



## Leadership Styles, Work Motivation, and Job Satisfaction

**Jumar P. Dolor**, Naga College Foundation, Inc., Naga City, 2025  
**Fausto C. Romero, Jr.**, Naga College Foundation, Inc., Naga City, 2025

**Abstract** - This study examined the influence of leadership styles and work motivation on job satisfaction among faculty members at Naga College Foundation, Inc. for Academic Year 2024–2025. Specifically, it assessed the level of leadership styles, the quality of work motivation, and the extent of job satisfaction among faculty; determined the significant relationships between leadership styles and both motivation and job satisfaction; and explored the extent to which leadership styles influence work motivation and job satisfaction. A faculty development program was also proposed to enhance institutional leadership capacity, motivation, and satisfaction. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected from 113 faculty respondents through a researcher-made questionnaire. Statistical tools included weighted mean, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, and Coefficient of Determination ( $r^2$ ). Findings revealed that leadership styles (AWM = 3.75), work motivation (AWM = 3.81), and job satisfaction (AWM = 3.80) were rated highly. Strong, significant correlations were identified between leadership styles and work motivation ( $r = 0.90$ – $0.99$ ), and between leadership styles and various dimensions of job satisfaction—including organizational culture, work-life balance, autonomy, and recognition. Visionary, servant, transactional, and autocratic leadership styles showed varied but significant influences across domains such as goal alignment, professional development, peer collaboration, and curriculum development ( $r^2 = 81$ – $99\%$ ). These findings informed the development of a faculty enhancement program designed to cultivate effective leadership, elevate motivation, and sustain faculty satisfaction. The study concludes that leadership styles significantly affect faculty motivation and job satisfaction, highlighting the importance of targeted leadership development in fostering high-performing academic environments.

**Keywords** - Leadership Styles, Work Motivation, and Job Satisfaction

### INTRODUCTION

Leadership styles play a pivotal role in determining organizational success, yet each style presents inherent challenges. Visionary leaders, who are driven by crafting a compelling future direction, often struggle to reconcile aspirational thinking with concrete implementation. Leaders who prioritize intellectual stimulation promote creativity and innovation, but they may find it difficult to sustain a consistently stimulating environment. Likewise, leadership that emphasizes individualized consideration, while fostering a personal approach to team dynamics, risks diluting

team cohesion. Adapting leadership styles to align with organizational goals and mitigate potential conflicts—such as misaligned team dynamics or ambiguous boundaries—is essential for fostering effective leadership.

Work motivation remains a persistent organizational challenge, necessitating a balanced integration of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors. While intrinsic motivators—such as personal fulfillment and purpose—stimulate internal drive, extrinsic incentives like promotions and salary increments provide vital reinforcement.

However, motivation cannot rely solely on tangible rewards. Organizations must cultivate environments that are engaging, purposeful, and aligned with employees' values to ensure sustained productivity. Conflicts arising from mismatches in leadership styles can disrupt team cohesion, affecting both individual and organizational development.

Job satisfaction is another critical determinant of institutional success, particularly in educational settings. It influences both faculty well-being and institutional performance. Factors such as recognition, compensation, administrative responsiveness, collegiality, and equity profoundly affect faculty satisfaction. Delayed decision-making, inadequate compensation, or experiences of discrimination can diminish morale. Addressing these issues through supportive leadership, fair incentives, and positive organizational culture is crucial to enhancing retention and productivity.

According to Muwaffaq et al. (2020), the effectiveness of an organization depends heavily on the creativity and engagement of its human capital, where leadership plays a central role in shaping motivation and performance. Transformational leadership, defined by its focus on vision, charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration, is particularly influential. The organizational environment—comprised of culture, interpersonal relationships, and physical conditions—also directly affects job satisfaction. This satisfaction mediates the relationship between leadership and employee performance, highlighting the importance of nurturing leadership and environmental factors in parallel.

In a study by Priarso et al. (2019) conducted at PT. Gynura Consulindo, transformational leadership, work motivation, and work environment were identified as key variables influencing job satisfaction, which in turn significantly impacted employee performance. The study emphasized the mediating role of job satisfaction in linking leadership and motivation to performance outcomes.

This study aligns with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth, particularly Target 8.5, which commits to achieving “full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men... and equal pay for work of equal

value” by 2030. Effective leadership, motivation, and satisfaction not only foster productivity and reduce turnover but also uphold the principles of equity, opportunity, and dignity in the workplace—principles central to SDG 8.5.

