewards, opportunities, and advancement—and create job satisfaction. The extrinsic subscale is represented by factors such as policies and supervision, work environment, and

administration. These represent those factors that can cause job dissatisfaction. The MCMJSS has been used in several educational research studies by other researchers (McKee, 1991; Mohrman, Cooke, & Mohrman, 1978; Mohrman, Cooke, Mohrman, Duncan, & Zaltman, 1977). The Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman instrument's qualities appear to be appropriate for this study's objectives as they measure the element of job satisfaction.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

For examining the validity of the instrument in this study (face validity evidence), it presented to six experts in educational administration, research and evaluation and educational measurement. They asked to check whether the statements in the instrument are clear and linked appropriately with the problem of study. Based on the experts' comments, some revisions regarding to the language done to the instrument.

Reliability data is presented on the Bolman (n.d.) website that showed the Cronbach's Alpha for section one of the survey is .920 for the structural frame, .931 for the human resource frame, .913 for the political frame, and .931 for the symbolic frame. Regarding the reliability of the instrument in this study, an internal consistency procedure (to estimate the consistency across the items) used. A pilot study of 30 participants conducted. Those participants did not participate in the final study. The instructions were clear and all of the items of instrument functioning in appropriate manner. The values of alpha (the internal consistency coefficient) for dimensions of instrument were as follows: .861 for the structural frame, .893 for the human resource frame, .919 for the political frame and .852 for the symbolic frame. The previous values considered reasonably satisfactory to achieve the objectives of the current study.

Data Analysis

Data entry and analysis was conducted using SPSS version 21. Descriptive statistics like mean, standard deviation were used to summarize sample characteristics and responses on the questionnaires'. t-test and a Four Way ANOVA technique were employed to test the difference in mean predominant leadership frame knowledge score

with regard to selected participants' demographics. Regarding the cut points, it should be noted that the researchers used the response scale of each item that ranged from 1 to 5 to determine these cut points according to the following manner: 1-2.33 = low, from 2.34 to 3.67 = moderate, and 3.68-5.00 = high levels.

Results

Sample characteristics

A total of 128 faculty members completed the questionnaire; of them 88(68.8%) were males, and 40(31.3%) were females. About 63(49.2%) were in Humanities colleges, were 65(50.8%) were in scientific colleges.

A predominant leadership frame that faculty members perceive department chairperson to use:

The means and standard deviations for the predominant leadership frames of department chairperson to use as perceived by their faculty members were calculated. The predominant leadership frame for the department chairpersons was in order "human resources" (M=4.53, SD=.67), then ""political" (M=4.38, SD=.65), "symbolic" (M=4.25, SD=.93), and "structure" (M=3.84, SD=.74). All of these predominant leadership frames were in high level.

Job satisfaction reported by faculty members:

The mean of Intrinsic job satisfaction (M=4.13, SD=.60), and extrinsic job satisfaction (M=3.91, SD=.62). The levels of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction were in high level that reported by faculty members supervised by department chairperson.

Comparisons of predominant leadership frames:

To understand if there are differences in the mean of predominant leadership frames with regard to participant characteristics, t-test was conducted.

The t-test showed that there was significant difference with regard to sex in all predominant leadership frames (structure, human, political, and symbolic) in favor of

http://dx.doi.org/10.29009/ijres.5.3.3

female. Structure, human, political, and symbolic predominant leadership frames have significantly higher means of predominant leadership frames among females than males. The t-test showed that there was no significant difference with regard to college. However, predominant leadership frames have higher means in scientific colleges than humanities.

Table 1. Comparisons of predominant leadership frame score and selected demographics (n=128)

	Characteristics	Mean (SD)	Test	Results (df)	P value
	Sex				
Structure	Male(88)	3.65(.73)	t-test	-4.531(126)	.000*
	Female(40)	4.25(.58)			
Human	Male (88)	4.37(.67)		-4.408(126)	.000*
	Female (40)	4.89(.49)			
Political	Male (88)	4.22(.61)		-4.219(126)	.000*
	Female (40)	4.71(.61)			
Symbolic	Male (88)	4.01(.95)		-4.588(126)	.000*
	Female (40)	4.77(.62)			
	College				
Structure	Humanities(63)	3.74(.76)	t-test	-1.395(126)	.166
	Scientific(65)	3.92(.71)			
Human	Humanities(63)	4.48(.72)		-.911(126)	.364
	Scientific(65)	4.58(.61)			
Political	Humanities(63)	4.33(.62)		-.715(126)	.476
	Scientific(65)	4.41(.68)			
Symbolic	Humanities(63)	4.17(.72)		-1.118(126)	.266
	Scientific(65)	4.31(.70)			

* significant at the 0.01 level

Comparisons of Job Satisfaction:

To understand if there are differences in the mean of job satisfaction with regard to participant characteristics, t-test was conducted.

