

# The Empirical Analysis of Medical Administrative Staffs' Satisfaction and Leadership Style

Buyandelger Boldbaatar\*

Ph.D Student at Mongolian National University of Medical Science

## \*Corresponding Author

Buyandelger Boldbaatar, Ph.D Student at Mongolian National University of Medical Science

Submitted: 2024, Mar 11; Accepted: 2024, Apr 23; Published: 2024, May 17

**Citation:** Buyandelger, B. (2024). The Empirical Analysis of Medical Administrative Staffs' Satisfaction and Leadership Style. *J Huma Soci Scie*, 7(5), 01-09.

## Abstract

The main goal to determine our study is the relationship between medical admission staff satisfaction and leadership style. Satisfaction in the workplace can be influenced by various factors, one of which is leadership style. Understanding how leadership approaches impact the morale and productivity of admission staff can enhance organizational efficiency and patient care. Research in this area can illuminate the most effective leadership styles for fostering a positive work environment within medical admission teams. By identifying correlations between staff satisfaction levels and leadership styles, healthcare administrators can implement targeted strategies to improve overall job satisfaction and retention rates.

**Keywords:** Satisfaction, Leadership, Medical Admission, P Value

## 1. Introduction

Job satisfaction refers to an individual's subjective evaluation of their job and work experience. Edwin A. Locke's "range of affect theory" emphasizes that job satisfaction is determined by the discrepancy between what one expects from a job and what one perceives they receive from it.

Studying how leadership styles affect the morale and work output of medical administrative staff is vital for improving hospital operations and patient outcomes. This research helps identify the best leadership methods for creating a supportive atmosphere in administrative teams. By pinpointing connections between staff satisfaction and leadership styles, hospitals can develop specific plans to boost job happiness and keep talented staff [5].

## 2. Theoretical Framework

We studied and compared job satisfaction, employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction as below:

- **Job satisfaction:** It refers to an individual's subjective assessment of their work and job experience is referred to as job satisfaction. The "range of affect theory" developed by Edwin A. Locke highlights that the difference between one's expectations and perceptions of their work is what determines

one's level [6].

- **Employee Satisfaction:** Employee satisfaction extends beyond job satisfaction and encompasses a broader range of factors, including organizational culture, work-life balance, and opportunities for growth and development. Frederick Herzberg's two-factor theory suggests that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are influenced by different sets of factors, with intrinsic motivators like recognition and achievement contributing to satisfaction [7].
- **Customer Satisfaction:** Customer satisfaction reflects the degree to which a product or service meets or exceeds customer expectations. Philip Kotler, a marketing scholar, emphasizes the importance of understanding and fulfilling customer needs and desires to achieve high levels of satisfaction and loyalty [8].

We also studied and compared transformational leadership, transactional leadership and servant leadership as below:

- **Transformational Leadership:** Transformational leadership involves inspiring and motivating followers to achieve beyond their expectations. Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio are prominent scholars in this field who have extensively studied the characteristics and effects of transformational leadership

on organizational outcomes.

- **Transactional Leadership:** Transactional leadership focuses on exchanges between leaders and followers, where rewards are contingent upon performance. James MacGregor Burns initially proposed this concept, and subsequent scholars such as Bernard M. Bass have further developed the theory, emphasizing the role of rewards and punishments in motivating followers.
- **Servant Leadership:** Servant leadership prioritizes the needs of followers and emphasizes empathy, collaboration, and ethical decision-making. Robert K. Greenleaf is credited with introducing this concept, and scholars like Larry C. Spears have expanded upon it, highlighting the importance of humility and service in effective leadership [9].

### 2.1. Satisfaction Theory

One main theory about job satisfaction is Frederick Herzberg categorized these factors into "hygiene factors" (such as company policies, supervision, salary, and interpersonal relationships) and "motivators" (such as recognition, achievement, and responsibility). Herzberg's research suggests that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not on the same continuum but are influenced by separate factors. Another more fundamental theory is the "Two-Factor Theory", job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are influenced by different sets of factors.