In the Philippine context, Santos et al. (2021) examined how organizational culture affects faculty performance and satisfaction in higher education. Their findings underscore the role of supportive leadership, open communication, and collegial collaboration in fostering high job satisfaction and faculty engagement. Similarly, Cabayag and Guhao (2024) studied public school teachers in Region XI, revealing significant relationships among self-efficacy, job performance, and transformational leadership. These relationships were shown to directly influence organizational commitment, particularly through affective commitment and a positive school climate. Their study recommended policy reforms focused on professional development, workload management, and enhanced faculty benefits.

At Naga College Foundation, Inc. (NCF), faculty members demonstrate high levels of work engagement, yet gaps in performance and role clarity remain. Issues such as unclear titles and ranks, as well as dissatisfaction with the compensation package—especially during pay periods—highlight systemic challenges. These gaps necessitate the implementation of transformational leadership, enhanced motivational strategies, and an improved work environment to elevate faculty performance and job satisfaction.

This research is grounded in *Republic Act No. 11713* (April 27, 2022), which states:

*“It is the declared policy of the State to protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels and to take appropriate steps to make such education accessible and relevant to all. It is likewise universally recognized that the teacher is the key to effective teaching-learning processes... The State recognizes the role of school leaders in supporting teachers by fostering an environment for effective teaching and a school culture that develops enthusiastic and independent learners committed to lifelong learning.”*

This legal foundation affirms the core elements of the present study—teacher quality,

leadership support, and favorable work conditions—as critical to educational effectiveness.

Understanding the interplay between leadership styles, motivation, and job satisfaction is essential for crafting evidence-based strategies in educational institutions. Effective leadership drives motivation, which in turn enhances job satisfaction—leading to improved faculty retention, higher performance, and greater institutional reputation. Moreover, research-informed interventions can mitigate burnout and enhance well-being, thereby strengthening both faculty capacity and student learning outcomes. By aligning institutional strategies with these factors, schools not only fulfill policy mandates but also contribute to the broader goals of quality education and national development.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to examine the influence of leadership styles, work motivation, and job satisfaction among faculty at Naga College Foundation, Inc. Specifically, it assessed the levels of transformational, transactional, servant, autocratic, and visionary leadership styles. It also evaluated work motivation through factors such as goal alignment, recognition, professional development, meaningful work, and work-life balance. Additionally, the study measured faculty job satisfaction in terms of professional fulfillment, work-life balance, recognition, institutional culture, and autonomy.

The research explored significant relationships between leadership styles, work motivation, and job satisfaction, and determined the extent to which leadership styles influenced work motivation and job satisfaction. Finally, based on these findings, a faculty development program was crafted to enhance leadership effectiveness, motivation, and job satisfaction, promoting faculty growth and institutional success.

## METHODS

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to investigate the levels of leadership styles, work motivation, and job satisfaction among faculty members at Naga College Foundation, Inc. The descriptive method was used to systematically characterize leadership

styles, specifically transformational, transactional, servant, autocratic, and visionary styles. It also described the quality of work motivation in terms of alignment with organizational goals, recognition and appreciation, professional development opportunities, meaningful and challenging work, and work-life balance and flexibility.

Moreover, the descriptive approach explored factors affecting job satisfaction, including professional fulfillment, work-life balance, recognition and rewards, institutional culture, and autonomy and academic freedom. The insights derived from these analyses provided a foundation for crafting a faculty development program aimed at enhancing leadership styles, work motivation, job satisfaction, and the overall work environment.

The correlational component examined significant relationships among leadership styles, work motivation, and job satisfaction, and determined the extent to which leadership styles and motivational factors influenced faculty job satisfaction and performance.

The study involved 113 voluntary faculty respondents drawn from various colleges within Naga College Foundation, including Education, Arts and Sciences, Criminal Justice Education, Accountancy and Finance, Health and Science, Business Management, Engineering, and Computer Studies. The distribution of respondents reflected representation across departments, with the highest percentage from the College of Teacher Education (20.36%).

Data collection employed a researcher-designed questionnaire divided into three parts addressing leadership styles, work motivation, and job satisfaction, which was validated by research experts and pilot-tested to ensure reliability and relevance. Responses were measured using a 4-point Likert scale, with tailored interpretations for each construct.

Statistical analyses included weighted mean to determine levels of leadership styles, motivation, and job satisfaction; Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient to assess relationships between variables; and the Coefficient of Determination to evaluate the extent of influence of leadership styles and motivational factors on job satisfaction.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study assessed the level of leadership styles among faculty members across five dimensions: visionary, transactional, transformational, servant, and autocratic. Table 1 results showed that visionary leadership received the highest mean rating (AWM = 3.82), indicating that respondents strongly agreed it was the most evident style.

