

LEADERSHIP STYLE AMONG MIDDLE MANAGERS IN SAUDI MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Ayedh Saud AlHarthi
Othman Ali M. Al Shehri
Ahed J. Al-Khatib

Jordan University of Science and Technology, Jordan

Abstract

Background: Middle managers within ministry of health act under continuous pressure from board level to be successful leaders of today's and tomorrow's healthcare service. Leadership styles are important factors among middle managers to retain employees in organizations and to ensure a high quality of practice.

Aims: Two main aims: to examine the leadership style(s) of middle managers as perceived by them as leader from different departments of the Saudi Ministry of Health, and to examine the leadership style(s) of the middle managers as perceived by their subordinates as raters from different departments of the Saudi Ministry of Health.

Materials and methods: A cross-sectional descriptive design was used to answer the research questions. A convenience sample of 121 participants, 30 middle managers and 91 subordinates, who were recruited through different departments at Saudi Ministry of Health during the period of June 2010 through September 2010. Participants were subjected to Univariate and Multivariate analysis. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was used to collect data.

Results: the mean ratings of all four components of transformational leadership for the subordinates and middle managers were between 2.90 to 3.29. The mean ratings for contingent reward and management by exception active were 3.30 and 2.50 respectively and this was well within the optimum range as suggested by Bass. Management by exception passive and laissez-faire showed mean ratings of 1.67 and 1.25 respectively. The correlation coefficients among transformational leadership style and each variable of, satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort for raters and leaders sample was high positively reached ($r = .72, p < 0.05$), ($r = .81, p < 0.05$), ($r = .80, p < 0.05$) respectively, The correlation coefficients among transactional leadership style and each variable of, satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort for raters and leaders sample was high positively reached ($r = .20, p <$

0.05) , (r = .44, p< 0.05) , (r = .35, p< 0.05) respectively, and The correlation coefficients among laissez -Faire leadership style and each variable of, satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort for raters and leaders sample was high negatively reached (r = -.48, p< 0.05) , (r = -.46, p< 0.05) , (r = -.43, p< 0.05) respectively. There are agreement between leaders and raters on transformational, transactional and laissez-faire as distributive in Saudi Ministry of Health in kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The result showed there was no significant difference on the MLQ factors for raters and Leader due to gender, marital status, and age. Also , the analysis showed significant differences among raters' opinions due to work experiences as contingent reward and extra effort in favor of raters who experience of them more than > 6 Month, and finally, the analysis showed there significant differences among raters' opinions due to period working with leaders as transformational, idealized Influence attributed, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward, and effectiveness in favor of raters who working with leaders for a period between 6 months - < 1 year, but significant differences among raters' opinions due to period working with leaders as Laissez –Faire in favor of raters who working with leaders for a period between 1 year - 2 years.

Conclusions: transformational leadership can contribute a lot to the effectiveness of organizations and that there is a need for further investigation of leadership at different levels.

Keywords: Leadership, leadership style, transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership, middle managers

Introduction

Middle managers within ministry of health act under continuous pressure from board level to be successful leaders of today's and tomorrow's healthcare services (Lindholm et al., 2000). Demands for skilled and competent middle managers, able to handle individuals and operations as well as money and information, have been clearly stated. There is also a plenty of studies indicating the skills and competencies that Middle managers need to acquire, although less has been written about exactly what to do in order to achieve these goals (Mulholland, 1994; Allen, 1998).

More than half of worldwide middle managers will retire in the next 10 years.⁽⁴⁾ New middle managers have numerous challenges.⁽⁴⁾ Society is changing, individuals are ageing, many middle managers are retiring and organization demands for high quality are rising. At the same time, the position of the new managers is changing. They need more information on budgeting, health care legislation, employment contracts and future planning. The most important resource of middle managers is employee (Vesterinen,

Isola and Paasivaara, 2009). What is the best way for middle managers to retain employees in organizations and to ensure a high quality of practice? It is important to pay attention to leadership and leadership style (s). Leadership could be defined as a process of interaction between leaders and subordinates in an attempt to influence the behavior of subordinates to accomplish organizational goals (Yukl and Yukl, 2002). Leadership styles are defined as the different combinations of tasks and transaction behaviors that influence individuals to attain goals (Huber et al., 2002).

Interestingly, earlier researches in this field laid the foundational knowledge and concepts of the subject by pointing out three main styles of leadership, which are laissez fair, transactional, and transformational style (Bass and Avolio, 1993). Leadership style is considered to be a major factor influencing the performance of organizations and their members (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007), and more importantly, contributing significantly to the success and failure of an organization (Lok and Crawford, 2004). Moreover, Leadership style improve job satisfaction, increase the retention of employees, prevent a rising any staff shortage, and promote staff to perform extra effort (Failla and Stichler, 2008). For the future, it is important to know more about middle manager's leadership behaviors. Goleman et al (2002) have written on primal leadership, which demands that a leader brings emotional intelligence to bear on his/her leadership. Leaders' skills in driving emotions in a positive, productive direction to achieve goals become a factor in how well an employee succeeds.

Conceptual Model of Leadership styles

A Bass (1985) model was used to guide this study. According to this model, leadership defined as a Leadership is a universal phenomenon in human societies. In Bass's model, leader behaviors are described on a continuum composed of 3 styles of leadership: transformational leadership style at one end, laissez-fair leadership style at the other end, and transactional leadership style at the middle will guide this study. Transformational leadership style is defined as a leadership approach that causes change in individuals and social systems. In its ideal form, it creates valuable and positive change in the followers with the end goal of developing followers into leaders. Enacted in its authentic form, transformational leadership enhances the motivation, morale and performance of followers through a variety of mechanisms. These include connecting the follower's sense of identity and self to the mission and the collective identity of the organization; being a role model for followers that inspires them; challenging followers to take greater ownership for their work, and understanding the strengths and weaknesses of followers, so the leader can align followers with tasks that optimize their performance (Bass, 1985). Transactional leadership style is defined as a leadership approach that

focuses more on a series of "transactions". It is interested in looking out for oneself, having exchange benefits with their subordinates and clarifies a sense of duty with rewards and punishments to reach goals. The laissez faire leadership style is also known as the "hands-off" style. It is one in which the manager provides little or no direction and gives employees as much freedom as possible. All authority or power is given to the employees and they must determine goals, make decisions, and resolve problems on their own (Bass, 1985).

