Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

RESEARCH ARTICLE

NURSING ACADEMIC STAFF ENGAGEMENT IN WORK AGAINST TRADITIONAL AND INNOVATIVE LEADERSHIP STYLES

Fathya Abdelrazek RN, PhD

Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Nursing, Ismailia, Suez Canal University, Egypt

……………………………………………………………………………………………………....

Manuscript Info	*Abstract*

………………….

………………………………………………………………

Aim: Study the relationship between nursing academic staff engagement in work and traditional and innovative leadership styles.

Background: Work engagement contributes to immersion of people in work with high level of energy caring about doing it as better as possible and the cautious of its quality with sense of enthusiasm and pride, targeting to high level of performance and better product/output. So, taking measures to achieve it is a requirement for successful organization and individuals. This requires a leadership not only with certain characters but basically certain practices that inspire, motivate and facilitate people/workforce engagement in work.

Methods: Utrech Work Engagement Scale was used to assess work engagement of all nursing assistant teaching staff in addition to a leadership styles questionnaire to determine leadership styles of nursing academic managers either traditional or innovative.

Results: Both work engagement and leadership styles were in average levels and practices. There was no significant correlations between work engagement and leadership styles whether the traditional or innovative ones.

Conclusion and implications: There is no dominant leadership style/s whether the traditional or innovative. That could be good, but when combined with average level of work engagement revealed no significant correlations. This means that work engagement level should be improved mainly based on/geared to vigor and dedication improvement measures.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………....

Introduction:-

Work engagement recently becomes one of work issues that have been paid attention in research especially with increasing interest in the positive psychology in work (Albrecht, 2015; Bailey et al., 2015).The target of this approach in human resource management, positive psychology in work, is the best for individuals as well as organization (Schaufeli, 2011). It is the positive side for practicing work, which contributing to work effectiveness (Laschinger et al., 2009), people and organizational performance (Breevaart et al., 2014, 2015) in addition to occupational and organizational success (Vincent-Hoper et al., 2012). It improves commitment, structural (Greco et al., 2006) and psychological empowerment (AL Zaabi et al., 2016), organizational identification (Gözükara and Şimsek, 2016), loyalty (Kalvina, 2016), job satisfaction and emotional control (Mencl et al., 2016), individuals well-being and productivity (Shuck and Reio Jr, 2014) in addition to positive organizational citizenship behavior (Burch

---

Corresponding Author: Fathya Abdelrazek RN, PhD.
Address: Faculty of Nursing, Ismailia, Suez Canal University, Egypt.

331

and Guarana, 2014). It is negatively correlated with turnover intention (Albrecht and Andreetta, 2011; Burch and Guarana, 2014), depression (Torp et al., 2012), and depersonalization (Shuck and Reio Jr, 2014). Globally, it constitutes occupational health promotion (Torp et al., 2012) and quality work life as a whole (Gillet et al., 2013).

Work engagement has been studied from many views using different measurements (Ludviga and Kalvina, 2016). Each one of them has its distinguished study scope: Job Engagement Scale (Rich et al., 2010) measuring cognitive, emotional and physical engagement; Employee Surveys measuring it as a multidimensional attitude (engagement with job itself/motivation, advocacy, involvement and identification with the organization) (Soieb et al., 2015); Utrech Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Schaufeli et al., 2002) that is the most common used one. Accordingly, work engagement is defined by Schaufeli et al. (2002 p. 74-75) as: 'Engagement is a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. Dedication refers to being strongly involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. Absorption, is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work' (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003 p. 4-5).

Earlier, work engagement has been studied with certain variables that its meanings could be interrelated with each other and need to be differentiated. Burnout usually represents the negative impact/side of work in contrast to work engagement (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003). Even, work engagement is sometimes assessed through measuring burnout (Soieb et al., 2015), the negative side of it. It is characterized by exhaustion compared to vigor, cynicism compared to dedication, in addition to professional efficacy (lack of occupational accomplishments) (Schaufeli et al. 2002; Schaufeli, 2011). It usually has negative correlation with work engagement (such as Langelaan et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2009). Whereas workaholism could be described as abnormal side/unhealthy state of work engagement, as it is characterized by a compulsive inner drive to work (not working puts individual in stress) and associated with job dissatisfaction and poor health even if it has positive outcomes for organization. It is hardly related to work engagement (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003; Schaufeli, 2011). However, work engagement, by itself, is basically positive by itself and healthy (Schaufeli, 2011). It is usually studied as a needed basic for workforce well-being (such as Mencl et al., 2016), and sometimes as a well-being itself (such as Perko et al. 2016). Its positive entity for individuals and organization (Shuck and Reio Jr, 2014) extends from antecedents/inputs as self-efficacy, job design/redesign, supervisory support, and organizational justice, to consequences/outcomes as morale, life satisfaction, and individuals and organizational performance, (Schaufeli, 2011; Bailey et al., 2015; Sharoni et al., 2015).