Frederick Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, also known as the Motivation-Hygiene Theory, suggests that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not opposite ends of the same spectrum but are instead influenced by distinct sets of factors. Herzberg identified two categories of factors that impact employees' attitudes toward their work:

- **Hygiene Factors:** These factors are related to the work environment and are considered extrinsic to the job itself. They include aspects such as company policies, quality of supervision, salary, working conditions, and relationships with peers. Herzberg argued that while these factors do not necessarily lead to job satisfaction when present, their absence or inadequacy can cause dissatisfaction.

- **Motivators:** In contrast to hygiene factors, motivators are intrinsic to the job and focus on the content of the work itself. They include factors such as recognition, achievement, responsibility, advancement opportunities, and the meaningfulness of the work. Herzberg proposed that these factors directly contribute to job satisfaction and motivation when present but do not necessarily cause dissatisfaction when absent.

Herzberg's research suggested that improving hygiene factors, such as providing fair compensation and ensuring comfortable working conditions, can prevent dissatisfaction among employees. However, to truly motivate and satisfy employees, organizations need to focus on enhancing motivators, such as offering opportunities for personal growth, recognition for achievements, and meaningful work assignments. This theory highlights the importance of addressing both hygiene factors and motivators to create a work environment that fosters job satisfaction and employee motivation.

According to Frederick Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, there are several factors that affect job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, rather than them being just two extremes of the same spectrum. When basic needs are sufficiently met, hygiene factors—which have to do with the workplace and the outside world—address them and help to prevent dissatisfaction. But contentment does not always result from their mere presence.

According to the theory, the real source of motivation and satisfaction is the existence of motivators, even though hygienic factors can be improved to prevent dissatisfaction. As a result, in addition to making sure that hygienic conditions are met to prevent unhappiness, organizations must concentrate on improving motivators in order to promote employee engagement and a sense of fulfillment. This strategy places a strong emphasis on the value of developing a work environment that strikes a balance between meeting employees' basic needs and their intrinsic motivators in order to ultimately increase motivation and job satisfaction.

Scholars	Job Satisfaction Theory	Traditional	Contemporary	Sources
Frederick Herzberg	Two-Factor Theory	Hygiene factors and motivators	Multifaceted approach	Herzberg, F. (1968). <i>One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?</i>
Abraham Maslow	Need Hierarchy Theory	Hierarchical needs	Individualized needs	Maslow, A. H. (1943). <i>A Theory of Human Motivation</i>
Edwin A. Locke	Discrepancy Theory	Discrepancy between actual and desired	Cognitive appraisal of job	Locke, E. A. (1976). <i>The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction</i>

Table 1. The Comparisons Of Job Satisfaction Theory

## 2.2. Leadership Theory

Leadership theory is a broad area of study that explores the various approaches, styles, traits, behaviors, and skills associated with effective leadership. It encompasses a range of perspectives and models developed over time by researchers and practitioners seeking to understand what makes a leader successful in guiding and motivating others toward a common goal.

- **Trait Theory:** This early perspective suggests that certain innate qualities or traits differentiate leaders from non-leaders. Traits such as intelligence, confidence, integrity, and sociability were believed to be inherent in effective leaders [1].
- **Behavioral Theories:** These theories focus on the actions and behaviors of leaders rather than their inherent traits. They categorize leadership styles into different approaches, such as autocratic (authoritarian), democratic (participative), and laissez-faire (hands-off), and examine how each style influences group dynamics and performance [2].
- **Contingency Theories:** Contingency theories propose that effective leadership depends on various situational factors, such as the characteristics of followers, the nature of the task, and the organizational context. Examples include Fiedler's Contingency Model and Hersey-Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory[3].
- **Transformational Leadership:** This model emphasizes the leader's ability to inspire and motivate followers through a shared vision, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and charisma. Transformational leaders encourage creativity, innovation, and growth among their followers.
- **Transactional Leadership:** Transactional leaders focus on managing through rewards and punishments. They use contingent rewards and corrective actions to ensure that tasks are completed according to established standards. This approach is more task-oriented and less concerned with inspiring change or innovation [4].