From this perspective it is important to know what kind of leadership style (s) are used by middle managers in Saudi Ministry of Health (SMOH). The results of the current study could be used in planning and developing a Saudi middle managers education and professional skills.

Aims of the Study

The main purposes of this study are to examine the leadership style(s) of middle managers as perceived by them as leader from different departments of the Saudi Ministry of Health. The second purpose is to examine the leadership style (s) of the middle managers as perceived by their subordinates as rater from different departments of the Saudi Ministry of Health. The subordinates in this study refer to the employees of the Ministry of health who directly report to the middle level managers.

Methodology

Research Design

This study utilized the descriptive cross-sectional design. Descriptive design helps describe the phenomenon of interest as they currently exist without manipulation (Polit, 2004). Cross-sectional design facilitates observation of some subset of a population at the same time with respect to independent variables (Polit, 2004).

Study Setting

This study was conducted at different departments at Saudi Ministry of Health. The main building of the Saudi Ministry of health in Riyadh contains the minister office and the administrations offices that plan strategic planning and facilitate health directorate operations. It also contains all resourcing and development Offices (World Health Report, 2006). It is considered the main and the biggest health care provider in the kingdom since its establishment in 1951. It has more than 60% of the provision of health (World Health Report, 2006). The Ministry of Health has a capacity of 31877 hospital beds, and 2037 of primary health centers and it has a total of 386 hospitals in the kingdom (The Ministry of Health. health statistical yearbook, 2010). Also its main funding source is driven from the public revenues which is allocated every year by the Council of Ministries and provided to (MOH) through Saudi Ministry of Finance (The Ministry of Health. health statistical yearbook, 2010).

Population and Sample

Our target population for this study was Saudi middle managers and their subordinates in Saudi Ministry of Health. Accessible population of this study was middle managers and their subordinates in departments of Saudi Ministry of Health.

A convenience sampling technique was used to obtain the required sample size. Given a power analysis using a medium effective size and a power estimation of .80, for a two-tailed test with alpha set at .05, at least 160 participants were required to have confidence in the findings, 40 middle managers and 160 subordinates.

Inclusion criteria used in this study were: (a) middle managers are that they currently work in one managerial position with total accountability and responsibility of not less than 10 employees (b) who had assigned in his position based on a formal written decision from the General Director of Finance and Administrative Affairs, (c) who have been in that post for at least 2 years, (d) Saudi nationality. Subordinates who worked under the supervision of the middle managers less than 6 months were not selected as Raters.

Instruments

This study used one instrument: The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) 5X Short. Written permissions were granted for using the instrument. Standard translation procedure from English to Arabic language was used for translation of tool.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

MLQ is the most widely accepted instrument to measure the extent of one's leadership style namely transformational, transactional or laissez-faire (Riggio, 2006). MLQ contains 45 items that identify and measure key leadership styles and effectiveness behaviours, and prior research has shown strong links with both individual and organizational success (Avolio et al., 2006). The MLQ 5X is the most current version after it was revised several times (Antonakis et al., 2003). According to Avolio and Burns (2004), this latest version has been used in nearly 300 research programs, doctoral dissertations and master's theses around the world between 1995 and 2004. The MLQ consists of 45 items that identify and measure key leadership styles and outcomes (Jung and Avolio, 1999). The 45 items are made up from the components of transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez faire leadership. Apart from that, there are also nine items included to measure leadership outcomes.

All items are assessed on a five-point rating scale. The anchors used are presented below: 0 = Not at all, 1= Once in a while, 2 = Sometimes, 3= Fairly often ,4 = Frequently, if not always.

According to Johnson and Christensen (2007), a key advantage of a questionnaire that uses a rating scale is that it provides more reliable, consistent and stable scores and produces more variability which enables the researcher to make finer distinctions among the respondents. The MLQ is available in two forms. The first is the self-rating form that asks the leader to rate their leadership behavior or style. The second is the rater form which is used by subordinates to rate their leader. The leader could be anyone from the immediate superior to the organization's top leader.

Results

Participants Characteristics

A total of 120 packages were distributed and 110 were returned showing a 92% response rate. Of those, 19 participants (Raters) were not included because of missing information. Overall, a total number of 91 participants (Raters) participated in this study. A total of 84.6% of the participants (Raters) were below the age of 42 while only 15.4% of the participants (Raters) were above the age 42. As shown in table 1, 87.9 % (n=80) of the participants (Raters) were male, and 12.1 % (n=11) were female. Regarding marital status, 74.7% (n=68) of the participants (Raters) married while 25.3% (n=23) were not married. Table 1 shows the number of years the participants (Raters) have been working in their current positions. 61.5 % (n= 56) of the participants (Raters) have been working in those positions for more than 2 year. Only 38.5% (n= 35) of the participants (Raters) have been working in the same position for less than 2 years.