The t-test showed that there was significant difference with regard to sex in job satisfaction (Intrinsic and Extrinsic) in favor of female. Intrinsic and Extrinsic satisfaction have significantly higher means of job satisfaction among females than males. The t-test showed that there was no significant difference with regard to college.

However, Intrinsic and Extrinsic satisfaction have higher means in scientific colleges than humanities.

Table 2. Comparisons of job satisfaction score and selected demographics (n=128)

	Characteristics	Mean (SD)	Test	Results (df)	P value
	Sex				
Intrinsic	Male (88)	4.01(.56)	t-test	-3.328(126)	.001*
	Female (40)	4.37(.59)			
Extrinsic	Male (88)	3.76(.61)		-4.164(126)	.000*
	Female (40)	4.22(.53)			
	College				
Intrinsic	Humanities (63)	4.13(.45)	t-test	.037(126)	.971
	Scientific (65)	4.12(.71)			
Extrinsic	Humanities (63)	3.88(.53)		-.524(126)	.601
	Scientific (65)	3.93(.70)			

* significant at the 0.01 level

The Correlation between predominant leadership frames and job satisfaction:

To understand if there are significant correlations between predominant leadership frames of department chairpersons and job satisfaction level as reported by faculty members, correlation test was conducted. The correlation test showed that there was significant positive correlation between intrinsic, extrinsic job satisfaction and leadership frames. High level of correlation was between Intrinsic job satisfaction and Human leadership frame (r=.781), and the least correlation was between Extrinsic job satisfaction and Structural leadership frame (r=.427).

Table 3. Pearson correlational analysis between leadership frame and job satisfaction that faculty members perceive department chairperson to use

	Mean (SD)	Structural	Human	Political	Symbolic	Total
Extrinsic job satisfaction	3.91(.62)	.427*	.334*	.449*	.430*	.433*
Intrinsic job satisfaction	4.13 (.60)	.675*	.781*	.558*	.620*	.688*
Over all job satisfaction	4.02 (.55)	.614*	.497*	.686*	.585*	.625*

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Discussion

The results of this study demonstrate that the predominant leadership frame for the department chairpersons was "human resources" (M=4.53, SD=.67) that in some degree related to Bolman and Deal's (2003) perspective, which task and relations oriented leadership relates to the structural and human resource frames. Intrinsic job satisfaction (M=4.13, SD=.60), was higher level than extrinsic job satisfaction (M=3.91, SD=.62). The correlation test showed that there was significant positive correlation between intrinsic, extrinsic job satisfaction and leadership frames. High level of correlation was between Intrinsic job satisfaction and Human leadership frame (r=.781), that result related in somehow to Mathis (1999) study which faculty members with the symbolic predominant frame expressed higher intrinsic and overall job satisfaction than faculty members with any other frame. The human resource and symbolic frames were both superior to the structural predominant frame when considering extrinsic job satisfaction. Faculty members with department chairperson using multiple frames expressed significantly higher intrinsic and extrinsic, and overall job satisfaction. According to Chang (2005) revealed that a leader who is perceived to use multiple frames of leadership provides leadership that is more satisfactory to faculty members.

Institutions of higher education are complicated locations. Maintain smooth operation calls for that schedules, budgets balanced, the safety and health of college students and faculty ensured, and accreditation organizations, and policy makers believe that core missions and goals are achieved. But, as complex as they are, while everything unit operates properly and interconnects as deliberate, the institution in large part features as is intended as complicated as they are, when each component unit operates well and interconnects as planned, the institution largely functions as is intended (Kruse, Hackmann, & Lindle, 2020).

While complexity inside a system is extended, for instance, whilst factors external to an organization (such as a global pandemic) have an effect on the operating of the system, the system will become much less predictable. In the case of COVID, as

traditional feedback structures (e.g., verbal exchange practices, budget forecasts) have become compromised, the everyday measures of productiveness, performance, and efficiency commenced to fail to offer meaningful and consequential remarks for heads. In flip, our capability to assure organizational consequences (e.g., pupil attendance and diploma completion, instructional exceptional, college productivity) become compromised. On this way, the complexity of our institutional systems served to undermine effective management movement.