This was followed by transactional (AWM = 3.79), transformational (AWM = 3.76), and servant leadership (AWM = 3.75), all interpreted as strongly evident. Autocratic leadership, though rated lowest (AWM = 3.65), still fell within the “strongly agree” range. The overall average weighted mean of 3.75 suggests a generally strong presence of all leadership styles, with a clear preference for visionary and transactional approaches. This indicates that faculty members recognize and value leadership that offers direction, structure, and inspiration within the institution.

**Table 1. Summary Table of the Level of Leadership Styles of Respondents**

Leadership Style	AWM	Int.	Rank
Visionary	3.82	SA	1
Transactional	3.79	SA	2
Transformational	3.76	SA	3
Servant	3.75	SA	4
Autocratic	3.65	SA	5
<b>Overall Average Weighted Mean</b>	3.75	Strongly Agree	

The study evaluated the level of work motivation among faculty members. Challenging and meaningful work received the highest weighted mean (WM = 3.86), indicating it was the most strongly recognized motivational driver. This was followed by recognition and appreciation (WM = 3.81), suggesting that acknowledgment of contributions played a significant role in motivation. Professional development opportunities and work-life balance and flexibility were equally valued, both with a mean score of 3.80. Alignment with larger goals ranked lowest (WM = 3.79), though still within the “strongly agree” range.

The overall average weighted mean of 3.81 signifies that all identified motivational factors were strongly present, highlighting a work environment that fosters professional growth, personal fulfillment, and institutional support.

**Table 2. Summary Table on the Quality of Work Motivation**

Quality of Motivation	Motivation		Rank
	W	Int.	
Challenging and Meaningful Work	3.8	SA	1
Recognition and Appreciation	3.8	SA	2
Professional Development Opportunities	3.8	SA	3.5
Work-Life Balance and Flexibility	3.8	SA	3.5
Alignment with Larger Goals	3.7	SA	5
<b>Average Weighted Mean</b>	3.8	Strongly Agree	

The study assessed the factors influencing job satisfaction among faculty members, focusing on five key aspects. Institutional culture emerged as the most significant contributor, receiving the highest average weighted mean (AWM = 3.84), reflecting the value faculty placed on a supportive and inclusive academic environment.

Recognition and rewards, along with autonomy and academic freedom, followed closely with equal mean scores of 3.82, indicating that both acknowledgment of efforts and the ability to exercise independent judgment were strongly appreciated. Professional fulfillment (AWM = 3.76) and work-life balance (AWM = 3.75) ranked slightly lower but still within the “strongly agree” category.

The overall average weighted mean of 3.80 suggests that faculty members were generally highly satisfied across all measured dimensions, reinforcing the importance of institutional support, personal growth, and recognition in enhancing job satisfaction.

**Table 3. Summary Table of the Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction of Faculty**

Aspects	AWM	Int.	Rank
Institutional Culture	3.84	SA	1

Recognition and Rewards	3.82	SA	2.5
Autonomy and Academic Freedom	3.82	SA	2.5
Professional Fulfilment	3.76	SA	4
Work Balance	3.75	SA	5
Overall Average Weighted Mean	3.80	Strongly Agree	

Leadership styles strongly shape faculty job satisfaction, particularly in institutional culture, recognition, autonomy, fulfillment, and work-life balance. Servant leadership showed the highest influence, with strong correlations in institutional culture ( $r = 0.99, p = 0.001$ ) and work-life balance ( $r = 0.98, p = 0.010$ ).

Transformational leadership also showed high correlations with culture ( $r = 0.97$ ), work-life balance ( $r = 0.95$ ), and recognition ( $r = 0.93$ ), though its link to autonomy was not significant. Transactional leadership aligned with recognition ( $r = 0.97$ ) and autonomy ( $r = 0.98$ ), but was weaker in other areas.

Visionary leadership impacted work-life balance ( $r = 0.99$ ) and culture ( $r = 0.96$ ), while autocratic leadership only showed significance in autonomy ( $r = 0.97, p = 0.004$ ).

Overall, servant and transformational styles proved most effective in enhancing faculty satisfaction, emphasizing the value of inclusive and supportive leadership.