Table 1: Number and percent distribution of Raters regarding their demographic data

Variables	Frequency	(%)
Gender		
Male	80	87.9
Female	11	12.1
Age (Years)		
< 23	1	1.1
23 – 32	43	47.3
33 – 42	33	36.3
43 – 52	12	13.2
> 52	2	2.2
Marital status		
Married	68	74.7
Not married	23	25.3
Experience (Years)		
6 months - < 2 year	35	38.5
> 2 year	56	61.5
The Period of Working with Leader		
6 months - < 1 year	15	16.5
1 year - < 2 year	27	29.7
2 year - < 3 year	15	16.5
>3 year	34	37.4
Total	91	100%

Table (2) shows that a total of 45 packages were distributed and 40 were returned showing an 89 % response rate. Of those, 10 participants (Leaders) were not included because of missing information. Overall, a total number of 30 participants (Leaders) participated in this study. A total of 73.3% (n= 22) of the participants (Leaders) were below the age of 43 while only 26.7% (n= 8) of the participants (Leaders) were above the age 43. As shown in table 2, 93.3% (n= 28) of the participants (Leaders) were male, and 6.7 % (n=2) were female. Regarding marital status, all of the participants (Leaders) were married. Table 4.5 shows that 43.3 % of the respondents hold at least a bachelor’s degree with another 40.0 % hold a diploma. Only 16.7 % of the respondents have obtained a postgraduate degree. The overall demographics indicate that more than 60 % of the respondents hold a tertiary level qualification (bachelor’s degree and postgraduate degree). Table 2 shows the number of years the participants (Leaders) have been working in their current positions. 83.3% (n=25) of the participants (Leaders) have been working in those positions more than 10 year. Only 16.7 % (n= 5) of the participants (Leaders) have been working in the same position between 6 years – 10 years. According leaders that obtained any courses in management or any management materials, about two third of the participants (Leaders) 66.7 % (n=20) were obtained management courses or management materials.

Table 2: Number and percent distribution of Leaders regarding their demographic data

Variables	Frequency	(%)
Gender		
Male	28	93.3
Female	2	6.7
Age (Years)		
< 23	0	0
23 – 32	1	3.3
33 – 42	21	70
43 – 52	5	16.7
> 52	3	10
Marital status		
Married	16	53.3
Not married	14	46.7
Education qualification		
Diploma	12	40
Bachelor degree	13	43.3
Postgraduate degree	5	16.7
Experience (Years)		
1 year -5 years	0	0
6 years – 10 years	5	16.7
> 10 year	25	83.3
Courses in Management or Management Materials		
Yes	20	66.7
No	10	33.3
Total	30	100%

Analysis of the Leadership Styles

The participants (Rater) rated the leadership styles of their superiors and the superiors rated them self-according to the dimensions of transformational, transactional and avoidance of leadership; the responses were then averaged to find the mean scores. Avolio and Bass (2004) recommended that the greater mean score on any of the leadership dimensions would most likely represent the groups or individuals preferred leadership styles. Riggio (2006) suggested that for optimal leadership, a mean of 3.0 or higher should be reflected on all of the five transformational leadership dimensions. The mean rating of contingent reward and active management by exception ideally should be at about 2.5 and passive management by exception and laissez-faire leadership at 1.0 or below on the average. Regarding to the first and second questions which deal with dominant leadership style in Saudi Ministry of Health, descriptive statistical analysis were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation (table 3).

Table 3: mean and standard deviation for leaders and raters point of view on leadership styles

LEADERSHIP DIMENSION/STYLES	MEAN	SD
*Total mean rating for transformational leadership styles	3.06	.63
Idealized Influence attributed	2.95	.84
Idealized Influence behavior	2.90	.72
Inspirational motivation	3.22	.72
Intellectual stimulation	3.29	.74
Individual consideration	2.92	.80
*Total mean rating for transactional leadership styles	2.49	.52
Contingent reward	3.30	.70
Management-by-exception (active)	2.50	.83
Management-by-exception (passive)	1.67	.91
Laissez Faire	1.25	.83
Extra effort	3.15	.86
Effectiveness	3.22	.78
Satisfaction	3.26	.91

Table 4 shows that mean ratings of all four components of transformational leadership for the subordinates and middle managers were between 2.90 to 3.29. The mean ratings for contingent reward and management by exception active were 3.30 and 2.50 respectively and this was well within the optimum range as suggested by Bass. Management by exception passive and laissez-faire showed mean ratings of 1.67 and 1.25 respectively. The total mean rating of 3.06 for transformational leadership styles suggests that the subordinates and middle managers were employing transformational leadership styles more compared to transactional leadership style which reported a mean of only 2.49 and also laissez-faire which was only 1.25.

Table 4: mean and standard deviation for raters' point of view on leadership styles

LEADERSHIP DIMENSION/STYLES	MEAN	SD
*Total mean rating for transformational leadership styles	3.00	.68
Idealized Influence attributed	2.96	.83
Idealized Influence behavior	2.83	.73
Inspirational motivation	3.18	.79
Intellectual stimulation	3.25	.82
Individual consideration	2.81	.87
*Total mean rating for transactional leadership styles	2.48	.53
Contingent reward	3.25	.77
Management-by-exception (active)	2.41	.81
Management-by-exception (passive)	1.76	.94
Laissez Faire	1.26	.87
Extra effort	3.07	.93
Effectiveness	3.17	.85
Satisfaction	3.15	.99

Table 5 shows that mean ratings of all five components of transformational leadership for the subordinates were between 2.81 to 3.25. The mean ratings for contingent reward and management by exception active were 3.25 and 2.41 respectively and this was well within the optimum range as suggested by Bass. Management by exception passive and laissez-faire showed mean ratings of 1.76 and 1.26 respectively. The total mean rating of 3.00 for transformational leadership styles suggests that the subordinates were employing transformational leadership styles more compared to transactional leadership style which reported a mean of only 2.48 and also laissez-faire which was only 1.26.

Table 5: mean and standard deviation for leaders' point of view on leadership styles

LEADERSHIP DIMENSION/STYLES	MEAN	SD
*Total mean rating for transformational leadership styles	3.21	.40
Idealized Influence attributed	2.93	.86
Idealized Influence behavior	3.08	.67
Inspirational motivation	3.35	.42
Intellectual stimulation	3.45	.41
Individual consideration	3.25	.43
*Total mean rating for transactional leadership styles	2.52	.50
Contingent reward	3.45	.41
Management-by-exception (active)	2.75	.86
Management-by-exception (passive)	1.37	.73
Laissez –Faire	1.22	.70
Extra effort	3.40	.50
Effectiveness	3.40	.48
Satisfaction	3.61	.42

Table 5 shows that the mean ratings of all four components of transformational leadership for the middle managers were between 2.93 to 3.45. The mean ratings for contingent reward and management by exception active were 3.45 and 2.75 respectively and this was well within the optimum range as suggested by Bass. Management by exception passive and laissez-faire showed mean ratings of 1.37 and 1.22 respectively. The total mean rating of 3.21 for transformational leadership styles suggests that the middle level managers were employing transformational leadership styles more compared to transactional leadership style which reported a mean of only 2.52 and also laissez-faire which was only 1.22.

