

Destructive Leadership and Job Satisfaction: An Evidence from higher Education Institutions in Indonesia

Abdullah M. Al-Ansi*

*Faculty of Education, Thamar University, Yemen

*Faculty of Economic and Business, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Email: ebrar.ansi@yahoo.com

Abstract

Destructive leadership (DL) refers to the dark side of leaders' behavior and negative consequences for the employees and organization. This research aims to analyze the role of destructive leadership of higher educational institutions leaders including rectors, faculties' directors, head of departments as perceived by lecturers and other staff about their job satisfaction in Malang city, Indonesia. This research was conducted by adopting quantitative approach and statistics analysis. Sample of research included 580 lecturers and staff who have full-time job at the Islamic universities in Malang city characterized by their gender, qualification, and years of experience. The results of this research reveals low to moderate level in all five different dimensions of destructive leadership, while nine dimensions of lecturers and staff's job satisfaction were revealed between moderate to high. Furthermore, results revealed no significant differences among lecturers in the perceived destructive leadership of universities leaders related to their gender, qualification and years of experience. Regarding to lecturers and staff's job satisfaction, results revealed significant differences based on gender of lecturers and staff in favor for female lecturers and staff, significant differences between qualification level of lecturers and staff in favor for Master or less qualifications, and significant differences among three groups of years of experience related to job satisfaction. Lecturers and staff with 1-5 years of experience have more job satisfaction than other experience level. No significant correlation exists between five dimensions of destructive leadership of universities' higher education leaders and nine dimensions of lecturers and staff' job satisfaction. Finally, this research recommend more awareness for both higher education leaders, lecturers and staff to enhance collaboration between them and lift up the development of higher education reputation and accreditation.

Key words: Destructive leadership; Job satisfaction; Higher education; Pedagogical issues; Indonesia

Introduction

The function of leadership in any business acts as a dynamo, demonstrating the leaders' ability to guide and influence individuals in reaching the business's outcomes and objectives. The topic of this study is disruptive leadership and job happiness. Destructive leadership is defined as "a leader's, supervisor's, or manager's systematic and repeated behavior that undermines and/or disrupts the organization's goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness, as well as the motivation, well-being, or work satisfaction of subordinates" (Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007). Furthermore, destructive leadership is characterized as a longer process in which an individual's job and activities are regularly influenced by their management in an aggressive and/or uncooperative manner (Schyns and Schilling, 2013). Krasikova, Green, and LeBreton (2013) went on to characterize it as volitional conduct. Einarsen et al. (2007) proposed a model for destructive leadership that includes two dimensions: subordinate-oriented behavior and institution-oriented behavior. Tyrannical, Derailed, Supportive-loyal, and Constructive leadership are the four different leadership styles identified by these dimensions. There are two sorts of destructive leader behaviors: passive and active. Unfavorable is a term used by

executives who have largely abdicated their managerial obligations. Individuals who seem to be active in employing punishment, who are egotistical, and who are considered to have more volitional behavior are all deemed to be more volitional (Einarsen et al., 2007).

It may be said "bad is stronger than good" meaning in this topic. This shows that some negative situations tend to have more effects on the person than some positive ones, and bad ones can be overcome with more force (Baumeister et al., 2001).

The results of the quest for both constructive and destructive leadership are mixed. With results such as job happiness, work atmosphere, and personal performance, constructive leadership has more positive relationships than destructive leadership has poor relationships (Fors Brandebo et al., 2016; Schyns and Schilling, 2013). Destructive leadership has a worse association with commitment and emotional weariness than excellent constructive leadership (Fors Brandebo et al., 2016; Schyns and Schilling, 2013). According to Fors Brandebo et al. (2016), constructive leadership has a strong influence on more work-related concepts like attitude toward immediate leaders and work environment, whereas destructive leadership has a strong influence on phenomena with stronger personal meaning like well-being and work turnover.

Individuals' attitudes and behaviors are positively influenced by job satisfaction (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2008). Job satisfaction, according to Hackman and Oldham (1976), is influenced by three psychological attitudes: meaning, accountability for job outputs, and knowledge of accomplishment results. Three functional elements prepare feasibility: variety of abilities, task identity, and task priority. Job satisfaction is influenced by demographic factors such as age, gender, and education (Alpass, Long, Chamberlain, & MacDonald, 1997). As an example, job satisfaction rises with age (Agho, Mueller, & Price, 1993; Lopes, Chambel, Castanheira, & Oliveira-Cruz, 2015).

Destructive leadership has been demonstrated in numerous studies to have a wide range of negative consequences for both individuals and organizations. Subversive leadership will almost certainly result in a slew of bad outcomes. Employees may have more negative opinions about the leader and lower levels of job satisfaction, which can lead to a higher risk of an employee quitting the organization. Furthermore, toxic leaders boost an employee's psychological stress level (Erickson, Shaw, Murray, & Branch, 2015). Some researchers (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006; Hogan & Hogan, 2001) place a premium on destructive leadership disorders like psychopathy, which is linked to alienation and betrayal, while others (Howell & Avolio, 1992) place a premium on behaviors like manipulation, intimidation, and coercion. Other researchers (House & Howell, 1992; O'Connor et al., 1995; Sankowsky, 1995) corroborate the unfavorable results experienced by firms, their employees, and external stakeholders. Destructive leadership, in either instance, leads to unfavorable outcomes.