Other variables are so important for work engagement, two major recourses; personal and job. Both represents many of work engagement antecedents and contribute to job demands-resources (JD-R) model especially job (Demerouti et al., 2001) and both are major contributors in the modified JD-R model of work engagement (Bakker and Demerouti 2007, 2008). JD-R model illustrates how job resources contributes to work engagement and hence positive outcomes whereas job demands contributes to burnout and hence negative outcomes (Demerouti et al., 2001; Hu et al., 2013; Schaufeli, 2015). Whereas, JD-R model of work engagement illustrates how both personal and job resources could contribute to work engagement (Bakker and Demerouti 2007, 2008). This is assured by the study of Xanthopoulou et al. (2009) which indicated how job resources can affect work engagement through personal resources. Job resources are such as job autonomy, coaching, responsibility, performance feedback, and supervisor support whereas personal resources such as self-efficacy, self-esteem, adaptive perfectionism, extraversion and optimism (Bakker and Demerouti 2008; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009; Schaufeli, 2011).

Leadership is so important for work engagement. Both are contributing to each other. If work engagement is one of partners in work achievement, leadership is the other one. Leadership usually works through influencing others to satisfy job requirements for organizational and personal goal achievement, which requires engaged subordinates (Tims et al., 2011; Breevaart et al., 2014; Cherry and Jacob, 2014). Besides, effective leadership whether ethical, or empowering contribute positively to work engagement (Albrecht and Andreetta, 2011; Den Hartog and Belschak, 2012). Furthermore, leadership is one of the work engagement antecedents especially the transformational one (Bailey et al., 2015). It is basic for building work engagement (Schaufeli, 2011; Tims et al., 2011). In addition, work engagement relations with leadership styles were mainly found positive especially with transformational leadership and other innovative styles (Tims et al., 2011; Wang and Hsieh 2013; Strom et al., 2014). However, traditional

leadership styles especially autocratic one is expected to have a negative impact on work engagement (Stanislavov and Ivanov, 2014).

This effect of leadership styles whether positive or negative is based on certain characteristics/practices adopted by the leader in each one of these styles. When found, work engagement could be largely found. These characteristics/practices are as coaching, autonomy, feedback, and social support, which should be combined with certain personal subordinates' characteristics (Bakker and Demerouti 2007, 2008). Concerning innovative leadership styles; transformational style is characterized by optimism, having the need of self-actualization, inspiring vision, encouraging performance beyond expectations, helping and encouraging staff development associated with effective performance appraisal. Besides, transformational leader is innovator, mentor and empowering his/her staff (Huber, 2010; Cherry and Jacop, 2014; Strom et al., 2014; Suan and Nasurdin, 2016). Transactional style is characterized by focusing on day to day operation and routine work, setting performance goal based on expected level from subordinates, and active monitoring associated with correction, providing needed information, and using reward and punishment (Huber, 2010; Cherry and Jacop, 2014; Strom et al., 2014).

Servant style is characterized by putting others' service before oneself, teaching subordinates then lead, sensing in communicating and treating them, helping them to be more free and autonomous, in addition to ability to deal with complex issues, good communication, and cautious about common good (Joseph and Winston, 2005; Marquis and Huston, 2005; Huber, 2010). Authentic style is characterized by ethical and transparency behaviors, self-awareness of oneself strengths and weaknesses and how they can impact others beside to self-efficacy, behaving based on life experience and oneself abilities, searching positive and negative perspectives of subordinates when critical decision, inspiring trust and optimism, providing supporting climate contributing to healthy work environment, providing high standard role model, fostering oneself and subordinates development and behaving in the same way (Wong and Laschinger, 2012). As regard to traditional leadership styles, autocratic and democratic and their similarities in addition to laissez faire are varied based on the chance given to subordinates to take the decision, self-controlled to do their tasks or controlled by supervisor in addition to communication channels. Autocratic style controls the whole situation whether decision or task implementations and communication is mainly one way (downward). That is in contrast to laissez faire style. Whereas in democratic style, subordinates participate in decision, have the chance to do their task with reasonable freedom and communication is two ways (Marquis and Huston, 2005; Huber, 2010; Cherry and Jacop, 2014). So, based on these characteristics, it is expected that transformational, authentic then servant could be highly positive contributor to work engagement. They could be followed by transactional (justice) and democratic (participation). Laissez faire (autonomy) could be sometimes positive according to the situation. Whereas autocratic could be a negative contributor to work engagement as a result of no chance for autonomous and feeling of professional self-efficacy.