Regarding to the third question which deals with best leadership style depend on better out come in Saudi Ministry of Health in kingdom of Saudi Arabia, a 2-tailed Pearson product –Moment correlation (Pearson’s r) was used to calculate the correlation coefficient among satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort variables and leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) depend on leader and rater point view (table 6).

Table 6: correlation coefficient among extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction variables and leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) for leader and rater point view

Sample	Leadership Outcome		Transformational	Transactional	Laissez - Faire
Leader	Satisfaction	r	.27	.40*	-.03
		P value	.14	.028	.87
	Effectiveness	r	.30	.32	-.13
		P value	.09	.07	.48
	Extra effort	r	.41*	.41*	-.06
		P value	.02	.02	.73
Rater	Satisfaction	r	.72*	.16	-.52*
		P value	.000	.10	.000
	Effectiveness	r	.83*	.43*	-.48*
		P value	.000	.000	.000
	Extra effort	r	.82*	.30*	-.49*
		P value	.000	.003	.000
Leader & Rater	Satisfaction	r	.72*	.20*	-.48*
		P value	.000	.02	.000
	Effectiveness	r	.81*	.44*	-.46*
		P value	.000	.000	.000
	Extra effort	r	.80*	.35*	-.43*
		P value	.000	.000	.000

***Significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$**

Tables (6) shows that there was a significant and positive correlation between transformational and extra effort for leaders sample ($r = .41, p < 0.05$), whereas there was no significant correlation between transformational

leadership style with satisfaction, and effectiveness ($r = .27, p < 0.05$), and ($r = .30, p < 0.05$) respectively.

The correlation coefficients among transactional leadership style and each variable of satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort for leaders sample was a significant and positive correlation between transformational and satisfaction for leaders sample ($r = .40, p < 0.05$), also a significant and positive correlation between transformational and extra effort ($r = .41, p < 0.05$), but there was no significant correlation between transformational leadership style, and effectiveness ($r = .27, p < 0.05$).

The correlation coefficients among laissez-faire leadership style and each variable of satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort for leaders sample was a low negatively reached ($r = -.03, p < 0.05$) ($r = -.13, p < 0.05$) ($r = -.06, p < 0.05$) respectively.

Tables (6) shows that there the correlation coefficients among laissez-faire leadership style and each variable of satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort for raters sample was a high positively reached ($r = .72, p < 0.05$) ($r = .83, p < 0.05$) ($r = .82, p < 0.05$) respectively.

The correlation coefficients among transactional leadership style and each variable of, effectiveness and extra effort for raters sample was a high positively reached ($r = .43, p < 0.05$) ($r = .30, p < 0.05$) respectively but the correlation coefficients among transactional leadership style and satisfaction is low reached

The correlation coefficients among laissez -Faire leadership style and each variable of, satisfaction effectiveness and extra effort for raters sample was high negatively reached ($r = -.52, p < 0.05$), ($r = -.48, p < 0.05$), ($r = -.49, p < 0.05$) respectively.

Tables (6) shows that the correlation coefficients among transformational leadership style and each variable of, satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort for raters and leaders sample was high positively reached ($r = .72, p < 0.05$), ($r = .81, p < 0.05$), ($r = .80, p < 0.05$) respectively.

The correlation coefficients among transactional leadership style and each variable of, satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort for raters and leaders sample was high positively reached ($r = .20, p < 0.05$), ($r = .44, p < 0.05$), ($r = .35, p < 0.05$) respectively.

The correlation coefficients among laissez -Faire leadership style and each variable of, satisfaction, effectiveness and extra effort for raters and leaders sample was high negatively reached ($r = -.48, p < 0.05$), ($r = -.46, p < 0.05$), ($r = -.43, p < 0.05$) respectively.

Regarding to the forth question which deals with an agreement between raters and leaders point of view on leadership styles distributive in

Saudi Ministry of Health in kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Paired Samples T test was applied .

Table 7 agreement between raters and leaders point of view on leadership styles distributive in Saudi Ministry of Health

Leadership style	Objects	n	Mean	S.D	t -Value	df	P-value
Transformational leadership	Leader	30	3.21	.40	-3.265	29	.619
	Rater	91	2.73	.74			
Transactional leadership	Leader	30	2.52	.50	-.788	29	.334
	Rater	91	2.41	.52			
Laissez -Faire leadership	Leader	30	1.22	.70	1.542	29	.807
	Rater	91	1.52	.76			

*Significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$

Table (7) shows that there are an agreement between leaders and raters on transformational, transactional and laissez-faire as distributed in Saudi Ministry of Health in kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Differences in the MLQ factors for Leaders and Raters Regarding Selected Demographic Variables:

Also, an independent–samples t-test was used to investigate the difference on the MLQ factors for leaders and raters in regards to gender, and marital status .While, One-way ANOVA was used to examine difference on the MLQ factors for leaders and raters in regard to age, work experiences, and period working with leaders as follow:

1- Gender variable for rater and leader:

As shown in table (8), the analysis showed there was no significant difference on the MLQ factors for raters due to gender, because significant scores for t value don’t reached to (0.05)

