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ABSTRACT
This study sought to examine the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers. Specifically the study investigated the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles and job satisfaction. The goal of this study is to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers. A total of 160 survey packages were mailed out to the Maryland parole and probation officers of which 115 officers returned completed survey packages representing 71.9%, while 45 officers did not return theirs representing 28.1%. The result of the study showed that management by exception (active) leadership factor had a positive correlation with job satisfaction. Based on the analysis, the study concluded that management by exception (active) was the only leadership factor that had positive relationship with job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers. Therefore, management by exception (Active) factor accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers.
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INTRODUCTION
Criminal justice practitioners, academicians, as well as researchers continue to give more attention to the part which leadership plays when it comes to job satisfaction in many public safety organizations, including the Maryland division of parole and probation (Bass & Avolio, 1995; Burns, 1978; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Myer & Allen, 1991). This attention has continued to grow rapidly due to the globalization of businesses, growing competition, and trends in high technological advancement. Accordingly, these trends in technological advancement have brought
numerous changes in both internal and external conditions under which public safety organizations conduct their businesses.

In many correctional agencies, the increasing role of leadership as it pertains to job satisfaction can no longer be ignored. These leadership roles have the potential to influence job satisfaction, productivity, turnover, employee behavior, employee morale, and employee effort (Olorunsola, 2010). To this end, whether officers are responding to the safety of offenders under their supervision, altering offenders behaviors, rehabilitating offenders, engaging offenders through behavior management, engaging offenders in the change process, and ensuring public safety (Taxman, Shepardson, & Byrne, 2005), the balance as to whether these goals can be achieved largely depended on leadership and officers job satisfaction. It is in this regard that public safety practitioners have redirected their focus on identifying the style of leadership that best supports job satisfaction among officers for effective performance of their duties.

Previous studies have examined the role of leadership as it relates to officers’ job satisfaction in various settings such as healthcare, military, education, and business organizations (Cook, Wall, Hepworth, & Warr, 1989; Bass, 1990; Chen & Silverthorne, 2004). These studies generally indicate that officers’ job satisfaction in the public sector is just as important as in the private sector. It is in this regard that the present study was conducted to investigate the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles to determine which style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers.

As observed by Taxman, Shepardson, and Byrne (2005), the division of parole and probation is essentially the basis for community corrections. However, the Maryland division of parole and probation has not received sufficient attention as an important component of public safety in the State of Maryland and yet, the size and scope of offenders and case load for probation officers continue to increase. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2003), about 6.7 million adults (representing 80% of the population) are in some form of community supervision across the United States which puts parole and probation in the forefront for public safety. As the prison population has been growing over the last 20 years, so did the number of people on parole and probation. Indeed, at the end of 2001, more than 4.6 million adults representing 1 in every 50 were on community supervision (Taxman, Shepardson, and Byrne, 2005).

The increased population of paroleses and probationers has continued to overwhelm parole and probation officers’ ability to perform effectively thereby diminishing their level of job satisfaction among officers. Research has shown that the Maryland division of parole and probation runs a great risk of officers leaving the division to other state agencies (Adebayo, 2005; Alemika & Chukwuma, 2006; Arase & Iwuofor, 2007; Igbinovia, 2000). According to Taxman et al. (2005), parole and probation officers’ dissatisfaction with their jobs is the leading causes of overcrowding in prisons and jail, as well as the clogging of court dockets. The incarceration of paroleses and probationers who have violated the terms of their release is the single most important factor behind the massive increase in prison population. Consequently, of the 4.6 million people under supervision in the U.S., an estimated 1.8 million are likely to violate the terms of their release (Taxman et al. (2005). Job satisfaction and leadership practices have been consistently linked to officers leaving their job or not performing their tasks. For example, in 1999 alone, nearly 35% of
prison population were parole violators and over half million probationers were sent to prison each year due to dissatisfaction of parole and probation officers (Taxman et al. 2005).

**Literature Review**

*Leadership*

Leadership and job satisfaction have gained enormous attention among public safety practitioners as a critical issue in the field of public safety. In this regard, leaders’ performance has come to symbolize the success or failure of most public safety organizations including the Maryland division of parole and probation due to their critical function in vision setting, policy formulation, allocating resources, and coordination of activities towards achieving organizational goals (Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978). The success or failure of a leader in this context will depend on how effective the leader handles the issue of employee job satisfaction. For example, leaders who are able to address the issues of employee job satisfaction are said to be more effective, while those whose leadership styles elicit disaffection among employees are said to be ineffective (Voon, Lo, Ngui, Ayob, 2011). Furthermore, it is also a generally accepted view that employees who are satisfied with their leaders’ style demonstrate high level of morale and attachment with organizational goals and values which ultimately leads to enhanced efforts, better performance, and greater productivity (Myers et al, 1993; Portal, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). The link between leadership and employee job satisfaction has therefore become a crucial component of public safety. Most importantly, both scholars and public safety practitioners are now interested in the types of leadership that will provide the desired outcome due to the complex and dynamic nature under which modern public safety organizations operate.