Leadership styles had been studied with different variables such as motivation (Walker, 2015), organization performance (Omira, 2015) in addition to commitment and subordinate-supervisor relationship (Babalola, 2016), and frequently showing positive relation such as transformational with commitment (Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016), authentic with structural empowerment (Regan et al., 2016) and with motivation and commitment (Guerrero et al., 2015). However, many studies researched the relationship between work engagement and leadership styles. Most of these studies were geared to work engagement and each leadership style separately. They were mainly conducted on transformational style (such as Breevaart et al., 2014; Burch and Guarana, 2014; Kopperud et al., 2014; Mencl et al., 2016), followed by authentic (such as Hassan and Ahmed, 2011; AL Zaabi et al., 2016), then servant (such as Villier, 2015), and so limited with other styles. Sometimes, the research studies gather between transformational and laissez faire and/or transactional styles in relation to work engagement (Soieb et al., 2015; Gilbert et al., 2016). But, they are less found regarding democratic and autocratic styles in addition to their similarities. Also, the studies in this area are so limited in higher education and none was found in nursing academia. Besides, no identified research studied all these styles of leadership together with work engagement in higher education or nursing academia in specific globally or in Egypt. So, the present study aimed to study the relationship between nursing academic staff engagement in work and traditional and innovative leadership styles.

Research objectives were to:-
- Assess work engagement of nursing assistant teaching staff.
- Determine dominant leadership styles of nursing academic managers
- Assess relationship between work engagement of nursing assistant teaching staff and traditional and innovative leadership styles of their academic managers.

Research questions were:-
- To what extent nursing assistant teaching staff are engaged in their work?
- To what extent nursing academic managers could be categorized as traditional or innovative leadership styles?
- Is relationship between work engagement of nursing assistant teaching staff and leadership styles of their academic managers differed with traditional from innovative?

Methods:-
Design:-
The study had a correlational and descriptive design. Data were collected at faculties of nursing of Port Said University and Suez Canal University, in Port Said and Ismailia, Egypt.

Sample:-
All nursing assistant teaching staff (63) working at the two faculties of nursing in Port Said (42) and Ismailia (21) had participated in the study. Majority of them (93.7%) were female compared to 6.3% were male with mean age 28.3± 4.7 ranged from 23 to 39 years old. 63.5 % of them were instructors compare to 36.5% were assistant lecturer.

Questionnaires:-
Two tools were targeted for data collection; Utrech Work Engagement Scale (UWES) and a leadership styles questionnaire. UWES-17, the long version of UWES (Work &Well-being Survey) had been used in this study to assess work engagement. It was developed by Schaufeli et al. (2002). It includes 17 items distributed on three subscales: vigor (6) such as "At my work, I feel bursting with energy ", dedication (5) such as" I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose", and absorption (6) such as "Time flies when I'm working". The responds were geared to how participants feel at work along 7-point scale (ranged between never = 0 to always = 6). The construct validity of UWES was assured on (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) indicated a sufficient and clear three-factor model for work engagement later (Bakker, 2009; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2010), and reveal that the three factors significantly loaded onto a higher-order construct of work engagement (Ghadi et al., 2013). Reliability of UWES was 0.83 for vigor, 0.92 for dedication, 0.82 for absorption, and 0.93 (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003) compared to 0.95 for UWES as a whole later (Roberts, 2014). UWES reliability in present study was 0.68 for vigor, 0.78 for dedications, 0.93 for absorption, and 0.86 for total work engagement/UWES. The leadership style questionnaire was used to determine leadership styles of academic managers. It is prepared by Abdelsalam (2013), based on Arabic copy of Hussein (2009) that was valid and reliable, and developed based on Clark (1998) for autocratic, democratic and laissez faire as traditional leadership styles, and Bass and Avoloi (1995) and El-Sayed (2005) for transformational and transactional. This Arabic copy was revised and modified by Abdelsalam (2013) to be suitable for academic field, adding servant and authentic leadership styles based on other studies as Hunt (2002) and Wood (2003). This modified questionnaire consisted of 99 items, categorized as 24 items for traditional styles (8 for each one of them), and 75 items for innovative styles (39 for transformational, 18 for transactional, 11for authentic, and 7 for servant). The participants responds were along five points rating scale ranged from never=1 to always= 5. The leadership style reliability in present study was 0.86 for autocratic, 0.73 for democratic, 0.79 for laissez faire, 0.66 for transformational, 0.76 for transactional, 0.70 for authentic, 0. 67 for servant, and 0.78 for the leadership style questionnaire as a whole.