Table 8.1: difference on the MLQ factors for raters in regards to gender

Variables	Male n= 80		Female n= 11		t -Value	df	P-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Transformational	2.93	.72	3.12	.61	-1.295	89	.19
Idealized Influence attributed	2.87	.93	3.11	.62	-1.451	87.7	.15
Idealized Influence behaviour	2.75	.74	2.96	.71	-1.285	89	.20
Inspirational motivation	3.14	.81	3.25	.77	-.650	89	.51
Intellectual stimulation	3.20	.82	3.33	.82	-.695	89	.48
Individual consideration	2.70	.90	2.98	.79	-1.490	89	.14
Transactional	2.45	.53	2.51	.54	-.533	89	.59
Contingent reward	3.24	.80	3.28	.74	-.269	89	.78
Management-by-exception (active)	2.36	.80	2.50	.84	-.764	89	.44
Management-by-exception (passive)	1.76	.96	1.77	.91	-.022	89	.98

Laissez -Faire	1.29	.88	1.22	.86	-.022	89	.98
Extra effort	3.01	.99	3.17	.84	-.779	89	.43
Effectiveness	3.19	.82	3.12	.90	.390	89	.69
Satisfaction	3.10	1.04	3.23	.93	-.598	89	.55

*Significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$

As shown in table (8), the analysis showed there was no significant difference on the MLQ factors for Leader due to gender, because significant scores for t. value don't reached to (0.05).

Table 8.2: difference on the MLQ factors for leaders in regards to gender

Variables	Male n= 28		Female n= 2		t -Value	df	P-value
	Mean	S D	Mean	S D			
Transformational	3.16	.41	3.31	.38	-.950	28	.35
Idealized Influence attributed	2.85	.89	3.10	.81	-.744	28	.46
Idealized Influence behaviour	3.06	.75	3.12	.50 3	-.237	28	.81
Inspirational motivation	3.26	.44	3.55	.32	-1.820	28	.08
Intellectual stimulation	3.43	.46	3.47	.32	-.228	28	.82
Individual consideration	3.21	.41	3.32	.47	-.668	28	.50
Transactional	2.51	.44	2.55	.63	-.232	28	.81
Contingent reward	3.45	.36	3.47	.50	-.155	28	.87
Management-by-exception (active)	2.80	.82	2.65	.95	.444	28	.66
Management-by-exception (passive)	1.28	.67	1.55	.86	-.918	28	.36
Laissez -Faire	1.21	.68	1.25	.77	-.135	28	.89
Extra effort	3.43	.49	3.33	.54	.504	28	.61
Effectiveness	3.35	.48	3.50	.48	-.793	28	.43
Satisfaction	3.5750	.43	3.70	.42	-.746	28	.46

*Significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$

2- Marital status variable for rater and leader

As shown in table (10), the analysis showed there was no significant difference on the MLQ factors for raters due to marital status, because significant scores for t value do not reached to (0.05), but there is a significant difference among opinion's leaders on some MLQ factors due to Management-by-exception (passive) in favor of married.

Table 9: difference on the MLQ factors for leaders in regards to marital status

Variables	Married n= 16		No married n= 14		t -Value	df	P- value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Transformational	3.09	.42	3.35	.34	-1.865	28	.07
Idealized Influence attributed	2.76	.76	3.12	.94	-1.147	28	.26
Idealized Influence behaviour	2.89	.67	3.30	.62	-1.741	28	.09
Inspirational motivation	3.29	.44	3.42	.39	-.845	28	.40
Intellectual stimulation	3.35	.40	3.55	.41	-1.286	28	.20
Individual consideration	3.14	.49	3.37	.32	-1.521	28	.13
Transactional	2.51	.61	2.54	.35	-.144	24.4	.88
Contingent reward	3.34	.47	3.58	.28	-1.740	25.1	.09
Management-by-exception (active)	2.56	.97	2.96	.67	-1.321	26.7	.19
Management-by-exception (passive)	1.64	.67	1.07	.71	2.257	28	.03
Laissez -Faire	1.45	.57	.96	.76	1.989	28	.06
Extra effort	3.29	.54	3.52	.44	-1.267	28	.21
Effectiveness	3.37	.57	3.42	.37	-.306	25.9	.76
Satisfaction	3.62	.50	3.60	.34	.114	26.7	.91

*Significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$

As shown in table (10), the analysis showed there was no significant difference on the MLQ factors for raters due to marital status, because significant scores for t value do not reached to (0.05).

Table 10: difference on the MLQ factors for Raters in regards to marital status

Variables	Married n= 68		No married n= 23		t - Value	df	P- value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Transformational	2.99	.66	3.05	.76	-.327	89	.74
Idealized Influence attributed	2.95	.75	2.98	1.06	-.182	89	.85
Idealized Influence behaviour	2.85	.72	2.78	.78	.394	89	.69
Inspirational motivation	3.14	.78	3.31	.84	-.893	89	.37
Intellectual stimulation	3.22	.81	3.33	.86	-.564	89	.57
Individual consideration	2.80	.87	2.82	.86	-.099	89	.92
Transactional	2.44	.51	2.59	.59	-1.218	89	.22
Contingent reward	3.24	.76	3.30	.83	-.328	89	.74
Management-by-exception (active)	2.38	.78	2.50	.913	-.575	89	.56
Management-by-exception (passive)	1.69	.88	1.98	1.09	-1.298	89	.19
Laissez -Faire	1.26	.78	1.27	1.09	-.016	89	.98

Extra effort	3.10	.94	3.00	.93	.452	89	.65
Effectiveness	3.12	.85	3.31	.84	-.942	89	.34
Satisfaction	3.19	.91	3.02	1.2	.732	89	.46

*Significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$

3- Age, Work experiences, and Period working with leaders for Raters

Due to find out differences among raters opinions on MLQ factors due to age, work experiences, and period working with leaders, a One-way ANOVA was used, result show there were no significant differences among raters opinions due to age as shown in table (11)