Employees with leaders that have some harmful tendencies hate their jobs and are more likely to leave, depending on the organizational level. They frequently feel disrespectful toward those who hired them, which can lead to a negative perception of the organization as a whole; they frequently feel depressed about their work lives and that work consumes all of their thoughts and private time; and they frequently feel depressed about their work lives and that work consumes all of their thoughts and private time (Al-Ansi & Rahardjo, 2015; Erickson et al. 2015).

Some academics are focusing on what harmful leaders do at work, such as stress or weariness (Howell & Avolio, 1992; Conger, 1990; Hogan et al., 1990). Furthermore, Conger & Kanungo (1998) describe a set of destructive actions that are frequent among narcissistic leaders, such as ignoring reality, exaggerating personal skills, and ignoring others' viewpoints. Furthermore, Hogan & Kaiser (2005) and Hogan & Hogan (2001) developed 11 personality characteristics that depicted the "dark side," each of which is associated with leader actions that alienate teammates, disrupt other teams, and so impair group performance.

When CEOs purposefully cause problems for their workforce, whether internal or external stakeholders, or even social structures, this is known as organizational destructive commerce (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005; Kaiser & Hogan, 2007). According to the literature, constructive leadership has a major impact on job satisfaction, whereas destructive leadership has the opposite effect (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Leaders have a big impact on how employees feel and regard their jobs. In their studies, Albus et al. (1997) and Judge & Piccolo (2004) both highlighted the favorable association between leadership and job satisfaction.

Despite the fact that many previous studies have been undertaken in the field of leadership, there are few studies that deal with destructive leadership and work satisfaction in the higher education sector. This study looks into higher education leaders' disruptive leadership and how it affects lecturers' and staff's job satisfaction, as perceived by lecturers and staff in Malang.

Research Significance

This research has important reasons due to the time of pandemic. This research examines the destructive leadership behavior on job satisfaction of subordinates in higher education organizations in Indonesia. The results of this research will contribute to the knowledge of leadership behavior and destructive leadership and its impact on the job satisfaction of employees, thus showing the background that will help achieve job satisfaction among employees.

This data will also help leaders understand how leadership affects job satisfaction and job satisfaction for lecturers in educational institutions. Research may also suggest areas that require additional research in disruptive leadership and employee job satisfaction. These results are also expected to improve the way educational institutions operate and the leadership of leaders.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

A survey of the related literature in Indonesian Islamic educational institutions indicated rareness of researches exploring the relationships among the destructive leadership of higher education leaders and its relation to lecturers and staff's job satisfaction as perceived by lecturers and staff in Islamic educational institutions in Malang city. Second, analyzing the significant differences among lecturers and staff in Indonesian Islamic higher education institutions based on their gender, qualifications, and years of experience.

The investigation attempted to achieve objectives and answer research's questions:

- RQ1. How do lecturers and staff at Islamic higher education institutions in Malang city perceive the destructive leadership of higher education leaders'?
- RQ2: How do lecturers and staff of Islamic higher education institutions in Malang city perceive their job satisfaction?
- RQ3: Do the destructive leadership of higher education leaders differ based on lecturers and staff's demographic characteristics?
- RQ4: Do lecturers and staff's job satisfaction differ based on their demographics (gender, qualifications, and years of experience)?
- RQ5: Do there significant relationships between the destructive leadership of higher education leaders and job satisfaction as perceived by lecturers and staff?

These questions were rewritten as the following hypotheses:

- H1. Lecturers and staff of Islamic educational institutions have positive perception of leadership behavior of higher education leaders.
- H2. Lecturers and staff of Islamic higher education institutions in Malang city have positive perception of their job satisfaction.
- H3. Destructive leadership of higher education leaders differs based on lecturers and staff's demographic characteristics.
- H4. Lecturers and staff's job satisfaction differs based on their demographics (gender, qualifications, and years of experience).
- H5. There is significant relationship between destructive leadership of higher education leaders and job satisfaction of lecturers and staff.

Methodology

Research Design and context

This research uses a quantitative approach by conducting questionnaires through utilizing the relationships between the destructive leadership of higher education leaders' and job satisfaction as perceived by lecturers and staff of Islamic educational institutions in Malang city, Indonesia. In addition, do lecturers and staff differ regarding to their gender, qualifications, and years of experience.