*Transactional Leadership Style*

Transactional leadership style operates on the basis of exchange rewards for services (Bass and Avolio, 1995). Indeed, transactional leadership is a diminished type of transformational leadership in that it does not focus on the individual needs of employees. Rather than personal motivation and employee enhancement, transactional leadership style favors the notion of exchange of valuables such as money and gifts to advance the goals of both the leader and the employee. In this instance, employees do exactly what the leader wants for their own best interest (Northouse, 2010). For example, politicians will win votes by promising, “no new taxes”, managers will offer, “promotion” to employees who surpass their goals, and teachers will “give grades” for work completed (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership style has three parts: contingent rewards, management by exception (active), and management by exception (passive). *Contingent reward* refers to leaders explaining in clear terms the task that must be achieved and use rewards in exchange for good performance(Antonakis et al, 2003). *Management by exception*(passive) refers to leaders who tend to intervene when errors occur (Bass & Avolio, 1995). Management by exception (active) involves leaders who actively monitor the work of their employees and ensure that standards are met (Bass & Avolio, 1995).

*Transformational leadership style*

Transformational leadership was first made public by Bass in 1985. Since then several other scholars have expanded on it. As noted by Bass (1990), transformational leadership takes root when leaders broaden and elevate the excitement of employees which translate to high level of commitment, greater productivity, and self-actualization (Barbuto, 2005). This essentially involves both leaders and employees raising each
other’s achievements, morality, and motivations to such a high level that may result in job satisfaction (Barnett, 2003). Transformational leadership assumes that followers may follow leaders that can inspire and motivate them. The style also believes that followers that have passion and vision can ultimately achieve both the organizational goal and outcome (Nwankwoala, 2014). In general, public safety organizations that apply transformational leadership style are better able to deal with changes in followers behaviors. In this context, Yukl (2002) noted that with transformational leadership, followers feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and total respect towards the leader which invariably translate to high level productivity. Transformational leadership according to Homrig (2001) seeks to gain agreement by appealing to the values of the employees and inducing them to act for certain goals that represent the shared values. This style of leadership empowers both the leader and the led to develop the capacity to achieve its plan by organizing and staffing jobs with qualified individuals, communicating plan of action effectively, delegating responsibility for carrying out plans, creating an organizational structure and set of objectives for accomplishing plan requirement, and devising system to monitor implementation (Homrig, 2001). Additionally, transformational leadership focuses on three behavioral patterns of charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Ortmeier & Meese, 2010). This model creates vision, mobilizes people for commitment, and institutionalizes all changes. Transformational leadership also focuses efforts and makes choices based on goals, values, and ideals that the leader determines or organization wants or ought to follow. Though complex, but potent, the model recognizes and exploits the existing need or demand of potential followers. Further, transforming leaders looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engage the full person of the follower (Ortmeier & Meese, 2010). This style of leadership passionately studies how strong leaders improve followers. Therefore, the model focuses primarily on developing passion, enthusiasm and energy in a team. In addition, it emphasizes how leaders can develop a vision for their organization, sell the vision to employees, and then help them to carry the vision successfully. The ultimate outcome of the transformational model is that it strives to create a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and converts leaders into moral change agents (Ortmeier & Meese, 2010). To this end, transformational model is a process that impacts strongly on internal values and motivate others to act above self-interest. This model is attractive to people because it is easily understood. Moreover, leaders in this model are seen as providing vision for the future. It also meets leaders and employees needs, treats leadership as a process in which needs and growth of others are central, and places emphasis on values and morality (Ortmeier & Meese, 2010). It also enables productive leaders to handle organizational transformations and change very efficiently despite the fact that organizational change is seldom easy (Collins & Powell, 2004).

Elements of Transformational leadership
Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1997) identified four elements of transformational leadership: Idealized influence, Inspirational motivation, Intellectual stimulation, and Individualized consideration. Idealized influence involves formulation and articulation of vision, challenging goals, and motivation of employees to work above and beyond their self-interest to achieve common goals (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater & Spangler, 2004). Leaders in this category behave in a manner that engages followers emotionally (Bass & Avolio, 2004). According to Bass and Avolio (2004),
leaders in this category align their ethics and values with that of the organization and they care about values, beliefs, have a strong sense of purpose, and collective sense of mission.

*Inspirational motivation* deals with the manner in which leaders motivate employees to commit to the organization’s vision. Leaders in this category motivate their employees by challenging them to higher heights (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

*Intellectual stimulation* involves stimulating innovation and creativity by questing assumptions and encouraging employees to approach old situation in a new way (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Nicholasson, 2007).

*Intellectual consideration* refers to leaders who care for employees’ needs and concerns. This category of leaders teaches, coaches, treats people as individuals rather than member of a group, and assist employees to develop their strengths (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is a much researched subject (Olorunsola, 2010). However, there is no consensus on the definition of job satisfaction. For example, Brayfield & Rothe (1951) defined job satisfaction as attitudes of an individual toward his/her work (p. 307). Smith et al. (1969) posit that job satisfaction is a feeling a worker has regarding his/her job (p. 100). Job satisfaction according to Mullins (2005) is more of an attitude, an internal state of mind which could be linked to personal feelings of achievement in real life. Robins (2001) added that job satisfaction represents an individual’s attitude towards his/her job. Riggio (2000) on the other hand noted that job satisfaction is a kind of feeling and attitude that people have regarding their job which may be good and bad, negative and positive and are likely to contribute to satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Administrators in correctional settings found themselves increasingly under pressure, attempting to provide various stakeholders with measurable outcomes regarding job satisfaction. Studies have found that satisfied workers, including Maryland parole and probation officers and correctional officers live longer, healthier lives, happier, are more cooperative, more dependable, and are less likely to quit their jobs (Whiteacre, 2006). Job satisfaction reduces absenteeism, turnover, and affects other behaviors, such as, compliance, altruism, dependability, punctuality, complaints, waste, cooperation, criticism, and arguing among employees (Whiteacre, 2006). This research is in support of what correctional administrators have already recognized: healthier and satisfied workforce increases productivity.