Table 11 Differences on MLQ factors for raters point view due to age variable

Variables	< 23 n= 1		23 – 32 n= 43		33 – 42 n= 33		43 – 52 n= 12		> 52 n=2		P- valu e
	Me- -an	SD	Me- -an	SD	Me- -an	SD	Me- -an	SD	Me- -an	SD	
Transformational	3.15	.	3.08	.68	2.89	.75	3.11	.45	2.5	.67	.62
Idealized Influence attributed	3.25	.	3.12	.83	2.80	.93	2.89	.54	2.37	.17	.41
Idealized Influence behavior	1.75	.	2.83	.74	2.78	.79	3.06	.47	2.75	.70	.49
Inspirational motivation	4.00	.	3.24	.84	3.09	.83	3.25	.53	2.62	.53	.61
Intellectual stimulation	3.25	.	3.34	.86	3.06	.81	3.45	.68	3.00	1.06	.53
Individual consideration	3.50	.	2.88	.80	2.69	1.01	2.91	.63	2.12	1.23	.58
Transactional	1.91	.	2.58	.57	2.46	.49	2.26	.42	2.20	.53	.27
Contingent reward	3.75	.	3.34	.76	3.13	.87	3.35	.43	2.62	1.23	.52
Management-by-exception (active)	1.25	.	2.45	.87	2.46	.84	2.22	.54	2.25	.00	.56
Management-by-exception (passive)	.75	.	1.94	.91	1.78	.93	1.20	.99	1.75	.35	.14
Laissez -Faire	.50	.	1.20	.87	1.43	.91	1.12	.74	1.12	.88	.65
Extra effort	3.66	.	3.20	.79	2.90	1.12	3.16	.81	2.33	1.41	.47
Effectiveness	3.75	.	3.26	.813	3.00	.94	3.37	.678	2.25	.70	.26
Satisfaction	4.00	.	3.20	1.07	3.00	1.03	3.33	.53	3.00	1.41	.73

*Significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$

Also, a One-way ANOVA was used to examine difference in the MLQ factors for raters point view in regard to work experiences. As shown in table (12), the analysis showed there significant differences among raters' opinions due to work experiences as contingent reward and extra effort in favor of raters who experience of them more than > 6 Month.

Table 12 Differences on MLQ factors for raters point view due to work experiences variable

Variables	> 6 Month n= 18		1 Year n= 13		2 Year n= 4		> 2 year n= 56		P- value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Transformational	3.28	.58	3.20	.51	2.65	1.33	2.90	.67	.08
Idealized Influence attributed	3.22	.74	3.36	.63	2.93	1.35	2.78	.83	.06
Idealized Influence behaviour	2.93	.83	2.98	.63	2.31	1.39	2.80	.67	.41
Inspirational motivation	3.56	.63	3.32	.61	2.81	1.41	3.05	.80	.07
Intellectual stimulation	3.55	.58	3.40	.59	2.75	1.27	3.15	.88	.16
Individual consideration	3.13	.83	2.96	.75	2.43	1.53	2.694	.84	.20
Transactional	2.62	.57	2.67	.48	2.31	.68	2.40	.51	.20
Contingent reward	3.51	.54	3.42	.62	2.25	1.79	3.20	.72	.02
Management-by-exception (active)	2.59	.95	2.73	.56	2.31	.96	2.29	.80	.24
Management-by-exception (passive)	1.75	.93	1.88	.93	2.37	1.08	1.70	.94	.55
Laissez -Faire	1.16	.78	1.19	.72	1.37	.92	1.31	.93	.91
Extra effort	3.46	.74	3.28	.90	2.1	1.66	2.97	.90	.04
Effectiveness	3.41	.66	3.26	.70	2.56	1.40	3.11	.88	.26
Satisfaction	3.44	.82	3.26	.78	2.50	1.73	3.08	1.0	.29

*Significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$

Furthermore, a One-way ANOVA was used to examine difference in the MLQ factors for raters point view in regard to period working with leaders. As shown in table (13), the analysis showed there significant differences among raters' opinions due to period working with leaders as transformational, idealized Influence attributed, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward, and effectiveness in favor of raters who working with leaders for a period between 6 months - < 1 year, but significant differences among raters' opinions due to period working with leaders as Laissez –Faire in favor of raters who working with leaders for a period between 1 year - 2 years.

Table 13 Differences on MLQ factors for raters point view due Period working with leaders' variable

Variables	6 months - < 1 year n= 15		1 year - 2 years n= 27		2 year - 3 years n= 15		> 3 years n= 34		P- val ue
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Transformational	3.43	.26	2.80	.72	3.08	.67	2.95	.72	.03
Idealized Influence attributed	3.43	.53	2.79	.91	3.15	.85	2.80	.79	.04
Idealized Influence behaviour	3.13	.60	2.62	.80	2.88	.56	2.85	.77	.18
Inspirational motivation	3.66	.32	2.95	.89	3.25	.68	3.13	.83	.04
Intellectual stimulation	3.83	.27	3.09	.78	3.15	.70	3.16	.96	.02
Individual consideration	3.10	.58	2.58	.91	2.96	.94	2.79	.88	.26
Transactional	2.53	.72	2.45	.53	2.42	.56	2.50	.44	.93
Contingent reward	3.81	.29	3.04	.75	3.31	.57	3.15	.91	.01
Management-by-exception (active)	2.28	.97	2.34	.76	2.30	.94	2.58	.73	.5
Management-by-exception (passive)	1.50	1.25	1.96	.822	1.66	.81	1.77	.93	.47
Laissez -Faire	.66	.78	1.48	.77	1.10	.62	1.44	.95	.01
Extra effort	3.48	.57	2.86	.91	3.26	1.00	2.98	1.01	.15
Effectiveness	3.80	.31	2.88	.76	3.20	1.00	3.10	.89	.00
Satisfaction	3.50	.944	2.96	.90	3.43	.96	3.02	1.07	.21

Discussion

The purposes of this study were to: examine the leadership style(s) of middle managers as perceived by them as leader from different departments of the Saudi Ministry of Health, examine the leadership style (s) of the middle managers as perceived by their subordinates as Rater from different departments of the Saudi Ministry of Health, identify the leadership style (s) that lead to best outcome (extra effort, effectiveness, satisfaction), and identify differences among leadership style(s) as perceived by middle managers and subordinates according to selected variables such as age, sex, marital status, work experiences, and level of education. According to available knowledge, this study considers a landmark study of leadership style(s) of middle managers as perceived by leader and raters from different departments among the Saudi Ministry of Health.