Participants

The participants of this research include both lecturers and staff who are permanently part of Malang Islamic educational institutions during second semester of academic year 2020/2021. There are three Islamic higher education universities in Malang city namely: UIN-Malang, UMM and UNISMA. Questionnaires were developed and administrated to 580 lecturers and staff (no leaders were included: rectors, deans and head of departments) where sample included both Females = 320 and Males = 260 participants. To fulfill the purpose of this research, stratified random sampling was conducted representing (580) lecturers and staff (F= 320, M= 260) based on lecturers and staff's gender, qualification (Doctorate degree = 265, Master or less studies = 315, and years of experience (1 to 5 = 215, among 5 to 10 = 230, and over 10 = 135).

Instrumentations

The instrumentations used for the survey part developed by the researcher based on different studies at the field. Destructive leadership behaviors: A developed questionnaire depends on researchers work like Larsson et al. (2012). The questionnaire included 20-items, with five factors with four items in each: (1) conceited, inequitable; (2) impediment, over-demands; (3) selfish, pseudo (4) unfavorable, funky; and (5) mysterious, ambiguous. The used scale on all items ranged from (1) Never to (5) always.

Job satisfaction: a suitable questionnaire was developed by researcher based on the studies in the field. A questionnaire was developed by Spector (1994) to measure job satisfaction. The job

satisfaction is a self-report instrument that is designed to measure employee attitudes about the job itself and various aspects of the job (Spector, 1985). The instrument is comprised of 36 items that are divided into to nine facets to include (a) remuneration, (b) promotion, (c) supervision, (d) marginal benefits, (e) Emergency Rewards, (f) operating regulations, (g) Team-mates, (h) work nature, and (i) communication. This instrumental tool has been tested and retested through multiple organizations that range from education to retail (Thomas, 2014). This instrument adopted 5-point Likert response scale that ranges from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Validity and Reliability

To ensure the validity of the measurement tools in this research (to prove sincerity), questions were asked to a group of experts in educational administration, research, evaluation and educational measurement in the three universities. They were asked to check whether the phrases in the tool were clear and appropriately related to the research problem. Based on the comments of experts, some language-related revisions have been made to the tools.

As for the reliability of the tools in this research, an internal consistency procedure (to estimate consistency across items) was used. A pilot study was conducted on 20 participants. These participants did not participate in the final research. The instructions were clear and all elements of the tool were working properly. The alpha values (internal consistency coefficient) for the dimensions of the Destructive Driving Behaviors tool were as follows: The questionnaire consisted of five factors with four items in each: (1) conceited Cronbach's alpha: 0.72; (2) impendent, over-demands, Cronbach Alpha: 0.74; (3) Selfish, pseudo-, Cronbach's alpha: 0.76; (4) unfavorable, funky, Cronbach alpha: 0.83; and (5) mysterious, ambiguous, Cronbach alpha: .89.

For the alpha value (internal consistency coefficient) for the dimensions of the job satisfaction questionnaire: payment or remuneration = 0.77, promotion = 0.81, supervision = 0.84, marginal benefits = 0.83, contingency bonuses = 0.83, emergency regulations = 0.87, teammates = 0.79, nature of work = 0.78, contact = 0.86. The previous values can be considered reasonably satisfactory to achieve the objectives of the current research.

In addition, the researcher used Breslin's (1970) reverse translation method to convert the questionnaire from English to Indonesian. The original English version was first translated into Indonesian by a professional translator. The Indonesian version was then translated back into English by another native speaker who was not familiar with the original. The two versions of the identified discrepancies were then compared and discussed, and improvements were made to the Indonesian version.

Data Collection and Analysis

After meeting with the representatives of three universities and obtaining permission to conduct this research. A message with a link from google drive was sent to the emails and application to all lecturers and staff at three universities. 1,109 emails were sent, and 762 google driver responses were received. Only 580 questionnaires were answered and fully accepted, while the other 178 responses were incomplete or inadequate.

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for data analysis. Descriptive statistics were performed to analyze means, standard deviations and ANOVA analysis were calculated for the research questions. For cut-off points, the response scale for each item ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always) will be defined as: 1-2.33 = low, 2.34 to 3.67 = medium, and 3.68-5.00 = high. Correlation analysis was performed to determine the significance of the relationship between leadership behaviors in higher education for leaders and job satisfaction as seen by lecturers and staff.

Results and Hypotheses Testing

Universities' characteristics

Among 84 universities in Malang city, there are three famous universities are considered as Islamic universities and categorized under ministry of religious affairs. As private or half-private universities, leadership behavior appears significant and employee's job satisfaction expected to be higher compare to the public sector universities. Table I demonstrated the demographics of employees including leaders, directors, lecturers and staff.

Table I: Demographics of Islamic Universities in Malang city

No.	University	Faculty Member and staff	Gender		Qualifications		Years of Experience		
			M	F	Ph.D.	Master or less	5	10	<
1.	UIN-Malang	586	342	244	130	456	213	220	153
2.	UMM	629	335	294	109	520	198	254	186

3.	UNISMA	342	187	155	88	254	146	132	64
4.	Total	1557	864	693	327	1232	557	606	403

Hypotheses Testing

H1: Lecturers and staff of Islamic educational institutions have positive perception of leadership behavior of higher education leaders.