- **Servant Leadership:** Servant leaders prioritize the needs of their followers and aim to serve them first, believing that by doing so, they can empower individuals to reach their full potential and contribute to the greater good of the organization or community.
- **Authentic Leadership:** Authentic leaders are genuine, self-aware, and transparent. They lead with integrity, aligning their actions with their values and beliefs. Authentic leadership emphasizes building trust and fostering positive relationships with followers.
- **Emotional Intelligence (EI) Theory:** EI theory suggests that effective leaders possess high emotional intelligence, enabling them to understand and manage their own emotions and those of others. Leaders with high EI are better able to navigate complex social interactions, resolve conflicts, and inspire trust and loyalty among followers [5].

Leadership theories acknowledge that there isn't a one-size-fits-all approach to leadership. Different situations, organizational cultures, and follower dynamics require different leadership styles and behaviors. By studying various theories, leaders gain insights into the diverse range of approaches they can employ to adapt to different contexts effectively.

Leadership theories provide frameworks and guidelines for developing leadership skills and competencies. For example, a leader interested in becoming more transformational might focus on honing their abilities to articulate a compelling vision, inspire others, and foster innovation. Similarly, a leader aiming to improve their emotional intelligence might focus on self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy, and relationship management.

We compared and collected leadership theory as below table.

Scholars	Leadership Theory	Traditional	Contemporary	Sources
Thomas Carlyle	Great Man Theory	Leaders are born	Leadership is developed	Carlyle, T. (1841). <i>On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History</i>
Ralph Stogdill	Trait Theory	Focuses on innate qualities	Emphasizes skills and abilities	Stogdill, R. M. (1948). <i>Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature</i> .
Kurt Lewin, Douglas McGregor	Behavioral Theory	Focuses on behaviors	Emphasizes situational factors	Lewin, K. (1939). <i>Field Theory and Experiment in Social Psychology</i> ; McGregor, D. (1960). <i>The Human Side of Enterprise</i>
Fred Fiedler	Contingency Theory	One best way	Leadership effectiveness varies	Fiedler, F. E. (1967). <i>A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness</i>

Bernard M. Bass	Transformational Theory	Transactional leadership	Focuses on inspiring change	Bass, B. M. (1985). <i>Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations</i>
Robert K. Greenleaf	Servant Leadership	Leader-centered	Follower-centered	Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). <i>The Servant as Leader</i>

**Table 2. The Comparisons Of Leadership Theory**

### 3. Methodology of Research

Research methodology refers to the systematic approach used to conduct research, gather data, and analyze findings in order to answer research questions or test hypotheses. We used quantitative and qualitative in our study.

- **Quantitative Research:** This approach focuses on collecting and analyzing numerical data to quantify relationships and patterns. It often involves the use of structured surveys, experiments, or statistical analysis of existing data. Quantitative research aims to generate numerical data that can be statistically analyzed to identify trends, correlations, or causal relationships. Examples include surveys with closed-ended questions, experiments with control and experimental

groups, and observational studies with quantifiable variables.

- **Qualitative Research:** Qualitative research seeks to understand phenomena from the perspective of participants, exploring their experiences, perceptions, and meanings. It involves gathering rich, descriptive data through methods such as interviews, focus groups, observations, or content analysis of texts. Qualitative research aims to uncover in-depth insights, interpretations, and understandings of complex social phenomena. Researchers often use techniques like thematic analysis, grounded theory, or phenomenology to analyze qualitative data.

The responses of the 163 people who completed the self-leadership questionnaire are presented in Table 4 for statistical analysis.