The study provides an overview of leadership style(s) which is also follows the context of the existing literature. This chapter will discuss study findings, implications, clinical practice and education. The strengths, limitations, conclusion and recommendations of the study will also be provided.

The leadership styles of the subordinates (raters) and middle level managers (leaders) were analyzed according to the dimensions of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership. This leadership paradigm has helped this study to understand the commonalities of leadership styles shown by the middle level managers and subordinates.

The results obtained from this study indicate that the middle level managers and the subordinates demonstrated both transformational and transactional leadership. This would confirm Bass (2008) argument that leaders and raters are both transformational and transactional. However, the transformational leadership attributes were more evident than transactional leadership or avoidance of leadership. This finding supports the findings made in previous research in which transformational leadership styles were found to be shown more by leaders and raters as compared to transactional leadership styles (Yukl and Yukl, 2002; Avolio et al., 2004; Bass et al., 2008). In addition, the findings of this study supported the argument brought forth by Eagly et al (2003) that transformational leadership styles were more frequently observed and applied by leaders and raters working in public organizations than those working in the private sector.

Even though the t-test revealed no significant differences in terms of the leadership styles practiced by the subordinates and middle level managers, the mean ratings and ranking of the dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership styles were useful to understand the leadership styles of middle level managers and subordinates according to the dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership. When the mean ratings of middle level managers and subordinates were compared and ranked, the middle level managers and subordinates displayed very similar mean ratings with one another. Therefore the findings of this study revealed no significant difference in terms of leadership styles between middle level managers and subordinates.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Bass and Riggio (2006) suggested that for optimal leadership, a mean of 3.0 or higher should be reflected on all four transformational leadership dimensions. The mean rating of contingent reward and active management by exception ideally should be at about 2.5 and passive management by exception and laissez-faire leadership at 1.0 or below on the average (Bass, 1998). The mean ratings of all the transactional components and transformational leadership as well as laissez-faire leadership were approximately close to the optimal mean ratings suggested by Bass.

The depth of the mean ratings for all transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership shown by middle level managers and subordinates were indicative of an optimal leadership as suggested by Bass" Model of Full Range Leadership. This shows that the managers and

subordinates were displaying the qualities of laissez-faire leadership style the least and increasing the frequencies of the transactional leadership styles of contingent reward and management by exception active and finally optimizing the styles of transformational leadership (Bass and Avolio, 1994). The findings would therefore mirror the optimal profile as suggested by Bass' Model of Full Range Leadership. The optimal profile indicated that the transformational four I's as being most frequently displayed. In addition, this also supports Bass' (1998) argument that "every leader displays each style to some amount" (p. 7). This supports Berson and Avolio's (2004) argument that transformational leaders have the ability to create agreement with their subordinates over the goals and vision of the organization.

The ranking of all leadership dimensions of transformational, transactional and non-leadership attributes of the middle level managers was useful to indicate Intellectual stimulation as the most dominant transformational leadership style practiced by middle level managers and subordinates. Intellectual stimulation is generally associated with encouraging subordinates to think about problems in new ways, which should be important in any organization seeking that competitive edge (Goleman, 1998).

Another transformational leadership dimension that has yielded an interesting finding was Inspirational motivation. A study conducted by Bodla and Nawaz (2010) which analyzed leadership styles among faculty members in private and public higher education institutes also placed inspirational motivation as the most dominant leadership style as compared to other leadership dimensions. A comparative study of leadership styles of those in managerial roles in four countries conducted by Ardichvili and Kuchin (2002) also showed that the participants exhibited inspirational motivation the most as compared to other transformational leadership dimensions. Lo, Ramayah and Min (2009) also found the participants in their study which consisted of 156 executives working in several Malaysian manufacturing industries showed inspirational motivation the most when compared with other transformational and transactional leadership components. In addition, it was found that inspirational motivation was found to have positive relationship with organizational commitment.

The findings also indicate that inspirational motivation was more strongly portrayed by middle level managers than subordinates. One of the main qualities of inspirational motivation is that the "leader creates clearly communicated expectations that followers want to meet and also demonstrate commitment to goals and the shared vision" (Bass, 1998, 2008). Perhaps this would support the argument that the goals and vision of the Ministry of health as a health organization were better understood by middle

level managers who were from the education scheme of service as than by the PTD middle level managers.

Dubinsky, Yammarino and Jolson (1995) add that managers with this dimension communicate their vision with fluency and confidence. Leaders who show a high degree of inspirational motivation often “provide visions of what is possible and how to attain them”. (Riggio, 2006) Clearly the vision of the organization as well as the vision of the leaders was considered important for all the middle level managers. Inspirational leaders not only strive to point out the importance of any task at hand, they also point out the positive qualities of their followers and the ways in which they can complement one another’s strength (Bass and Riggio, 2006).

The strong presence of contingent reward among the middle level managers and subordinate confirms the effectiveness of this transactional style of leadership. The findings of this study indicate that contingent reward was placed higher than the transformational dimension of individualized consideration, Idealized Influence behaviour, and Idealized Influence attributed. Several studies revealed high presence of contingent reward participants of their study (Ardichvili and Kuchinke, 2002; Keegan and Hartog, 2004; Zagorsek et al., 2009). This finding lends support to Zaleznik’s (1993) argument that those who are holding managerial positions are most likely to show transactional leadership qualities.