Data collection:-
The data were collected during the second term of the academic year 2011/2012, using structured interview for UWES-17 and self-instruction for leadership styles questionnaire from all nursing assistant teaching staff after explaining the aim of the study and how to fulfill both tools beside to other needed explanations.

Ethical considerations:-
The data were collected after official permission from the deans of both faculties of nursing in Port Said and Ismailia, followed by explaining purpose of the study to the research participants, and having their agreement. The anonymity of them and the right to be withdrawn from the study are assured in addition to the data will be used only for the research purpose.

Data analysis:-
Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) the data were analyzed (FA). Descriptive statistics were computed for sample characteristics and the studied variables. Levels of work engagement were calculated using percentiles according to statistical norms established for the UWES by Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) as five levels; very low (< 5 percentile), low ($5 \leq$ - 25 percentile), average ($25 \leq$ - 75 percentile), high ($75 \leq$ - 95 percentile), and very high ($95 \leq$ percentile). Cut points were used to determine three levels of practicing leadership styles; low (0.00- 33.33%), average (33.33 - 66.66%), and high (66.66 - 100%). The reliability of data collection tools was measured using Cronbach's alpha. Pearson correlation was used to test the relationship between work engagement of nursing assistant teaching staff and innovative and traditional leadership styles of their academic managers in addition to all studied variables. The 5% level of significance was set for all correlations test among both variables.

Results:-
Levels of work engagement and relationships among its attributes:-
The highest percentages of nursing assistant teaching staff had an average level of work engagement and all its attributes especially vigor (50.8%) compared to dedication (31.7%) that had high levels more than others, with slightly highest mean. In addition, vigor had the highest significant correlations with work engagement and its attributes compared to absorption; see Table 1 and 2.

Table 1: Levels of work engagement

Work engagement	Very low		Low		Average		High		Very high		Mean/SD
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Vigor	3	4.8	12	19.0	32	50.8	13	20.6	3	4.8	4.04/1.19
Dedication	3	4.8	11	17.5	29	46.0	12	19.0	8	12.7	4.32/1.31
Absorption	2	3.2	12	19.0	30	47.6	13	20.6	6	9.5	4.02/1.12
Total	3	4.8	12	19.0	28	44.4	17	27.0	3	4.8	4.13/1.07

Table 2: Relationships among work engagement attributes

Work engagement	1	2	3	4
1.Vigor	_____			
2.Dedication	0.87[**]	_____		
3.Absorption	0.64[**]	0.52[**]	_____	
4.Total	0.95[**]	0.91[**]	0.80[**]	_____

Leadership styles practice and relationships among them:-
Three styles; two of traditional and one of innovative were practiced more in average, and other three styles had same percentages of practice (33.3%) along low, average and high. Servant was the highest practiced leadership style (36.5%). In addition, servant had highest positive significant relationships as a whole especially with transformational (0.87), authentic (0.81), democratic (0.63) in addition to transactional (0.45). This is in contrast to autocratic; see Table 3 and 4.