Means and standard deviations for the lecturers and staff perceived destructive leadership of higher education leaders in Indonesian higher education institutions were measured for each dimension: conceited, inequitable (M=1.34, SD=.323) with low-level perception, impediment, punishments, over demands (M=1.26, SD=.370) with low-level perception, selfish, pseudo (M=1.44, SD=.299) with low-level perception, unfavorable, funky (M=2.65, SD=.375) with moderate-level perception, and mysterious, ambiguous, messy (M=2.51, SD=.357) with moderate-level perception. The destructive leadership behavior of higher education leaders at higher education as perceived by lecturers and staff was in total (M=1.84, SD=.193) with low-level perception as presented in Table II.

Mean for the lecturers perceived destructive leadership behavior of higher education leaders was low to moderate which reflects that hypotheses one is accepted. Leader's behavior of higher education universities was positive due to the low level of destructive leadership factors.

Table II: Descriptive Statistics for lecturers and perceived destructive leadership behavior

DL Factors	Mean	SD	Level
conceited	1.34	.323	Low
impudent, over-demands	1.26	.370	Low
selfish, pseudo	1.44	.299	Low
unfavorable, funky	2.65	.375	Moderate
mysterious, ambiguous	2.51	.357	Moderate
Total	1.84	.193	Low

H2: Lecturers and staff of Islamic higher education institutions have positive perception of their job satisfaction.

The means and standard deviations for the lecturers and staff perceived their job satisfaction at Islamic higher education institutions were measured. The job satisfaction as perceived by lecturers and staff as total (M=3.71, SD=.658) with high-level perception, as presented in Table III. The following dimensions were coming in high-level: pay-pay or remuneration (M=3.79, SD=.707), promotion-opportunities for promotion (M=3.91, SD=.781), supervision-immediate supervisor (M=3.83, SD=.742), and Ancillary benefits - cash and non-monetary ancillary benefits (M=3.86, SD=.688), while the following dimensions were coming in moderate level: Emergency Rewards (M=3.57, SD=.851), contingent regulations (M=3.60, SD=.765), Team-mates (M=3.67, SD=.932), work nature (M=3.62, SD=.870), and communication (M=3.53, SD=.829).

Means and Standard Deviation (SD) for job satisfaction of lecturers in Islamic higher education was moderate to high and this prove the second hypothesis of this research.

Table III: Descriptive Statistics of Lecturers and Staff's perception of Job Satisfaction

	Mean	SD	Level
Remuneration	3.79	.707	High
Promotion	3.91	.781	High
Supervision	3.83	.742	High
Ancillary benefits	3.86	.688	High
Emergency rewards	3.57	.851	Moderate
Contingent regulations	3.60	.765	Moderate
Team-mates	3.67	.932	Moderate
work nature	3.62	.870	Moderate
Communicating	3.53	.829	Moderate
Total	3.71	.658	High

Destructive Leadership and Demographic Characteristics

H3: Destructive leadership of higher education leaders differs based on lecturers and staff's demographic characteristics.

Destructive Leadership based on Gender

Perception of gender differences among lecturers and staff was tested by using T-test through the mean of each category. Related to gender; table IV shows that there were no significant differences between male and female lecturers and staff in their perception of destructive leadership of higher education leaders.

Gender privilege was measured through t-test including average and SD for the difference in the perceived destructive leadership of higher education leaders shows no significant difference and that leads to reject hypothesis three in case of Gender. That means that the female and male lecturers and staff receive the same treatment by leaders of higher education institutions.

Table IV: Destructive Leadership based on Gender

DL factors	Gender	n	Means	SD	T	P
conceited, inequitable	M	260	1.34	.332	.535	.593
	F	320	1.33	.310		
impediment, over-demands	M	260	1.26	.375	.070	.944
	F	320	1.26	.364		
selfish, pseudo	M	260	1.45	.305	1.304	.193
	F	320	1.41	.291		
unfavorable, funky	M	260	1.66	.393	1.102	.271
	F	320	1.62	.348		
mysterious, ambiguous	M	260	1.51	.355	.042	.966
	F	320	1.51	.361		
Total	M	260	1.44	.198	.995	.320
	F	320	1.43	.186		

Destructive Leadership based on Qualifications

Continuing same approach, by using t-test to test the degree of difference in means between lecturers and staff perceived. Related to their "qualifications"; Table V shows that there were no significant differences between "qualification" of lecturers and staff in the perceived destructive leadership of higher education leaders.

The following table shows the means and SD for lecturers and staff's "qualifications" in the perceived destructive leadership of higher education leaders which leads to reject the third hypothesis. There are no difference of leaders' behavior towards employees based on their qualifications.