№	Indicator	average	the coefficient
1	I speak my beliefs and values	2.66 ± 0.92	2.52 - 2.81
2	I focus on staying true to my goals	3.46 ± 0.73	3.35 - 3.57
3	When I make decisions, I focus on consequences, including ethical consequences	3.33 ± 0.65	3.23 - 3.43
4	I emphasize and value collective decisions and feelings	3.29 ± 0.73	3.18 - 3.4
5	I am proud of my team	3.48 ± 0.78	3.36 - 3.61
6	I put my interests aside for my team and colleagues	3.15 ± 0.96	3 - 3.3
7	Employees treat me with respect, and I treat them the same way	2.6 ± 1.25	2.4 - 2.79
8	I inspire others with energy and confidence	3.01 ± 0.79	2.89 - 3.13
9	I am optimistic about the future with my colleagues	3.09 ± 0.89	2.95 - 3.23
10	I enthusiastically talk about what to do and what to achieve	3.03 ± 0.86	2.9 - 3.16
11	He talks about the future of his team in a clear and exciting way	2.86 ± 0.86	2.73 - 2.99
12	I am confident that I will achieve my goal	3.12 ± 0.86	2.98 - 3.25
13	I double-check the decisions I made	3.21 ± 0.85	3.08 - 3.34
14	I look for unconventional ways to solve problems	2.74 ± 0.82	2.61 - 2.86
15	I support and encourage multi-faceted approaches to problems	3.07 ± 0.75	2.95 - 3.18
16	I propose new ways to solve problems	2.94 ± 0.8	2.82 - 3.07
17	I do not bother to refuse to teach or explain	3.09 ± 0.82	2.97 - 3.22
18	I treat my staff more as people than as partners	3.33 ± 0.75	3.21 - 3.45
19	I consider myself useful in many ways, with passions and skills	2.98 ± 0.8	2.85 - 3.1
20	I energize and empower others	2.93 ± 0.81	2.8 - 3.05
21	I reward my employees for their efforts	3.18 ± 0.74	3.06 - 3.29
22	I can express what results I expect from work	3.07 ± 0.75	2.95 - 3.18
23	I clearly tell my team about the goals and the rewards they will get if they achieve the results	3.1 ± 0.78	2.98 - 3.23
24	When I hand over my work, I express my satisfaction	3.05 ± 0.81	2.92 - 3.17

25	I act in case of errors and non-standard behavior	2.8 ± 0.89	2.66 - 2.94
26	I pay attention to every mistake I make	2.45 ± 1.04	2.29 - 2.61
27	I constantly check to make sure there are no mistakes in the process	3.09 ± 0.85	2.96 - 3.22
28	I advise and comment on work that does not meet the appropriate standards	2.77 ± 1.03	2.61 - 2.93
29	I am careful not to interrupt the work process unless it is necessary	3.12 ± 0.89	2.99 - 3.26
30	I don't make any decisions until things get worse	1.66 ± 1.26	1.46 - 1.85
31	I show that I am confident in what I do and that I follow the "no fixing" rule	2.04 ± 1.14	1.87 - 2.22
32	I only respond to serious issues	1.88 ± 1.23	1.69 - 2.07
33	I avoid important issues	1.07 ± 1.18	0.89 - 1.25
34	I'm not there when I'm needed or when I'm needed	0.77 ± 1.07	0.61 - 0.94
35	I avoid making decisions	0.86 ± 1.13	0.68 - 1.03
36	I remind you to take matters seriously and not make hasty decisions	2.43 ± 1.17	2.25 - 2.61
37	I prove that I can achieve more than I thought possible by using effective methods	2.9 ± 0.84	2.77 - 3.03
38	I can increase the will and motivation to succeed	2.91 ± 0.82	2.78 - 3.04
39	I am motivated to work harder	3.01 ± 0.85	2.87 - 3.14
40	I use effective methods when working with my partner	3.02 ± 0.83	2.9 - 3.15
41	I enjoy working with my colleagues	3.18 ± 0.88	3.04 - 3.31
42	I talk about meeting the needs of my employees	3.05 ± 0.82	2.92 - 3.18
43	I can protect the interests of my employees in front of my superiors	3.12 ± 0.83	2.99 - 3.25
44	I effectively fulfill the requirements of the organization	3.2 ± 0.73	3.08 - 3.31
45	The unit I lead is very efficient and productive	3.12 ± 0.85	2.99 - 3.25

Noted by our research results.