Just as there is no universally accepted definition of job satisfaction, its research and methods are not either. As important as Job satisfaction is to researchers and employees, both are looking for ways to better attract and maintain the best out there. The study of job satisfaction came to light back in the 1920s and 1930s with the Hawthorn experiment of Elton Mayo, who decided to study whether or not altering the work environment would increase or decrease productivity (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1973). He in effect proceeded to alter physical structural factors such as lighting, temperature, and humidity which he compared to production level of workers. Upon the conclusion of the experiment, it was determined that increased or decreased lightening has no effect on productivity hence the term, “Hawthorn effect”, because workers were made aware of the experiment, so they improved their performance (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1973). This serves as the foundation for later studies.

Job satisfaction is so critical that its absence most often results to reduced productivity and absenteeism (Levinson, 1997; Moser, 1997). In addition, lack of job satisfaction is usually a strong predictor of quitting a job (Alexander, Lichtenstein, & Hellmann, 1997; Jamal, 1997).
Most often workers may leave one organization for another. Other times, workers may move from one profession to another that is considered better or greener pasture. The latter is very common in the Maryland division of parole and probation where issues such as poor salary, furloughs, hiring freezes, and salary reductions are common themes (http://marylandreporter.com). In such instances, employees tend to frequently move to better paying jobs (Fafunwa, 1971). Clarifying this trend, Armentor & Forsyth, 1995; Flanagan, Johnson, & Berret, 1996; Kadushin & Kulys, 1995) agree that job satisfaction is essentially controlled by factors external to workers. From this view point, satisfaction may be motivated by the nature of the work, the pervasive social climate, and the extent to which workers peculiar needs are met. To this end, addressing the job satisfaction of the Maryland division of parole and probation officers becomes very critical.

Studies of job satisfaction have been extensive in the field of psychology and other organizations. However, in public safety, studies of job satisfaction have been minimal at best to capture data. As observed by Mire, 2005, law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies who have a high level job satisfaction are often more enthusiastic to perform their duties. The existing public safety job satisfaction literature shows that there are factors that cause dissatisfaction among officers. Zhao et al (1999) study examined the effect of environment and demographic variables have on job satisfaction of officers. The authors used the entire Spokane WA Police Department as their sample. A total of 199 officers completed three survey instruments, including the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), and the demographic survey questionnaire. In addition, the authors used the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) statistical model for their analysis. The results showed that job satisfaction has a positive correlation with the work and type of tasks and that the relationship between officers’ demographic variables and job satisfaction has no effect.

Another research, Mire (2005) studied 87 officers from Lafayette, Louisiana to determine the correlates of their job satisfaction. The author’s goal was aimed at enhancing the theoretical extent of job satisfaction research within public safety. Mire (2005) used self-report for data collection. In addition to demographic variables, the author included organizational variables such as task identity, skill variety, autonomy, task significance, and feedback, while the personality variables included neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and consciousness. The study findings showed that age, years of service, and rank correlated with job satisfaction. Similarly, the five organizational variables had a significant correlation with job satisfaction with a 13% variance. Further, the five personality variables with exception of openness were significantly correlated with job satisfaction, with 10% variance (Mire, 2005).

Koslowsky, Caspy, and Lazar (1990) work on Israeli police officers to examine the causal relationship between job satisfaction and commitment. Commitment in this context was operationalized as a consequence of perceived cost/benefits and consisted of four facets: job rewards, job costs, investment size, and perceived alternatives. The authors used a longitudinal approach for data from the Central Command Unit in Tel-Aviv. The authors job satisfaction and commitment questionnaires were administered to 63 police officers two times in a six months interval. The result showed no cost and benefit relationship between job satisfaction and commitment.

According to Johnson, (2012), studies of job satisfaction in public safety/law enforcement have always been focused on officers’ demographic characteristics. Only recently have some studies show that job task variables are the main source of
Job satisfaction. Johnson (2012) conducted research in which he analyzed three dimensions of correlates of job satisfaction: officers’ demographic characteristics, officers’ job task characteristics, and officers’ organizational environment characteristics. The sample included patrol officers from 11 public safety agencies from the Southern United States. The findings from this study showed that officer’s job task characteristics were the main source of job satisfaction, while organizational environment characteristics played a minor role in determining officer’s job satisfaction.

Lim et al as cited in Ozbaran (2010) conducted research in Singapore to examine whether or not job satisfaction of officers was related to how officers perceive their job image. In this study, perceived job image has four facets: prestige, integrity, competence, and non-routine job nature. The authors used a mix study in which surveys were administered to 467 officers and 28 officers were interviewed. A regression analysis was used for the analysis. The result of the study showed that the four dimensions of perceived job image, especially the prestige dimension affected job satisfaction of the officers. To this context, the authors noted that job satisfaction is strongly associated with perceived job image of the officers. Similarly, Yim & Scafer (2009) conducted research to show how officers’ public perception affected their job satisfaction. The authors drew their sample from metropolitan agencies in the Midwestern States of the United States. A self-administered questionnaire was utilized to obtain officers data. Findings from the study showed that officers believed public perception of them is less favorable. The findings also revealed that officers’ perceived image in most non-enforcement situations was strongly related to their job satisfaction.