Table V: Destructive Leadership based on Qualifications

DL Factors	Education	n	Means	SD	T	P
conceited, inequitable	Doctorate	265	1.35	.328	.678	.498
	MS or less	315	1.33	.317		
impediment, over-demands	Doctorate	265	1.27	.376	.773	.440
	MS or less	315	1.25	.363		
selfish, pseudo	Doctorate	265	1.45	.294	1.018	.309
	MS or less	315	1.42	.305		
unfavorable, funky	Doctorate	265	1.65	.348	.271	.786
	MS or less	315	1.64	.403		
mysterious, ambiguous	Doctorate	265	1.51	.387	.451	.652
	MS or less	315	1.50	.321		
Total	Doctorate	265	1.45	.191	1.106	.269
	MS or less	315	1.43	.196		

Destructive Leadership based on Years of Experience

Related to lecturers and staff's years of experience; Table VI shows mean and standard deviation of dimensions for perceived destructive leadership of higher education leaders regarding to lecturers and staff's "years of experience". Results show low perception of destructive leadership behavior of higher education's leaders.

Table VI: Descriptive Statistics for Years of Experience

Dimensions	Teaching experience	N	Mean	SD
conceited, inequitable	> 5	215	1.31	.329
	5 to10	230	1.32	.285

	10 <	135	1.39	.345
	Total	580	1.34	.323
impediment, over-demands	> 5	215	1.23	.364
	5 to10	230	1.26	.360
	10 <	135	1.29	.387
	Total	580	1.26	.370
selfish, pseudo	> 5	215	1.43	.323
	5 to10	230	1.44	.279
	10 <	135	1.42	.286
	Total	580	1.43	.299
unfavorable, funky	> 5	215	1.68	.412
	5 to10	230	1.61	.320
	10 <	135	1.63	.369
	Total	580	1.65	.375
mysterious, ambiguous	> 5	215	1.51	.364
	5 to10	230	1.50	.335
	10 <	135	1.50	.372
	Total	580	1.51	.357
Total	> 5	215	1.43	.203
	5 to10	230	1.43	.172
	10 <	135	1.45	.201
	Total	580	1.44	.193

Three-Way ANOVA shows the difference among the lecturers in the perceived destructive leadership of higher education leaders related to years of experience. By using three-way ANOVA variance analysis, as shown in the Table VII, that explaining that no significant difference among these three groups based on the experiences perceived by lecturers and staff. This result reject hypothesis number three of this research.

Table VII: Destructive Leadership based on Years of Experience

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
conceited, inequitable	BG	.553	2	.276	2.664	.071
	WG	47.938	577	.104		
	Total	48.491	579			
impediment, over-demands	BG	.287	2	.144	1.049	.351
	WG	63.247	577	.137		
	Total	63.534	579			
selfish, pseudo	BG	.027	2	.013	.149	.862
	WG	41.727	577	.090		
	Total	41.753	579			
unfavorable, funky	BG	.422	2	.211	1.501	.224
	WG	64.890	577	.140		
	Total	65.311	579			
mysterious, ambiguous	BG	.011	2	.006	.044	.957
	WG	59.355	577	.128		
	Total	59.366	579			
Total	BG	.033	2	.016	.438	.645
	WG	17.381	577	.038		
	Total	17.414	579			

Job Satisfaction and Demographic Characteristics

H4: Lecturers and staff's job satisfaction differs based on their demographics (gender, qualifications, and years of experience).

Job Satisfaction based on Gender

Gender difference of employees' satisfaction was determined by using t-test to test the means differences among lecturers and staff. Related to gender; Table VIII represent the significant differences among gender of lecturers and staff in their job satisfaction in favor for female lecturers and staff as it showed in means of dimensions of job satisfaction.

These results prove hypothesis number 4 of this research which indicate that there is difference between lecturers and staff based on their gender in their job satisfaction.

Table VIII: T-test of Job Satisfaction based on Gender

Dimensions	Gender	n	Means	SD	t	P
Remuneration	M	260	3.63	.635	-5.680	.000
	F	320	4.01	.744		
Promotion	M	260	3.71	.790	-7.115	.000
	F	320	4.20	.676		
Supervision	M	260	3.66	.786	-6.485	.000
	F	320	4.08	.600		
Marginal benefits	M	260	3.72	.689	-5.392	.000
	F	320	4.06	.640		
Emergency Rewards	M	260	3.36	.805	-6.712	.000
	F	320	3.87	.824		
Contingent regulations	M	260	3.40	.731	-6.882	.000
	F	320	3.87	.726		
Team-mates	M	260	3.37	.942	-8.916	.000
	F	320	4.07	.748		
Work nature	M	260	3.37	.909	-8.297	.000
	F	320	3.97	.670		
Communication	M	260	3.31	.799	-7.138	.000
	F	320	3.83	.774		
Total	M	260	3.50	.654	-8.806	.000
	F	320	4.00	.549		

Job Satisfaction based on Qualifications

Through testing mean and SD, we follow the same approach to do t-test was used to determine the differences based on "qualifications" lecturers and staff. Table IX shows the significance of differences among "qualifications" of lecturers and staff in their job satisfaction in favor for "Master or less qualifications". This result don't reject hypothesis number 4 of this research.