One possible explanation as to why the transactional component of contingent reward was found to be high among the middle level managers may be attributed to the annual appraisal system which is compulsory for ministry of health in Saudi Arabia. Rewarding subordinates with high appraisal marks in return for good performance essentially promotes high contingent reward leadership styles. Podsakoff (as cited by Bass, 2008) found that subordinates were more satisfied if their leaders provided them with rewards contingent on their performance. In this study the middle level managers agreed as to the effectiveness of rewarding their subordinates with the appropriate marks for their annual appraisal. However, the middle level managers felt that rewarding subordinates should not go beyond that. Rewarding subordinates with anything material in return for work performance was never an option for the middle level managers. This finding therefore supported the argument made by Lowe et al. (1996) in which it was found that contingent reward has a general positive association with subordinates’ perceptions of work unit effectiveness especially in public organizations. Therefore contingent reward style of leadership “may be especially important in public organizations characterized by systematic and political reward granting” (Lowe et al., 1996, p. 416).

Conclusion

The current study provides insight to the nature of leadership (s) and extends our understanding of association between transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles and leadership outcomes. Overall findings of the study support the propositions of the Full Range Leadership Model that transformational leadership extends the results of transactional leadership toward results beyond expectations. In line with our findings and findings of previous research (Singer & Singer, 1989; Densten, 2003) we can conclude that transformational leadership can contribute a lot to the effectiveness of organizations and that there is a need for further investigation of leadership at different levels.

One of the strengths of this study was that study examined not only one side of the leadership equation: leaders' self-perception of leadership reality in ministry of health. Followers' perception of leadership in ministry of health would give us clearer picture about leadership practice in ministry of health "Leaders need to understand how their followers perceive their behaviour in order to more effectively lead them." (Densten, 2003: 414). However, current study is one of the first systematic examinations of transformational leadership in ministry of health and will hopefully encourage further research.

References:

- Allen DW. How nurses become leaders. Perceptions and beliefs about leadership development. *J Nurs Adm.* 1998 Sep;28(9):15-20.
- Antonakis J, Avolio BJ, Sivasubramaniam N. Context and leadership: an examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* 1. *The Leadership Quarterly.* 2003;14(3):261-95.
- Ardichvili A, Kuchinke KP. Leadership styles and cultural values among managers and subordinates: a comparative study of four countries in the former Soviet Union, Germany and the US. *Human Resource Development International.* 2002;5:99-118.
- Avolio BJ, Bass BM, Zhu FWW. Multifactor leadership questionnaire: manual and sampler set. 3 ed: Mind Garden, Inc.; 2004.
- Bass BM, Riggio RE. *Transformational leadership*: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2006.
- Bass BM. *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*: Lawrence Erlbaum; 1998.
- Lo MC, Ramayah T, Min HW. Leadership styles and organizational commitment: a test on Malaysia manufacturing industry. *African Journal of Marketing Management.* 2009;1(6):133-9.

- Bass BM, Avolio BJ. Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership: Sage Publications, Inc; 1994.
- Bass BM, Avolio BJ. Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public administration quarterly*. 1993;17:112-.
- Bass BM, Bass R, Bass RR. *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*: Free Pr; 2008.
- Bass BM. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*: Free Press New York; 1985.
- Bass. *handbook of leadership: Theory, research & managerial applications*. 4 ed: New York: Free Press.; 2008.
- Berson Y, Avolio BJ. Transformational leadership and the dissemination of organizational goals: A case study of a telecommunication firm. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 2004;15(5):625-46.
- Densten IL. Senior police leadership: does rank matter? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*. 2003;26(3):400-18.
- Dubinsky AJ, Yammarino FJ, Jolson MA. An examination of linkages between personal characteristics and dimensions of transformational leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. 1995; 9(3):315-35.
- Eagly AH, Johannesen-Schmidt MC, Van Engen ML. Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological bulletin*. 2003;129(4):569.
- Failla KR, Stichler JF. Manager and staff perceptions of the manager's leadership style. *J Nurs Adm*. 2008 Nov;38(11):480-7.
- Goleman D. *Working with emotional intelligence*. 2 ed. New York, NY.: Bantam Books; 1998.
- Huber DL, Maas M, McCloskey J, Scherb CA, Goode CJ, Watson C. Evaluating nursing administration instruments. *J Nurs Adm*. 2000 May;30(5):251-72.
- Johnson B, Christensen LB. *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc; 2007.
- Jung DI, Avolio BJ. Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions. *The Academy of Management Journal*. 1999;42(2):208-18.
- Keegan AE, Den Hartog DN. Transformational leadership in a project-based environment: a comparative study of the leadership styles of project managers and line managers* 1. *International Journal of Project Management*. 2004;22(8):609-17.
- Lindholm M, Sivberg B, Uden G. Leadership styles among nurse managers in changing organizations. *Journal of Nursing Management*. 2000;8(6):327-35.2.

- Lok P, Crawford J. The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*. 2004;23(4):321-38.
- Lowe KB, Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. . Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. . *Leadership Quarterly*. 1996;7(3):385 - 425.
- Mulholland J. Competency-based learning applied to nursing management. *J Nurs Manag*. 1994 Jul;2(4):161-6.
- Nawaz MM, Bodla MA. Comparative study of Full Range Leadership Model among faculty members in public and private sector higher education institutes and universities. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 2010;5(4):P208.
- Polit B. *Nursing research: Principles and methods*. 7th ed ed. USA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2004.
- Riggio B. *Transformational Leadership* 2ed. New Jersey: Lawrence: Erlbaum Associates.; 2006.
- The Ministry of Health. *health statistical yearbook*. 2 ed. Saudi Arabia 2010.
- Vesterinen S, Isola A, Paasivaara L. Leadership styles of Finnish nurse managers and factors influencing it. *J Nurs Manag*. 2009 May;17(4):503-9.
- Vigoda-Gadot E. Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models. *Personnel Review*. 2007;36(5):661-83.
- World Health Report 2006 [database on the Internet]2006. Available from: Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/whr/2006/en/> access: 2 January 2010
- Yukl GA, Yukl G. *Leadership in organizations*. 3 ed: Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ; 2002.
- Zagorsek H, Dimovski, V., & Skerlavaj, M, pp. Transactional and transformational leadership impacts on organizational learning. *Journal for East European Management Studies*. 2009;14(2):145 - 65.
- Zaleznik A. Managers and leaders: Are they different. *Contemporary issues in leadership*. 1993;3:36-56.