Limitations of the study

The finding of this study is valuable as it adds the existing body of leadership frames on job satisfaction that faculty members perceive department chairperson to use. Nevertheless, caution must be exercised in interpreting the results due to some limitations. First, the study was conducted in one single university in Sultanate of Oman, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Further studies may include other faculty members with bigger sample size for a more conclusive outcome. Lastly, response bias cannot be circumvented with self-reported online data collection.

References

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 587-595. https://doi.org/10.2307/255908

Beaudoin, M. F. (2002). Distance education leadership: An essential role for the new century. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 6(2). Retrieved from https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer62/beaudoin62.html

Berdrow, I. (2010). King among kings: understanding the role and responsibilities of the department chair in higher education. Educat. Manage. Administr. Leadership 38, 499–514. doi: 10.1177/1741143210368146

Birnbaum, R. (1999). Academic leadership at the millennium: Politics or porcelain? Academe, 85(3), 14–19. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40251740.

Bock, W. (2004). Virtual teams. Retrieved from http://www.bockinfo.com/docs/virteam.htm

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bower, B. (2001). Distance education: Facing the faculty challenge. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 4(2). Retrieved from: http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer42/bower42.html

Brownson, K. (2004). The benefits of a work-at-home program. Health Care Manager, 23, 141–144. Retrieved from http://journals.lww.com/healthcaremanagerjournal/Abstract/2004/04000/The_Ben efits_of_a_Work_at_Home_Program.7.aspx

Burtha, M., & Connaughton, S. L. (2004). Learning the secrets of long-distance leadership: Eight principles to cultivate effective virtual teams. Knowledge Management Review, 7(1), 24-27.

Cantu, D. A. (1997). The leadership frames of academic deans randomly selected and nominated as exceptionally effective at public colleges and universities. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI No. 9724134)

Chang, T. (2005). Leadership styles of department chairs and faculty utilization of technology. Dissertation Abstracts International (UMI No. 3152254).

Crawford, C., & Gannon Cook, R. (2002). Faculty attitudes towards distance education: Enhancing the support and rewards system for innovative integration of technology within coursework. Paper presented at the 13th International Conference of the Society of Information technology and Teacher education (Nashville, TN, March 18-23). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED471121).

Creech II, F. (2005). Assessing the efficacy of perceived principal leadership frames and teacher satisfaction. Dissertation Abstracts International (UMI No. 3200631).

Davenport, T. (2005). Rethinking the mobile workforce. Retrieved April 15, 2011 from http://www.optimizemag.com/article/showArticle.jhtml?printableArticle=true&ar ticleId=166402970

Frye, T. W., & Lovas, J. C. (1991). Leadership in governance: Creating conditions for successful decision making in the community college. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Gallagher, S., & Palmer, J. (2020). The pandemic pushed universities online. The change was long overdue. Harvard Business Review, September 29, 2020.

Gary, J. (2005). Becoming an E-Learning instructor. Retrieved from http://www.jaygary.com/print_elearn_instructor.shtml

Gmelch, W. H., Roberts, D., Ward, K., and Hirsch, S. (2017). A retrospective view of department chairs: lessons learned. Depar. Chair 28, 1–4. doi: 10.1002/dch.30140

Herzberg, F. (1957). Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh.

Hitt, F. J. (2003). Leadership frame use and job satisfaction of private postsecondary staff. Published dissertation. Argosy University.

Howell, S., Williams, P., & Lindsey, N. (2003, Fall). Thirty-two trends affecting distance education: An informed foundation for strategic planning. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 6(3). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall63/howell63.html

https://hbr.org/2020/09/the-pandemic-pushed-universities-online-the-change-was-long-overdue

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2020.614641/full

Irlbeck, S. A. (2002). Leadership and distance education in higher education: A U.S. perspective. International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 3(2). https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v3i2.91

Johnson, D. F. (2003). Toward a philosophy of online education. In D. G. Brown (Ed.), University of Florida in developing faculty to use technology, programs and strategies to enhance teaching (Chap. 4). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Kanter, R. (1999, Summer). The enduring skills of change leaders. Leader to Leader, 1999(13), 15-22. https://doi.org/10.1002/ltl.40619991305

Kruse, S.D., Hackmann, D.G., and Lindle, J.C. (2020) Academic leadership during a pandemic: Department heads leading with a focus on equity. Front. Educ. 5:614641. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2020.614641

Lee, J. (2001). Instructional support for distance education and faculty motivation, commitment, satisfaction. British Journal of Educational Technology, 32(2), 153–160. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8535.00186

Lee, J. (2002). Faculty and administrator perceptions of instructional support for distance education. International Journal of Instructional Media, 29(1), 27-45. https://search.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/faculty-administrator-perceptions-instructional/docview/204262350/se-2?accountid=27575

Leonard, H. S. (2003). Leadership development for the postindustrial, postmodern information age. Consulting Psychology Journal, 55(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.55.1.3

Liu, L. (2005). A study of university physical education department director leadership behavior and physical education teacher job satisfaction in northern Taiwan. Dissertation Abstracts International (UMI No. 3165943).