Table IX: T-test of Job Satisfaction based on Qualifications

	Qualifications	n	Means	SD	t	p
Remuneration	Ph.D.	265	3.67	.659	-3.814	.000
	Master or less	315	3.92	.736		
Promotion	Ph.D.	265	3.77	.794	-4.379	.000
	Master or less	315	4.08	.734		
Supervision	Ph.D.	265	3.69	.779	-4.705	.000
	Master or less	315	4.00	.663		
Marginal benefits	Ph.D.	265	3.73	.694	-4.630	.000
	Master or less	315	4.02	.650		
Emergency Rewards	Ph.D.	265	3.38	.824	-5.432	.000
	Master or less	315	3.79	.829		
Contingent regulations	Ph.D.	265	3.42	.740	-5.579	.000
	Master or less	315	3.80	.742		
Team-mates	Ph.D.	265	3.42	.956	-6.286	.000
	Master or less	315	3.94	.823		
Work nature	Ph.D.	265	3.40	.919	-6.097	.000
	Master or less	315	3.87	.738		
Communication	Ph.D.	265	3.33	.811	-5.459	.000
	Master or less	315	3.74	.798		
Total	Ph.D.	265	3.53	.665	-6.401	.000
	Master or less	315	3.91	.594		

Job Satisfaction based on Years of experience

Related to the lecturers and staff "years of experience"; Table X shows the mean and standard deviation of dimensions for job satisfaction regarding to lecturers and staff "years of experience". Results show that lecturers and staff with less experience are more satisfied than other with long experience. The more are the years of experience, the less are the satisfactions of employees in some dimensions of job satisfaction. Furthermore, these results are acting like a curve, satisfaction at the beginning of career, decrease with time to middle of career then increase of satisfaction again with long term experiences.

Table X: Descriptive Statistics of Job Satisfaction and Year of Experience

Dimensions	Years of experience	N	Mean	SD
Remuneration	> 5	215	4.17	.772
	5 to10	230	3.56	.565
	10 <	135	3.47	.428
	Total	580	3.79	.707
Promotion	> 5	215	4.33	.576
	5 to10	230	3.69	.739
	10 <	135	3.55	.802
	Total	580	3.91	.781
Supervision	> 5	215	4.12	.605
	5 to10	230	3.60	.540
	10 <	135	3.66	.942
	Total	580	3.83	.742
Marginal benefits	> 5	215	4.14	.605
	5 to10	230	3.38	.554
	10 <	135	3.98	.663
	Total	580	3.86	.688
Emergency Rewards	> 5	215	4.00	.893
	5 to10	230	3.38	.751
	10 <	135	3.17	.577
	Total	580	3.57	.851
Contingent regulations	> 5	215	3.89	.838
	5 to10	230	3.22	.487
	10 <	135	3.57	.716
	Total	580	3.60	.765
Team-mates	> 5	215	4.10	.714
	5 to10	230	3.26	.698
	10 <	135	3.47	1.148
	Total	580	3.67	.932
Work nature	> 5	215	4.07	.760
	5 to10	230	3.37	.616
	10 <	135	3.24	.958
	Total	580	3.62	.870
Communication	> 5	215	3.86	.918
	5 to10	230	3.23	.570
	10 <	135	3.36	.758
	Total	580	3.53	.829
Total	> 5	215	4.08	.622
	5 to10	230	3.41	.435
	10 <	135	3.50	.654
	Total	580	3.71	.658

Regarding (1 to 5) years "years of experience" toward job satisfaction (M=4.08) differ significantly from (5 to10) years "teaching experience" (M= 3.41) at $p=.00$ and (10 and over) years of "years of experience" (M=3.50). This means that lecturers and staff with 1-5 years of "years of experience" have more job satisfaction than other "years of experience" level of lecturers and staff.

By using ANOVA variance analysis as can be observed in Table XI, it shows that there are significant differences between the three groups of lecturers and staff in based on their years of experience. Three-Way ANOVA, shows the difference among the lecturers and staff in their job satisfaction related to their "years of experience". These results don't reject the hypothesis number 4 in this research.

Table XI: Variance Analysis of Years of Experience and Job Satisfaction

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Remuneration	BG	49.483	2	24.742	62.623	.000
	WG	182.531	577	.395		
	Total	232.015	579			
Promotion	BG	58.703	2	29.351	60.363	.000
	WG	224.648	577	.486		

	Total	283.351	579			
Supervision	BG	27.368	2	13.684		
	WG	228.696	577	.495	27.644	.000
	Total	256.064	579			
Marginal benefits	BG	48.975	2	24.488		
	WG	171.019	577	.370	66.152	.000
	Total	219.995	579			
Emergency Rewards	BG	61.829	2	30.915		
	WG	274.829	577	.595	51.969	.000
	Total	336.658	579			
Contingent regulations	BG	36.252	2	18.126		
	WG	235.418	577	.510	35.572	.000
	Total	271.670	579			
Team-mates	BG	62.667	2	31.334		
	WG	340.397	577	.737	42.527	.000
	Total	403.064	579			
Work nature	BG	66.399	2	33.200		
	WG	285.116	577	.617	53.797	.000
	Total	351.516	579			
Communication	BG	37.028	2	18.514		
	WG	282.409	577	.611	30.288	.000
	Total	319.437	579			
Total	BG	44.190	2	22.095		
	WG	157.273	577	.340	64.905	.000
	Total	201.463	579			

Relationship between Variables in Higher Education

H5: There is significant relationship between destructive leadership of higher education leaders and job satisfaction of lecturers and staff.