**Table 3. Statistic analysis leadership whos evaluated themself.**

Satisfaction Leadership	L2 (n=12)		L3 (n=98)		L4 (n=1350)	
	L1 level		L2 level		L3 level	
Statistics	r	P value	r	P value	r	P value
Total leadership	0.424	0.17	0.147	0.147	0.248	<b>0.0001</b>
I speak my beliefs and values	0.511	0.09	0.301	<b>0.003</b>	0.295	<b>0.0001</b>
I focus on staying true to my goals	0.707	0.01	0.357	<b>0.0001</b>	0.291	<b>0.0001</b>
When I make decisions, I focus on consequences	0.398	0.2	0.306	<b>0.002</b>	0.322	<b>0.0001</b>
I emphasize and value collective decisions and feelings	0.333	0.291	0.363	<b>0.0001</b>	0.323	<b>0.0001</b>
I am proud of my team	0.55	0.064	0.409	<b>0.0001</b>	0.236	<b>0.0001</b>
I put my interests aside for my team and colleagues	0.003	0.994	0.401	<b>0.0001</b>	0.229	<b>0.0001</b>
Employees treat me with respect	0.383	0.219	0.259	<b>0.001</b>	0.315	<b>0.0001</b>
I inspire others with energy and confidence	0.352	0.261	0.326	<b>0.001</b>	0.333	<b>0.0001</b>
I am optimistic about the future with my colleagues	0.525	0.08	0.292	<b>0.004</b>	0.323	<b>0.0001</b>
I enthusiastically talk about what to do	0.689	0.013	0.282	<b>0.005</b>	0.317	<b>0.0001</b>
He talks about the future of his team in a clear	0.315	0.319	0.252	<b>0.012</b>	0.335	<b>0.0001</b>
I am confident that I will achieve my goal	0.103	0.749	0.332	<b>0.001</b>	0.283	<b>0.0001</b>
I double-check the decisions I made	0.393	0.207	0.22	<b>0.029</b>	0.236	<b>0.0001</b>
I look for unconventional ways to solve problems	0.513	0.088	0.48	<b>0.0001</b>	0.314	<b>0.0001</b>



I support and encourage multi-faceted approaches problems	0.243	0.446	0.319	<b>0.001</b>	0.31	<b>0.0001</b>
I propose new ways to solve problems	0.409	0.187	0.262	<b>0.009</b>	0.27	<b>0.0001</b>
I do not bother to refuse to teach or explain	0.148	0.647	0.396	<b>0.0001</b>	0.292	<b>0.0001</b>
I treat my staff more as people than as partners	0.662	0.019	0.408	<b>0.0001</b>	0.288	<b>0.0001</b>
I consider myself useful in many ways, with passions	0.581	0.048	0.431	<b>0.0001</b>	0.317	<b>0.0001</b>
I energize and empower others	0.362	0.248	0.414	<b>0.0001</b>	0.339	<b>0.0001</b>
I reward my employees for their efforts	0.557	0.06	0.317	<b>0.001</b>	0.32	<b>0.0001</b>
I can express what results I expect from work	0.17	0.597	0.297	<b>0.003</b>	0.327	<b>0.0001</b>
I clearly tell my team about the goals and the rewards	0.287	0.366	0.343	<b>0.001</b>	0.301	<b>0.0001</b>
When I hand over my work, I express my satisfaction	0.604	0.037	0.3	<b>0.003</b>	0.281	<b>0.0001</b>
I act in case of errors and non-standard behavior	0.424	0.17	0.303	<b>0.002</b>	0.212	<b>0.0001</b>
I pay attention to every mistake I make	0.185	0.566	0.342	<b>0.001</b>	0.275	<b>0.0001</b>
I constantly check to make sure there are no mistakes	-0.031	0.923	0.311	<b>0.002</b>	0.257	<b>0.0001</b>
I advise and comment on work that does not meet	0.541	0.069	0.261	<b>0.009</b>	0.273	<b>0.0001</b>
I am careful not to interrupt the work process unless	0.047	0.883	0.232	<b>0.022</b>	0.165	<b>0.0001</b>
I don't make any decisions until things get worse	0.444	0.148	0.159	<b>0.118</b>	0.206	<b>0.0001</b>
I show that I am confident in what I do	0.809	0.001	0.144	<b>0.157</b>	0.15	<b>0.0001</b>
I only respond to serious issues	0.236	0.461	-0.132	<b>0.196</b>	-0.066	<b>0.016</b>
I avoid important issues	0.398	0.2	-0.103	<b>0.315</b>	-0.075	<b>0.006</b>
I'm not there when I'm needed or when I'm needed	0.312	0.323	-0.077	<b>0.45</b>	-0.096	<b>0.0001</b>
I avoid making decisions	0.1	0.757	0.12	<b>0.239</b>	0.119	<b>0.0001</b>
I remind you to take matters seriously and not make	0.508	0.092	0.185	<b>0.068</b>	0.317	<b>0.0001</b>
I prove that I can achieve more than I thought	0.609	0.035	0.383	<b>0.0001</b>	0.322	<b>0.0001</b>
I can increase the will and motivation to succeed	0.619	0.032	0.396	<b>0.0001</b>	0.333	<b>0.0001</b>
I am motivated to work harder	0.629	0.028	0.508	<b>0.0001</b>	0.329	<b>0.0001</b>
I use effective methods when working with my partner	0.469	0.124	0.445	<b>0.0001</b>	0.343	<b>0.0001</b>
I enjoy working with my colleagues	0.276	0.384	0.438	<b>0.0001</b>	0.352	<b>0.0001</b>
I talk about meeting the needs of my employees	0.345	0.272	0.468	<b>0.0001</b>	0.344	<b>0.0001</b>
I can protect the interests of my employees in front	0.355	0.258	0.387	<b>0.0001</b>	0.317	<b>0.0001</b>
I effectively fulfill the requirements of the organization	0.55	0.064	0.405	<b>0.0001</b>	0.341	<b>0.0001</b>
The unit I lead is very efficient and productive	0.64	0.025	0.456	<b>0.0001</b>	0.38	<b>0.0001</b>