Morrrale (2002) researched the relationship between public safety leadership styles and officers willingness to exert extra effort for their job satisfaction. The result showed that officers are more satisfied with their work and more willing to exert when they work with managers who demonstrate transformational leadership style. Similarly, Harris (1998) research examined the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover. The author identified eight factors that may cause an officer to quit his/her job which includes: opportunity for advancement, general benefits, retirement package, salary, position, department’s personnel policies, leadership style, and administrative policies of the department. The study included a total of 232 officers who had resigned or quit their jobs to work for other agencies. The result showed a negative correlation between officer’s turnover and satisfaction with opportunities for promotion, job realities and job expectations. The author noted that most of the participants showed dissatisfaction with pay and advancement opportunities.

Kung (2004) study examined job satisfaction among women officers. The study consisted of 101 women officers. The variables that had a significant effect on job satisfaction for women officers were perceived organizational support, task significance, and autonomy. The findings for the study showed that job satisfaction increased when the organization in which they work for valued their contribution and well-being as individuals. The study further revealed that women officers were satisfied due to the fact that organization granted them some measure of independence which enabled them to make sound judgments while doing their work.

Stress has also been found to impact job satisfaction in public safety organizations. Getaham et al (2008) study indicates that parole and probation officers who report less stress are more likely to equally report high level of job satisfaction. Martelli et al (1989) reported that officers with high level of stress have low job satisfaction.
satisfaction with their job. Violanti and Arin (1993), on source of public safety officers’ stressors found organizational stressors such as the fear of being jammed in the course of discharging their duties to significantly impact job satisfaction. To this end, organizational stressors were found to be six times more than inherent stressor on public safety officers (Violanti & Arin, 1993). The author concluded that individuals with higher level of job satisfaction were shown to have much lower stress level (Violanti & Arin, 1993).

The attempt to understand the determinants of job satisfaction among public safety officer was performed by Ozbaran (2010), who examined the relationship between leadership styles of Turkish Traffic management and the job satisfaction of traffic officers. The author utilized the bivariate correlation and multiple regressions for analysis. The result of the study showed a positive relationship between leadership characteristics of the managers and job satisfaction of traffic officers. The results also showed that when officers perceive their managers to demonstrate transformational leadership style and behavior, they are more likely to be satisfied with supervision, present work, and their overall jobs.

Influence of Leadership on Job satisfaction

Essentially, the relationships between leadership style, job satisfaction, and work performance have been adequately researched (Bass, 1990a; Collins & Porras, 1996; & Manz & Sims, 1991; all cited in Ozbaran, 2010). In addition, Joseph (1998) equally observed the fact that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and co-workers transformational/transactional style of leadership that describes leaders who are most concerned with employee performance and job satisfaction. Equally, Riaz and Haider (2010) conducted a study which determined the impact of transformational and transactional leadership style on job satisfaction and career success. The result of the study further showed a positive relationship between leadership style, job satisfaction, and career success. This result is consistent with other studies (Berson & Linton, 2005; Wiratmadja, Govindaraju, & Rahyuda, 2008).

Equally, Lashbrook (1997) posited that leadership style plays a critical role in influencing employees’ job satisfaction. Other researchers discovered that different leadership styles will endanger different working environment and directly impact job satisfaction of employees (Bogler, 2001; Heller, 1993; Timothy & Ronald, 2004). In the same vein, Bass (1985) postulated that transformational leadership enhances job satisfaction, given its capacity to impart a sense of mission and intellectual stimulation. Furthermore, leaders practicing transformational leadership style tend to encourage and motivate their employees to take on added responsibilities (Emery & Barker, 2007) there by improving employees’ sense of belonging, accomplishment, and satisfaction with their job. In this context, transactional and transformational leadership styles have been associated to have positive impact on employees and organizational outcomes (Bass 1990). In addition, these styles of leadership are directly linked to positive employee perceptions, job satisfaction, and organizational satisfaction (Felfe & Schyns, 2006; Brycio, Hackett & Allen, 1995; Niehoff, Enz & Grover, 1990). As observed by Lund (2003),employees are most satisfied when they perceive their leaders as exhibiting relational and task oriented behaviors. Certainly, factors such as pay, race, and promotion opportunities may be associated with job satisfaction (Lim & Teo, 2000; Buzawa, 1984).Other studies show that job satisfaction has a positive relationship with management (Brunetto & Wharton, 2003; Barnes & Sheley, 2004). This position is collaborated by Chiok (2001) study that examined the effect of leadership behavior on job satisfaction, productivity, and organizational commitment among nurses. The author concluded
that job satisfaction was mostly influenced by managers’ style of leadership (Chiok, 2001). Another variable related to job satisfaction is the supervision component (Barnes & Sheley, 2004). Equally, Bass (1985) examined transformational leadership in a different environment and came to a conclusion that leadership style of managers is a critical factor for job satisfaction. Bass (1985) strongly maintained that workers are more likely to feel better with their task when they work with managers who demonstrate transformational leadership behavior.