Table XII displays the correlation matrix between the destructive leadership of higher education leaders and job satisfaction as perceived by lecturers and staff. The results of the Pearson Correlational analysis revealed that negative relationship but no significant correlation exists between five dimensions of destructive leadership of higher education leaders and nine dimensions of lecturers and staff's job satisfaction. This result show that there is negative relationship but this relationship is insignificant which reject the fifth hypothesis of this research.

Table XII: Pearson Correlations among Destructive Leadership Dimensions of school higher education leaders and job satisfaction as perceived by lecturers and staff

	Conceited, inequitable	impediment, over-demands	selfish, pseudo	unfavorable, funky	mysterious, ambiguous,	Total
Remuneration	-0.098	-0.048	-0.031	-0.061	-0.085	-0.049
Promotion	-0.059	-0.033	-0.003	-0.067	-0.049	-0.026
Supervision	-0.021	-0.038	-0.026	-0.109	-0.015	-0.018
Marginal benefits	-0.046	-0.004	-0.005	.058	-0.045	-0.018
Emergency Rewards	-0.043	-0.045	-0.018	-0.061	-0.003	-0.001
Contingent regulations	-0.046	-0.043	-0.027	-0.082	-0.003	-0.009
Team-mates	-0.024	-0.044	-0.018	-0.069	-0.027	-0.014
Work nature	-0.047	-0.047	-0.019	-0.072	-0.003	-0.013
Communication	-0.045	-0.031	-0.002	-0.063	-0.036	-0.015
Total	-0.046	-0.045	-0.007	-0.086	-0.030	-0.012

Discussion and Conclusion

To conclude, this research contribute to literature on the relationship of destructive leadership and job satisfaction on higher education. Furthermore, detailed and specific understanding of destructive leadership's dimensions and their interactions with nine different dimensions of job satisfaction were effectively revealed in higher education.

Finding Discussion

The present research examined the relationships between the destructive leadership of higher education leaders and job satisfaction as perceived by lecturers and staff. All dimensions of destructive leadership were in low level: conceited, inequitable, impediment, punishments, over demands, selfish, pseudo, unfavorable, funky, and mysterious, ambiguous, messy. All dimensions of lecturers and staff's job satisfaction were in moderate and high level: The following were coming in high-level: pay-pay or remuneration, promotion-opportunities for promotion, supervision-immediate supervisor, and marginal benefits-monetary and non-monetary marginal benefits, and the following were coming in moderate level: Emergency Rewards, contingent regulations, Team-mates, work nature, and communication. These results were consistent with most previous research but not in details as in this research (Al-Ansi, et. al, 2015; Brandebo, et. al, 2019).

No significant differences between male and female lecturers and staff in the perceived destructive leadership of higher education leaders. No significant differences between "qualifications" of lecturers and staff in the perceived destructive leadership of higher education leaders and there were no significant differences among the three groups of lecturers and staff and in "years of experience" variable.

There were significant differences between male and female lecturers and staff in their job satisfaction in favor for female lecturers and staff as it showed in Means of dimensions of job satisfaction, that there were significant differences between "education" lecturers in their job satisfaction in favor for "Master or less education". These results are unique and have no pervious references.

Finally, no significant correlation exists between five dimensions of destructive leadership of higher education leaders and nine dimensions of lecturers and staff' job satisfaction. It is important to point out that the correlation was not significant. It is possible, however, that the five destructive leadership behavior selected for the present research are not the ones that affected lecturers and staff's job satisfaction. Pervious works have proved this negative and insignificant relationship (Skogstad, et. al, 2015; Schyns & Schilling 2013).

Conclusion

The results of the current research provide an important evidence of the field of leadership and job satisfaction studies. In addition, these results help addressing the limitation of some researches on disruptive leadership and its relationship to job satisfaction. These data could be helpful individuals improve leader-follower relationships through increased training in the practice of avoiding destructive leadership behaviors associated with follower job satisfaction. Promoting destructive leadership on a global scale will enable more leaders to realize the disadvantages of using destructive leadership behaviors to lead their organizations, build job satisfaction among their followers, and increase their job satisfaction.

Implications for practice

The findings presented here are immediate actions from both key research stakeholders and scholars in the area of disruptive leadership behavior and job satisfaction. In light of data indicating that administrators within the educational system responsible for leadership training would benefit from providing training in leaders of higher education institutions. This training can improve the leadership behavior of the officials which may in turn increase the job satisfaction of their employees. Moreover, this research revealed in detail a detailed perception of employee satisfaction based on demographics including gender, qualifications and years of experience. It gives a deep understanding of the interaction between the dimensions of destructive leadership and the different dimensions of job satisfaction.