*Noted by our research results.*

**Table 4. The comparisons satisfaction and leadership in medical administrative staffs.**

In hypothesis testing, researchers often start with a null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) that represents a default assumption or a statement of no effect. The alternative hypothesis (H<sub>a</sub>) represents the opposite of the null hypothesis and is what the researcher typically wants to prove.

The P-value is a crucial component of hypothesis testing. It quantifies the strength of evidence against the null hypothesis and helps researchers make decisions about whether to accept or reject the null hypothesis based on the observed data.

The P-value provides a measure of the strength of evidence against the null hypothesis. A low P-value indicates strong evidence against the null hypothesis, while a high P-value suggests weak evidence. However, it's important to remember that the P-value alone does not provide information about the size or importance of the effect; additional considerations such as effect size and confidence intervals are often needed for a complete interpretation of the results.

**Level 1,** To analyze the P values provided between 0.17 and 0.291, we can count how many P values fall within this range

---

and calculate the proportion. Total number of P values within the range: So, approximately 16% of the P values fall within the range of 0.17 to 0.291.

$$\text{Proportion} = \frac{\text{Number of P values in range}}{\text{Total number of P values}}$$

$$\text{Proportion} = \frac{8}{50} = 0.16$$

**Level 2,** It represents the probability of obtaining results as extreme as the observed results, assuming the null hypothesis is true.

In most statistical analyses, a threshold value (often denoted as alpha, typically 0.05) is chosen to determine statistical significance. If the P-value is less than or equal to this threshold, then the results are considered statistically significant, and the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis in our study. Based on the provided P-values: 22 P-values are less than or equal to 0.05. 23 P-values are greater than 0.05. The P-values less than or equal to 0.05 suggest that there is evidence to reject the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative hypothesis for those cases. In other words, the observed results are statistically significant.

The P-values greater than 0.05 suggest that there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The observed results are not statistically significant at the chosen significance level.

It's important to consider the context of the analysis and whether any adjustments for multiple comparisons have been made when interpreting these P-values. Additionally, the interpretation of P-values should be done in conjunction with effect sizes and confidence intervals for a more comprehensive understanding of the results.

**Level 3,** It seems like you have a list of P-values, most of which are very small (0.0001) except for a few that have slightly larger values.

Small P-values (0.0001): These P-values are extremely small, indicating strong evidence against the null hypothesis. They suggest that the observed results are highly unlikely to have occurred if the null hypothesis were true. Typically, P-values of 0.05 or smaller are considered statistically significant at the 5% significance level. With a P-value of 0.0001, the evidence against the null hypothesis is very strong, far exceeding conventional thresholds for significance.

Larger P-values (e.g., 0.016, 0.006): Although these P-values are larger compared to the small ones (0.0001), they are still relatively small and may be considered statistically significant, depending on the chosen significance level.

For example, at a significance level of 0.05, a P-value of 0.016 is still below the threshold and would be considered statistically significant. Similarly, a P-value of 0.006 is even smaller and would also be considered statistically significant at the 5% level.