Another study conducted by Emery and Baker (2007) determined the effect of transformational leadership style on organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The study population consists of 77 branch managers from three regional banking industry and 47 store managers from a national food chain industry. The authors utilized the abridged version of MLQ instrument. They also used the modified version of JDI which included items that the researchers felt was directly affected by supervisor style. Data was analyzed using correlation analysis with Cohen and Cohen formulae for comparing the size of dependent correlation (Emery & Baker, 2007). The study findings showed that employees whose managers demonstrated transformational leadership style enjoyed high levels of job satisfaction. The authors also found that the factors of charisma and intellectual stimulation correlated with job satisfaction of food employees at r = .212 and r = 322 respectively. This study provided support for the use of transformational leadership to increase job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Emery & Baker, 2007).

**Measuring Job Satisfaction**

Several job satisfaction measuring instruments has been developed over the years. Indeed, there are too many to be listed in this paper. Therefore, just a few will be discussed. For instance, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969); the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was developed by Weiss, Davis, England, and Lofquist (1967); The Porter Need Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Porter (1962); Brayfield-Rothe Index was developed by Brayfield and Rothe (O’Connor et al, 1978).

Job satisfaction instruments have been used very widely by researchers in quantitative studies. However, for this study, a Single-Item Global Job Satisfaction Measure developed by Wanous et al, (1997) was utilized. Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997) published a study in which they demonstrated that single-item measures of overall job satisfaction correlates highly with multiple items (or scale) measures of overall job satisfaction (uncorrected correlation of .63 corrected only for reliability, r=.67). Wanous et al, (1977) concluded that single item measures of overall satisfaction are more robust than the scale measures of overall job satisfaction (p. 250). Wanous et al equally listed conditions upon which a single item measure may be preferred. These conditions includes: (1) single item measures may take less space than scale measures, (2) single item measures may be more cost effective, (3) single item measures may contain more face validity, more so when an organization has poor employee relations such as negative reaction to perceived repetition questions from scale measures, and (4) single item measures may be better to measure changes in job satisfaction (Wanous et al, 1977).

Following the objectives of this study, two research questions were developed:

**Question 1:** what is the relationship (if any) between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Maryland division of parole and probation officers?
Question 2: what is the relationship (if any) between transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive), and job satisfaction among Maryland division of parole and probation officers?

RESEARCH DESIGN
The study used the quantitative methodology to investigate the function of leadership as it relates to job satisfaction of Maryland parole and probation officers. Specifically, the study investigated the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership style, and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Maryland division of parole and probation officers. A total of 160 questionnaires were distributed to officers of the Maryland division of parole and probation using a convenient sampling method. However, only 115 returned their completed surveys accounting for 71.9% response rate.

The questionnaires consisted of three parts:

1. The first instrument used was the MLQ 5X rater form developed by Avolio and Bass (1995) to collect information on transformational and transactional leadership style.
2. The second instrument used was the Single-Item Global Measure on Job Satisfaction developed by Wanous et al (1997).
3. The third part consisted of officers’ bio data reflecting Maryland parole and probation officers personal characteristics.

The first part of the survey consists of 45-item MLQ rater as developed by Avolio and Bass (1985). This instrument was used to rate the frequency of observed leaders behavior on a 5-point Likert scale of 0-4. The MLQ 5X contains 45 items key measures of leadership factors and organizational effectiveness outcome variables. The nine components of leadership measured transformational and transactional leadership style, while the remaining four components measured performance outcomes. The averages of the participants rating were taken for all the variables for analysis. Permission to use the MLQ 5X questionnaires came from Mind Garden for Avolio and Bass (1985).

The second instrument was the Single-Item Global job satisfaction Measure by Wanous et al (1997). The Single-item Global Job Satisfaction Measures is a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5, with 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree. Respondents were asked to respond to the statement, “considering everything, I am satisfied with my job” Respondents were to choose from items (1) strongly disagree to item (5) strongly agree that represents the level of their job satisfaction. Responses were summed up, with highest score indicating a high level of job satisfaction while a low score indicated low level of job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers. Permission to use the Single-Item Global Job Satisfaction was obtained from Professor Wanous et al, (1997).

The third instrument was the officers’ bio data. The bio data information summarized the personal characteristics of the participants to provide the background information on their perception to leadership factors. The bio data equally reflected the quality and degree of understanding of participants’ ability to assess leadership functions.

Data Analysis
For data analysis, ordinal data analysis procedure was used (RQ1-RQ2). The MLQ 5X measures the transformational leadership style, 20 question items, five leadership behavior scales which
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includes: idealized influence (attribute), measured by items (10, 18, 21, and 25) on the MLQ 5X form; idealized influence (behavior) measured by items (6, 14, 23, and 34) on the MLQ 5X form; inspirational motivation measure by items (9, 13, 26, and 36) on the MLQ 5X form; intellectual stimulation, is measured in items (2, 8, 30, and 32) on the MLQ 5X form; and individualized consideration, measured by items (15, 19, 29, and 31) on the MLQ 5X form. The MLQ 5X is a Likert-type scale. Where, 0 is (not at all) and 4 is (frequently if not always). Scores from the 20 question items will be summed up to yield a total score that reflects not at all or frequently, if not always. Higher scores will indicate that a relationship exist between the leadership style being measured and the officers job satisfaction on the Single-Item Global Job satisfaction Measure scale, while a lower score will indicate no relationship.