Lucas, A. (1994). Strengthening departmental leadership: A team building guide for chairs in colleges and universities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mathis, S. (1999). The relationship of leadership frame use of departmental chairs to faculty job satisfaction as perceived by selected departmental faculty members. Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI No. 9926704)

McCloskey, D. W., & Igbaria, M. (2003). Does "out of sight" mean "out of mind"? An empirical investigation of the career advancement prospects of telecommuters. Information Resources Management Journal, 16, 19–34.

McKee, J. G. (1991). Leadership styles of community college presidents and faculty job satisfaction. Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 15, 33–46.

Meyer, K. A. (2002). Quality in distance education: Focus on online learning (ASHE ERIC High Education Report, Vol. 29, Issue 4). New York: Wiley.

Mohrman, A. M., Cooke, R. A., & Mohrman, S. A. (1978). Participation in decision making: A multi-dimensional perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14(1), 13-29.

Mohrman, A. M., Cooke, R. A., Mohrman, S. A., Duncan, R. B., & Zaltman, G. (1977). An assessment of a structural task approach to organizational development of a school system. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Napier, B. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1993). Distance in organizations. Human Resource Management Review, 3, 321-357.

Nickson, D., & Siddons, S. (2004). Remote working: Linking people and organizations. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

O'Quinn, L., & Corry, M. (2002, Winter). Factors that deter faculty from participating in distance education. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 5(4). Retrieved from http://www.wesga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter54/Quinn54.htm

Olsen, D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. Journal of Higher Education, 64, 453–471. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1993.11778439

Olson, A. M. (1996). The influence of job satisfaction on part-time faculty's commitment to the collegiate function of the community college.

Pahal, D. (1999). Effective leadership: An IT perspective. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration 2(2). Retrieved from: www.westga.edu/~distance/pahal22.html

Parker, A. (2003). Motivation and incentives for distance faculty. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration 6(3). Retrieved from www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall63/parker63.html

Poscente, K. (2004, December). Distance education. CSEG Recorder. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from http://www.cseg.ca/recorder/pdf/2004/12dec/dec04_07.pdf

Puzziferro-Schnitzer, M., & Kissinger J. (2005). Supporting online adjunct faculty: A virtual mentoring program. Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 9(2), 16, Retrieved from http://www.sloanc.org/publications/jaln/v9n2/ v9n2_puzziferro.asp

Russell, C. (2000). Community college academic deans: Leadership frames and stress. UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 9990484) Sample size calculator. Retrieved from http://rogerwimmer.com/samplesizecalculator.htm

Schnitzer, M., & Crosby, L. S. (2003). Recruitment and development of online adjunct instructors. Online Journal of Distance Learning. Retrieved from http://www.westgat.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer62/crosby_schnitzer62.html

Sloan-C, (2005). Growing by Degrees: Online Education in the United States. Retrieved from http://www.sloan-c.org/resoures/survey.asp

Smith, J. M. (2006). From traditional classrooms to online scenarios. Retrieved, from http://adulted.about.com/cs/integratingtech/a/teach_w_tech.htm

Spodark, W. (2003). Five obstacles to technology integration at a small liberal arts university. E Journal, 30, 1-6.

Sullivan, L. G. (2001). Four generations of community college leadership. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25, 559–571.

Tompkins, C. L., Tompkins, B. S., & Batchelder, W. (2002). Creating virtual communities to support online instructors. Retrieved from www.uwex.edu/disted/conference/resource_library/proceedings/02_76.pdf

Vega, G. (2003). Managing teleworkers and telecommuting strategies. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., and Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. Organizat. Sci. 16, 409–421. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1050.0133

Woods, A. M., & Weasmer, J. (2004). Maintaining job satisfaction: Engaging professionals as active participants. The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 7(3), 118-121. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098650409601242

WorldatWork (2013). Survey on Workplace Flexibility 2013. Scottsdale, AZ; Dieringer Research Group.