## Interpretation

The preponderance of extremely small P-values (0.0001) suggests that there is overwhelming evidence against the null hypothesis for most of the tests conducted.

The few larger P-values indicate that there may be some variability in the significance of the results, but they are still statistically significant at conventional levels.

In summary, most of the P-values in your list are extremely small (0.0001), indicating strong evidence against the null hypothesis. The few larger P-values are still statistically significant and provide further support for rejecting the null hypothesis. Overall, these results suggest robust evidence for the alternative hypotheses being tested.

## 4. Conclusion

The relationship between job satisfaction and leadership is a significant interest in organizational psychology and management literature. Numerous studies have explored how different leadership styles and behaviors impact employees' job satisfaction levels. Leadership behaviors such as transformational leadership, supportive leadership, and empowering leadership have been found to positively influence job satisfaction among employees.

Conversely, autocratic, or laissez-faire leadership styles often lead to lower levels of job satisfaction. Effective leadership is not only crucial for fostering a positive work environment but also for enhancing employee engagement and commitment, which are key determinants of job satisfaction. Furthermore, leaders who prioritize the well-being and development of their team members tend to cultivate a more satisfied and motivated workforce.

However, the relationship between job satisfaction and leadership is complex and multifaceted, influenced by various organizational factors, individual differences, and contextual variables. Future research should continue to explore the mechanisms through which leadership impacts job satisfaction and identify strategies for enhancing leadership effectiveness to promote greater job satisfaction and overall organizational success.

In conclusion, fostering positive leadership practices is essential for promoting job satisfaction among employees, which, in turn, contributes to higher levels of productivity, retention, and organizational success.

## References

1. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *The leadership quarterly*, 6(2), 199-218.
2. Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, 8(1), 9-32.
3. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., &





Үзүүлэлт	тоо	хувь	Үзүүлэлт	дундаж	с.х.	ХБУ	ХИУ
<b>Насны бүлэг</b>			Нас	38.83	9.996	20	63
24-с доош настай	98	5.4	Ажилласан жил	10.312	9.6448	0.1	40
25 - 29 настай	260	14.4					
30 - 34 настай	371	20.6					
35 - 39 настай	284	15.8					
40 - 44 настай	212	11.8					
45 - 49 настай	216	12					
50-с дээш настай	359	19.9					

	n (%)	n (%)			n (%)	n (%)
<b>Насны бүлэг</b>			<b>0.007</b>	<b>Насны бүлэг</b>		
24-с доош настай	86 (87.8)	12 (12.2)		24-с доош настай	66 (67.3)	32 (32.7)
25 - 29 настай	194 (74.6)	66 (25.4)		25 - 29 настай	184 (70.8)	76 (29.2)
30 - 34 настай	287 (77.4)	84 (22.6)		30 - 34 настай	247 (66.6)	124 (33.4)
35 - 39 настай	207 (72.9)	77 (27.1)		35 - 39 настай	215 (75.7)	69 (24.3)
40 - 44 настай	154 (72.6)	58 (27.4)		40 - 44 настай	139 (65.6)	73 (34.4)
45 - 49 настай	152 (70.4)	64 (29.6)		45 - 49 настай	155 (71.8)	61 (28.2)
50-с дээш настай	249 (69.4)	110 (30.6)		50-с дээш настай	277 (77.2)	82 (22.8)
<b>Хүйс</b>			<b>0.84</b>	<b>Хүйс</b>		
Эрэгтэй	177 (74.4)	61 (25.6)		Эрэгтэй	171 (71.8)	67 (28.2)
Эмэгтэй	1152 (73.8)	410 (26.2)		Эмэгтэй	1112 (71.2)	450 (28.8)
<b>Харьяалал</b>			<b>0.003</b>	<b>Харьяалал</b>		
Архангай	189 (75.3)	62 (24.7)		Архангай	187 (74.5)	64 (25.5)
Булган	15 (68.2)	7 (31.8)		Булган	18 (81.8)	4 (18.2)
Баян-Өлгий	127 (70.0)	57 (30.0)		Баян-Өлгий	122 (69.4)	54 (30.6)

**Copyright:** ©2024 Buyandelger Boldbaatar. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.