The data was organized in an (SPSS) file. Similarly, the analysis utilized descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics allows data obtained to be structured, accurate, and in a cohesive manner (Huysamen, 1990). This statistics was used to analyze the demographic data which includes: age, education, gender, time at present work. The statistics equally measured the mean, frequency, percentages, and standard deviation. While inferential statistics on the other hand allowed this researcher the capacity to infer based on the analysis between and among variables of different subgroups, and how independent variables explained the variance in dependent variable (Sekaran, 2000).

The Pearson product correlational coefficient (r) guided the measurement of the associations of two variables characterized by a linear relationship (positive or negative). This statistics guided the investigation of the relationship between transformational and transactional. Analysis was equally employed in the present study using linear regression, which took into account the relationship between two or more variables by applying linear equation to observe data (Sekaran, 2000). Essentially, the linear regression analyzed the relationship between dependent and independent variables and the extent of their relationship.

Descriptive Statistical Results
Table 1 contains descriptive statistics for the sample demographic characteristics of age, gender, education, marital status, and years of experience as a Maryland parole and probation officer. Most of the participants were either between 31 and 40 years of age (36.5%) or 41 and 50 years of age (39.1%), and most (54.9%) were male. Most of the participants had a bachelor’s degree (73.0%) with 14.8% having second bachelor’s degree, and 12.2% having a master’s degree. Most of the participants were married (68.7%), 31.3% were single, and none were divorced. There was wide variation in years of experience as Maryland parole and probation officer with the most common levels of experience being between 6 and 10 years (20.9%), between 21 to 25 years (20.0%), and between 16 to 20 years (19.1%).

Descriptive statistics for the nine leadership scales and the job satisfaction measure are shown in Table 2. Among the leadership scales, the highest means were for the Intellectual Stimulation scale (M = 8.55, SD = 2.80), the Management-by-Exception(Active) scale (M = 8.50, SD = 3.27), and the Idealized Influence (Attribute) scale (M = 8.31, SD = 3.06). The lowest means were for the Inspirational Motivation scale (M = 7.71, SD = 2.69) and the Idealized Influence (Behavior) scale (M = 7.95, SD = 2.74).
Table 1
*Descriptive Statistics for Sample Demographic and Background Characteristics (N = 115)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest level of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Bachelor degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of experience as a parole and probation officer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or older</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Leadership and Satisfaction Scales (N = 115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attribute)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Passive)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFERENTIAL STATISTICAL RESULTS

Research Question 1
The first research question of this study was: What is the relationship (if any) between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Maryland division of parole and probation officers? Table 3 shows the Pearson correlations among the transformational leadership scales and job satisfaction. Job Satisfaction scores were not significantly related to Idealized Influence (Attribute) scores, \( r = -.09, p = .359 \), Idealized Influence (Behavior) scores, \( r = -.02, p = .801 \), Inspirational Motivation scores, \( r = .00, p = .959 \), Intellectual Stimulation scores, \( r = -.01, p = .953 \), or Individualized Consideration scores, \( r = -.02, p = .833 \).
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Table 3

Pearson Correlations between Transformational Leadership Scales and Job Satisfaction (N = 115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Idealized Influence (Attribute)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01.

The results of a linear regression analysis with the five transformational leadership scale as predictors of job satisfaction scores are shown in Table 4. Overall, the regression model was not statistically significant, $R^2 = .01$, $F(5, 190) = .26$, $p = .936$. This indicated that the transformational leadership scales were not predictive of Job Satisfaction scores. Based on the fact that the Pearson correlation analysis indicated that none of the correlations between the transformational leadership scales and Job Satisfaction scores were statistically significant, and that the regression model was not statistically significant, the answer to the first research question of this study was that there were no relationships between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Maryland division of parole and probation officers.

Research Question 2

The second research question was: What is the relationship (if any) between transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive), and job satisfaction among Maryland division of parole and probation officers? Table 5 shows the Pearson correlations between the three transactional leadership scales and Job Satisfaction scores. Job Satisfaction scores were not significantly related to Contingent Reward scores, $r = -.05$, $p = .582$, Management-by-Exception (Active) scores, $r = .13$, $p = .159$, or Management-by-Exception (Passive) scores, $r = -.10$, $p = .267$. 
Table 4
Results from Linear Regression Analysis with Transformational Leadership Scales as Predictors of Job Satisfaction (N = 115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE_b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-10.96</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attribute)</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Model $R^2 = .01$, $F(5, 109) = .26$, $p = .936$.

Table 5
Pearson Correlations between Transactional Leadership Scales and Job Satisfaction (N = 115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Contingent Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management-by-Exception (Active)</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Management-by-Exception (Passive)</td>
<td>0.64*</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01.
Table 6 shows the results from the linear regression analysis with the three transactional leadership scales as predictors of Job Satisfaction scores. The regression model as a whole was not statistically significant, Model $R^2 = .06$, $F(3, 111) = 2.34$, $p = .077$. However, the Management-by-Exception (Active) scale was statistically significant as a predictor of Job Satisfaction scores, $\beta = .26$, $p = .019$. Based on the Pearson correlation and linear regression results, the answer to the second research question of this study was that one of the transactional leadership variables, management by exception (active), had a positive relationship to Job Satisfaction scores among Maryland division of parole and probation officers. Specifically, participants who rated their leader as exhibiting a management by exception (active) leadership style tended to have higher levels of job satisfaction.