**Table 4. Extent of Influence of Leadership Styles on Quality of Work Motivation**

Leadership Styles	Quality of Work Motivation	r-value	r <sup>2</sup> -value (in %)	Int.
Transformational	Alignment with Larger Goals	0.95	90	Very Strong
	Recognition and Appreciation	0.89	80	Strong
	Professional Development Opportunities	0.93	87	Very Strong
	Challenging and Meaningful Work	0.76	59	Moderate
	Work-Life Balance and Flexibility	0.89	80	Strong
Transactional	Alignment with Larger Goals	0.92	85	Very Strong
	Recognition and Appreciation	0.64	42	Moderate

Servant	Professional Development Opportunities	0.94	88	Very Strong
	Challenging and Meaningful Work	0.86	73	Strong
	Work-Life Balance and Flexibility	0.99	99	Very Strong
	Alignment with Larger Goals	0.96	91	Very Strong
	Recognition and Appreciation	0.92	84	Very Strong
	Professional Development Opportunities	0.94	88	Very Strong
	Challenging and Meaningful Work	0.77	60	Moderate
	Work-Life Balance and Flexibility	0.87	76	Strong
	Autocratic	Alignment with Larger Goals	0.84	72
Recognition and Appreciation		0.57	33	Weak
Professional Development Opportunities		0.90	1	Very strong
Challenging and Meaningful Work		0.98	6	Very Strong
Work-Life Balance and Flexibility		0.94	8	Very Strong
Visionary		Alignment with Larger Goals	0.98	7
	Recognition and Appreciation	0.74	5	Moderate
	Professional Development Opportunities	0.97	4	Very Strong
	Challenging and Meaningful Work	.73	4	Moderate
	Work-Life Balance and Flexibility	.89	9	Strong

In the same manner, leadership styles strongly influence faculty motivation across key areas. As shown in Table 4, visionary leadership had the highest impact on goal alignment ( $r^2 = 97\%$ ), while transformational and servant styles showed very strong effects on professional development ( $r^2 = 94\%$  and  $88\%$ ). Transactional leadership excelled in promoting work-life balance ( $r^2 = 99\%$ ).

Servant leadership showed consistently strong influence, especially in alignment ( $r^2 = 91\%$ ) and recognition ( $r^2 = 84\%$ ). Autocratic leadership yielded high influence in development ( $r^2 = 81\%$ ) and meaningful work ( $r^2 = 96\%$ ) but was weak in recognition ( $r^2 = 33\%$ ).

The proposed Faculty Development Program (FDP) directly responds to findings on the impact of leadership styles and motivation on faculty satisfaction and performance. By integrating transformational, servant, and visionary leadership approaches—identified as most effective—the

program promotes collaboration, professional growth, and institutional alignment.

Motivational factors such as recognition, autonomy, and alignment with institutional goals are addressed through targeted strategies including mentorship, flexible policies, and structured support systems. Institutional elements like inclusivity, collaboration, and work-life balance are reinforced to create a more dynamic academic environment.

Thus, the FDP offers a strategic, evidence-based approach to improving faculty engagement and productivity, aligning leadership development with institutional success.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings revealed that faculty members perceived a strong presence of various leadership styles within their institutions, with visionary leadership receiving the highest ratings, followed by transactional, transformational, servant, and lastly, autocratic leadership. This suggests a leadership climate that values foresight, structured guidance, and motivation, while less emphasis is placed on directive or authoritarian approaches. Faculty members resonate more with leadership that is inspirational, supportive, and collaborative in nature.

To further improve the leadership environment, institutions are encouraged to strengthen visionary leadership by promoting long-term strategic planning and innovation. Transactional leadership should be supported with clearly defined expectations and performance-based incentives to drive accountability. Transformational leadership can be developed through continuous mentoring and capacity-building programs that inspire faculty to grow and innovate. Servant leadership should be reinforced by cultivating a culture of empathy, trust, and empowerment, enhancing collegiality and inclusivity. Meanwhile, reliance on autocratic leadership should be minimized by adopting participative decision-making processes that encourage shared governance and adaptability.

The level of work motivation among faculty members was also perceived to be high, with the strongest agreement on the availability of

meaningful and challenging work, followed by recognition, professional development, and work-life balance. Although slightly lower, alignment with broader institutional goals was still positively acknowledged. This indicates a work culture that generally fosters personal growth and fulfillment but requires more explicit connections between individual roles and institutional vision.

To sustain and improve motivation, academic institutions should design roles and assignments that are intellectually stimulating and personally rewarding. Recognition initiatives should be expanded, including awards and peer acknowledgment programs, to reinforce positive performance and commitment. Institutions should also increase access to professional development opportunities such as research grants, interdisciplinary collaborations, and training seminars. Ensuring a healthy work-life balance through flexible work arrangements and wellness initiatives can further enhance motivation. Additionally, leaders must consistently communicate institutional goals and ensure that individual contributions are aligned with broader organizational objectives.