Recommendations for future research

Regarding destructive leadership and job satisfaction more studies are needed. There is need for conducting similar studies of destructive leadership including different factors and sectors to enrich the theories and evidence from different regions. Qualitative studies are more recommended to deepen these outcome and understand the reasons and consequences beyond such theories.

References

- Agho, A. O., Mueller, C. W., & Price, J. L. (1993). Determinants of employee job satisfaction: An empirical test of a causal model. *Human Relations*, 46(8), 1007–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600806>
- Alpass, F., Long, N., Chamberlain, K., & MacDonald, C. (1997). Job satisfaction differences between military and ex-military personnel: The role of demographic and organizational variables. *Military Psychology*, 9(3), 227–249.
- Al-Ansi, A. M., Rahardjo, K., & Prasetya, A. (2015). Analysis impact of leadership style and pay fairness on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 17(3), 76-82.

- Al-Ansi, A. M., Suprayogo, I., & Abidin, M. (2019). Impact of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) on different settings of learning process in developing countries. *Science and Technology*, 9(2), 19-28.
<https://doi.org/10.5923/j.scit.20190902.01>
- Al-Ansi, A. M. (2021). Students Anxiety and Recruitment during COVID-19 Pandemic: Role of University, Specialization and Employment Expectation. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania– Perspectives of Science and Education*, 49(1), 404-413.
<https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2021.1.27>
- Al-Ansi, A. M., & Al-Ansi, A. (2020). Future of Education Post Covid-19 Pandemic: Reviewing Changes in Learning Environments and Latest Trends. *Solid State Technology*, 63(6), 201584-201600.
<http://solidstatetechnology.us/index.php/JSST/article/view/8792>
- Al-Ansi, Abdullah M. (2017). "Reforming Education System in Developing Countries." *International Journal of Education and Research*, Vol. 5 No. 7 July.
<http://www.ijern.com/journal/2017/July-2017/25.pdf>
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. E. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 5(4), 323–370.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.5.4.323>
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185-216.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/135910457000100301>
- Conger, J. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19, 44–55.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90070-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90070-6)
- Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207–216.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002>
- Erickson, A.; Shaw, B.; Murray, J.; & Branch, S. (2015). Destructive leadership: Causes, consequences and countermeasures. *Organizational Dynamics*,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2015.09.003>
- Fors Brandebo, M., Nilsson, S., & Larsson, G. (2016). Leadership: Is bad stronger than good? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37(6), 690–710.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-09-2014-0191>
- Fors Brandebo, M., Österberg, J., & Berglund, A. K. (2019). The impact of constructive and destructive leadership on soldier's job satisfaction. *Psychological reports*, 122(3), 1068-1086.
- Garad, A., Al-Ansi, A. M., & Qamari, I. N. (2021). The role of e-learning infrastructure and cognitive competence in distance learning effectiveness during the covid-19 pandemic. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 40(1).
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250–279.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00162>
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2), 169–180.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.169>
- Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K. Clark, & M. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343–354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- House, R., & Howell, J. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 81–108.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(92\)90028-E](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(92)90028-E)
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*, 6(2), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.5580/ame.1992.4274395>
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>
- Kaiser, R. B., & Hogan, R. (2007). The dark side of discretion: Leader personality and organizational decline. In R. Hooijberg, J. Hunt, J. Antonakis, & K. Boal (Eds.), *Being there even when you are not: Leading through strategy, systems and structures*, Monographs in leadership and management, Vol. 4. (pp. 177–197) London: Elsevier Science.
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2008). *Organizational behavior* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Larsson, G., Fors Brandebo, M., & Nilsson, S. (2012). Destruo-L: Development of a short scale designed to measure destructive leadership behaviors in a military context. *Leadership &*

- Organization Development Journal*, 33(4), 383–400.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731211229313>
- Lopes, S., Chambel, M. J., Castanheira, F., & Oliveira-Cruz, F. (2015). Measuring job satisfaction in Portuguese military sergeants and officers: Validation of the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General Scale. *Military Psychology*, 27(1), 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mil0000060>
- O'Connor, J., Mumford, M., Clifton, T., Gessner, T., & Connelly, M. (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: An historiometric research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 529–555.
- Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 617–633. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leafqua.2006.10.005>
- Sankowsky, D. (1995). The charismatic leader as a narcissist: Understanding the abuse of power. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23, 57–71.
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leafqua.2012.09.001>
- Skogstad, A., Aasland, M. S., Nielsen, M. B., Hetland, J., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2015). The relative effects of constructive, laissez-faire, and tyrannical leadership on subordinate job satisfaction. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*.
- Spector, P. (1994). Job satisfaction survey. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.
- Thomas, S. (2014). The effects of leadership behavior on new Lecturers' overall job satisfaction. Doctoral dissertation, Walden University.