Table 6
Results from Linear Regression Analysis with Transactional Leadership Scales as Predictors of Job Satisfaction ($N = 115$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SEB$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Passive)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Model $R^2 = .06$, $F(3, 111) = 2.34$, $p = .077$.

Summary of Findings and Discussions of Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles and job satisfaction to determine which leadership style accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers. In order to establish the relationship between leadership factors and employee job satisfaction, research questions were posed to guide this research in arriving at empirically tested answers. Answers to these research questions formed the basis for the following findings. The first research question (RQ1) was: What is the relationship (if any) between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers? The summary of the analysis showed that Job Satisfaction scores were not significantly related to Idealized Influence (Attribute) scores, $r = -.09$, $p = .359$, Idealized Influence (Behavior) scores, $r = -.02$, $p = .801$, Inspirational Motivation scores, $r = .00$, $p = .959$, Intellectual Stimulation scores, $r = - .01$, $p = .953$, or Individualized Considerations scores, $r = -.02$, $p = .833$. The results of a linear regression analysis with the
v五transformational leadership scale as predictors of job satisfaction scores are shown in Table 4. Overall, the regression model was not statistically significant, $R^2 = .01$, $F(5,190) = .26, p = .936$. This indicated that the transformational leadership scales were not predictive of Job Satisfaction scores.

Based on the fact that the Pearson correlation analysis indicated that none of the correlations between the transformational leadership scales and Job Satisfaction scores were not statistically significant, and that the regression model was not statistically significant, the answer to the first research question of this study was that there were no relationships between transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers. Furthermore, transformational leadership style does not account for most of the variance in determining the perception of job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers. It is critical to note that transformational leadership generally influence, arouse, and develop subordinates. However, in this study, the non-correlation of transformational leadership variables with job satisfaction is surprising. This essentially symbolizes low morale and a psychological detachment of employees to their organization. The non-correlation between transformational leadership variables and job satisfaction of the Maryland parole and probation officers indicates poor responses of officers in this category to their leadership actions and styles. Indeed, officers with low job satisfaction only stay in their job because they are compelled to remain. In this regard, employees with low job satisfaction are not prepared to develop their potential and may not contribute to the accomplishment of organizational vision and mission. The finding of this study is not consistent with Bass and Avolio (1999), Bass (1990), Idris and Ali (2008), and Yukl, (1999) studies that linked transformational leadership style to higher organizational performance. Their findings are not relevant to the Maryland parole and probation because it is critical to define factors that affect the quality of leadership practices that satisfies organizational performance and job satisfaction. In this context, transactional leadership variable of management-by-exception (active) was found to be the only leadership style that most positively affects quality of work practices which ultimately impact Maryland parole and probation officers’ job satisfaction.

The second research question (RQ2) the present study sought to answer was What is the relationship (if any) between transactional leadership variables of contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers?

Table 5 shows the Pearson correlations between the three transactional leadership scales and Job Satisfaction scores. Job Satisfaction scores were not significantly related to Contingent Reward scores, $r = .05, p = .582$, Management-By-Exception (Active) scores, $r = .13, p = .159$, or Management-By-Exception (Passive) scores, $r = -.10, p = .267$.

Table 6 shows the results from the linear regression analysis with the three transactional leadership scales as predictors of Job Satisfaction scores. The regression model as a whole was not statistically significant, Model $R^2 = .06, F(3, 111) = 2.34, p = .077$. However, the Management-By-Exception (Active) scale was statistically significant as a predictor of Job Satisfaction scores, $\beta = .26, p = .019$.

Based on the Pearson correlation and linear regression results, the answer to the second research question of this study was that one of the
transactional leadership variables, management-by-
exception (active), had a positive relationship with
Job Satisfaction scores among Maryland parole and
probation officers. Indeed, participants who rated
their leader as exhibiting a management-by-
exception (active) leadership style tended to have
higher levels of job satisfaction. The positive
correlation between management-by-exception
(active) leadership style and job satisfaction
showed that Maryland parole and probation
officers are prepared to abide by the constructive
criticisms and corrective measures put in place by
their leaders in order to retain their jobs. This
finding is not equally consistent with Avolio
(1994), Avolio and Bass (2004), and Sosik and
Dionne (1997) that the corrective actions of leaders
in transactional leadership management-by-
exception (active) is not a good practice in
supporting organizational effectiveness, performance
and ultimately job satisfaction.