Regarding job satisfaction, faculty members strongly agreed on the significance of institutional culture, recognition, autonomy, and work-life balance as key influencing factors. The results underscore the central role of a supportive institutional environment and the importance of faculty having a sense of independence, recognition, and overall well-being in their professional lives.

To foster job satisfaction, institutions should continue to build a positive institutional culture grounded in collaboration, inclusion, and academic freedom. Recognition and reward systems should be structured and merit-based, highlighting faculty contributions across teaching, research, and service. Autonomy and academic freedom should be preserved and expanded, enabling faculty to exercise independent judgment and creativity in their professional roles. Promoting flexible schedules, wellness programs, and ongoing feedback mechanisms will help maintain a balanced and fulfilling work environment.

Significant relationships were established between leadership styles, work motivation, and job satisfaction. Strong correlations were observed

particularly between transformational and servant leadership styles and various aspects of faculty motivation and satisfaction. This confirms that the quality and nature of leadership directly impact faculty morale, productivity, and overall institutional engagement.

Given these relationships, institutions should enhance leadership training programs with a focus on transformational, servant, and visionary models that emphasize support, inspiration, and shared goals. Leadership strategies must balance oversight with autonomy, ensuring that faculty feel both guided and empowered. Visionary leadership can be leveraged to align personal and institutional goals, while servant leadership should emphasize emotional intelligence, recognition, and team cohesion. Moreover, policies should be developed that institutionalize recognition systems and clarify expectations to reinforce a motivation-driven leadership framework.

Finally, the analysis confirmed that leadership styles and work motivation strongly influence faculty job satisfaction, with the highest correlations observed in areas such as institutional culture, autonomy, and professional development. Visionary leadership had a notable influence on goal alignment, while transactional and servant leadership significantly affected motivation and recognition.

In light of these findings, it is recommended that institutions implement a comprehensive Faculty Development Program (FDP) that targets the development of leadership skills, motivational structures, and institutional engagement. The FDP should include leadership training workshops, mentoring systems, strategic planning initiatives, and wellness support. By enhancing visionary and servant leadership practices and improving the motivational climate through recognition and career growth opportunities, institutions can build a dynamic, inclusive, and high-performing academic workforce. Such efforts will not only improve faculty job satisfaction but also contribute to the broader goals of academic excellence and institutional success.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Gary N. Mclean & Baiyin Yang (2018). Creativity and Human Resource Development: An Integrative Literature Review and a Conceptual Framework for Future Research Retrieval Number: DOI:10.1177/1534484313481462. ISSN: 12(4):390-421, Volume-7, Issue-6S5, April 2018
- [2] Muhammad Tafrizi & Prastilyo Diatmono (2019). The Effect of Transformational Leadership Style, Work Motivation, and Work Environment on Employee Performance in Mediation by Job Satisfaction Variables in PT Gynura Consindo • Business and Entrepreneurial Review (BER) 18 (2) <https://doi.org/10.25105/ber.v18i2.5334/>
- [3] Maartje Paais, Jozef Pattiruhu (2020). Effect of Motivation, Leadership, and Organizational Culture on Satisfaction and Employee Performance • Journal of Asian Finance Economics and Business 7(8):577-588 <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020>
- [4] Republic Act 11713, April 27, 2022. [https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2022/ra\\_11713\\_2022.html](https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2022/ra_11713_2022.html)
- [5] Sheila Jean L. Cabayag & Eugenio S. Guhao Jr. (2024). Self Efficacy, Job Performance, and Transformational Leadership: A Structural Equation Model on Organizational Commitment Among Public School Teachers. European Journal of Education Studies 11(1) License CC By 4. DOI:10.46827/ejes.v11i1.5168
- [6] Nguyen Thi Thu Cuc. (2023). Impact Of Transformational Leadership Style On Organizational Commitment Of Employees At Commercial Banks In Digital Transformation Context: Vinh University Journal of Science 52(3B):83-96 License CC By 4. DOI:10.46827/ejes.v11i1.5168
- [7] Theo Émile Ravet-Brown, Marco Furtner, & Andreas Kallmuenzer (2023). Transformational and Entrepreneurial Leadership: A Review of Distinction and Overlap. Publisher: Review of Managerial Science. DOI: 10.1007/s11846-023-00649-6. Type: Literature review
- [7] Mathewos Mekonnen, & Zelalem Bayissa (2023). The Effect of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles on Organizational Readiness for Change Among Health Professionals. Publisher: SAGE Open Nursing. DOI: 10.1177/23779608231185923