The negative correlation between contingent
reward and job satisfaction among
Maryland parole and probation officers showed that
these officers do not value reward and exchange
that occur with their leadership. This indicates that
officers view reward as temporary or artificial in
that it does nothing to assist them perform their jobs more effectively. The negative relationship between contingent reward and job satisfaction collaborated Bass
(1985a). As noted by Bycio et al. (1995), the non-
correlation occurred because job satisfaction does
not translate to potential rewards an employee may
expect to accumulate from his or her leader who
relies entirely on contingent reward. The findings
also supported Berson and Linton (2005), Podsakoff,
MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990), Yukl (1999) that transactional leadership contingent reward style only reward followers who participate in accomplishing tasks and punish those who do not participate, a

**Policy Implications of the Findings**
The analysis of the findings indicated a positive
relationship between management-by-exception
(active) leadership variable and job satisfaction.
Transformational leadership variables of idealized influence, idealized
consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational
motivation, had negative relationship with
job satisfaction among Maryland parole and
probation officers. With respect to transactional
variables, management-by-exception remains the
most important factor in influencing Maryland
parole and probation officers as it correlated very
strongly and positively with job satisfaction.
This indicates that Maryland parole and probation
officers value constructive criticisms and corrective measures put in place by leadership. The negative correlation between contingent reward and job satisfaction indicated that officers of the Maryland parole and probation considered the costs associated with leaving the service or cost of
securing another employment more than rewards
that can be offered by their leaders. The study also
showed that transformational leadership variables
do not augment transactional leadership factors in
determining outcome variables of extra effort,
leadership effectiveness, and job satisfaction
among Parole and probation officers. This clearly
showed that exchanges between leaders and their
subordinates are not particularly important
in determining employee job satisfaction in the
Maryland parole and probation hence the non-
correlation shown by transformational factor of
idealized influence, idealized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation in predicting outcome variables. In this context, only
management-by-exception (active) factor aspect of
the transactional leadership style has the predicting
outcome variables and also the only leadership
style that accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among the Maryland parole and probation officers.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The present study has provided the framework on which future research on the Maryland parole and probation could be based. There is no doubt that for Maryland parole and probation to attain its organizational goals there is a great need for purposeful leadership and employee job satisfaction. Future research could focus on the following areas in order to improve on the quality of the present findings. The need to widen the scope of the present study to cover the entire Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services is greatly encouraged. A larger sample size of the entire Department of Public Safety and Correctional services might yield different results than the present study.

The present study dealt with one aspect of leadership and job satisfaction. Other studies could focus on Maryland parole and probation work environment, policies, officers’ intention to quit, and officers’ personal attributes as it relates to job satisfaction for future studies. These additional studies could reinforce some of the findings of the present study. Further, the recommended studies could also provide very useful insights into leadership as it relates to employee job satisfaction in the Parole and Probation setting.

**Conclusions and recommendations for Policy Implications**

From the findings of this study, the need for policy recommendations that will guide the present Maryland parole and probation leadership in mobilizing the human resources of the agency towards accomplishing its agenda is critical. It is therefore in recognition of the crucial role which Maryland parole and probation play in maintaining public safety that the finding of this study becomes very vital to leadership in ensuring and promoting officers’ job satisfaction.

There is also the need for training, retraining, and in-service training of officers and human resources both at leadership and subordinate levels. This study has clearly shown that leaders applying management-by-exception (active) characteristics in which subordinates are continually evaluated based on the utility of corrective actions and constructive criticisms put in place by leadership to enable officers perform their assigned tasks are particularly valued among Maryland parole and probation officers.

Therefore, efforts should be made to incorporate management-by-exception (active) leadership values and qualities into Maryland parole and probation upper management in order for them to be more conscious of their actions, attitudes, and behaviors. The values of accountability, transparency, honesty, and discipline should also be put in place in the Maryland parole and probation leadership to further enhance officers’ job satisfaction. The high correlation between management-by-exception (active) leadership style and job satisfaction among parole and probation officers is an indication that leadership must exemplify and institute performance improving corrective actions and criticisms which will impact officers’ job satisfaction.

To promote creativity, innovations, and efficiency in employee job satisfaction, leadership must place high emphasis on high order of needs such as, opportunity for personal growth, training, and retraining. The positive correlation between management-by-exception (active) and job satisfaction indicates that promoting corrective measures and high order of needs would definitely enhance leadership effectiveness. Furthermore, there is need for the Parole and Probation leadership to design and implement
efficient corrective actions that would incorporate fairness and equity. The result of this study showed that management-by-exception (active) factor was very significant in promoting officers job satisfaction which impacted the outcome variable of the Maryland parole and probation leadership effectiveness. The fact that officers value the system of corrective measures and constructive criticism put in place by their leaders indicate that they are satisfied and would abide by that system to keep their jobs.

As pointed out by Bass (1985), an active management-by-exception leader continuously evaluates subordinates performance to be able to intervene immediately in the event of errors or problems. In such instance, the standards for evaluation are clearly set from the onset and any deviations are quickly corrected to ensure that employees are on track and set goals are achieved. According to Peters (1991), bold times calls for bold leaders and bold ideas. The present global security challenges in addition to prison population explosion in America offer unique opportunities for the Maryland parole and probation leadership to change the ways it conducts its business over the years.

Based on the findings of this study, it can therefore be concluded that the transactional leadership variable of management-by-exception (active) accounts for most of the variance in perception of job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers. Furthermore, with purposeful leadership as exemplified by management-by-exception (active), the Maryland parole and probation could be made effective and efficient to provide the much-needed platform for successful implementation of organizational programs and practices. The parole and probation policy makers and implementers are encouraged on the basis of the findings of this study, to develop strategies that will enhance, reorient, and promote effectiveness of the parole and probation leadership as well as increasing performance and ultimately ensure job satisfaction among Maryland parole and probation officers.
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