Table 3: Levels of leadership styles

Leadership styles	Low		Average		High	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Autocratic	18	28.6	23	36.5	22	34.9
Democratic	21	33.3	21	33.3	21	33.3
Laissez faire	18	28.6	23	36.5	22	34.9
Traditional styles	21	33.3	18	28.6	24	38.1
Transformational	21	33.3	21	33.3	21	33.3
Transactional	21	33.3	21	33.3	21	33.3
Servant	20	31.7	20	31.7	23	36.5
Authentic	19	30.2	23	36.5	21	33.3
Innovative styles	21	33.3	21	33.3	21	33.3

Table 4: Relationships among leadership styles

Leadership styles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.Autocratic	___								
2.Democratic	-0.19	___							
3. Laissez faire	-0.19	0.43**	___						
4.Traditional	0.28*	0.71**	0.77**	___					
5.Transformational	-0.33**	0.72**	0.36**	0.45**	___				
6.Transactional	0.13	0.30*	0.03	0.238	0.51**	___			
7.Servant	-0.28*	0.63**	0.28*	0.37**	0.87**	0.45**	___		
8.Authentic	-0.26*	0.47**	0.18	0.24	0.78**	0.48**	0.81**	___	
9.Innovative	-0.25*	0.64**	0.27*	0.38**	0.93**	0.64**	0.94**	0.91**	___

Relationships between work engagement and leadership styles:-

There was negative correlation between work engagement and its attributes with traditional leadership styles in contrast to innovative ones except vigor. It had negative correlations with all leadership styles except servant. This is without statistical significant correlation. These results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Relationships between work engagement and leadership styles

Leadership Styles	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total Work Engagement
Autocratic	-0.007	-0.056	-0.075	-0.052
Democratic	-0.152	-0.105	-0.187	-0.164
Laissez faire	-0.063	-0.054	-0.109	-0.083
Traditional styles	-0.123	-0.118	-0.205	-0.165
Transformational	-0.003	0.026	0.031	0.021
Transactional	-0.027	-0.096	-0.012	-0.053
Servant	0.036	0.087	0.124	0.092
Authentic	-0.030	-0.042	0.128	0.016
Innovative styles	-0.003	0.008	0.090	0.033

Discussion:-

The highest percentages of nursing assistant teaching staff had an average level of work engagement and all its attributes especially vigor compared to dedication that had high levels more than others, with slightly highest mean. This average level could be as a result of personal characteristics of subordinates or the type of their personalities (Akhtar et al., 2015). The slightly highest mean of dedication compared to other elements of engagement in the present study agrees with results of McDonald (2015) in contrast to results of Shusha and Abdelkader (2016) that showed vigor scored slightly highest mean compared to others. However, the present study results mean scores of vigor, dedication, and absorption are higher than results of Hassan and Ahmed (2013) but in banking field.

In addition, total mean score of engagement in present study is considered good if it compared with study results of Alzyoud et al. (2015) that showed slightly lower mean score than present study in contrast to results of McDonald (2015). However, mean scores of work engagement and its elements are within international score range regardless the fields of studies and professions; industrials, health and nursing, banking, education and academia. This is assured when comparing present study total mean score (4.13) with results of Japan that had score less than 3.00 or China that its score was about 3.50, in addition to Greece, Sweden, Netherlands, Norway, Poland and Canada that had scores lay between 3.50 and 4.00 (Schaufeli, 2011).

Vigor had the highest significant correlations with work engagement and its attributes compared to absorption. The correlations among elements of engagement especially absorption agrees with Sarti (2014) compared to vigor. But disagrees with the study results of Shusha and Abdelkader (2016) that showed absorption had the highest significant correlations followed by vigor, and results of McDonald (2015) that showed dedication had the highest significant correlations followed by vigor. In addition, the present study results that vigor was strongly associated with dedication and total work engagement and moderately with absorption, may mean that vigor then dedication is the key of work engagement compared to dedication then vigor with McDonald (2015). So, it is expected that taking measures to improve vigor and dedication could contribute positively to improving work engagement environment.

Three styles; two of traditional and one of innovative were practiced more in average, and other three styles had same percentages of practice along low, average and high. Servant was slightly the highest practiced leadership style, and had highest positive significant relationships especially with transformational, authentic, democratic in addition to transactional in contrast to autocratic. These results indicate that all leadership styles are practiced by academic managers in the same/closely range. There is no dominant leadership style/s whether the traditional or the innovative. But, when practicing servant, it is strongly associated with using transformational, authentic, followed by democratic then transactional compared to weakly less using of autocratic.

In addition, the variety of using leadership styles may be as a result of the situation, and the subordinate/follower styles and their characteristics could contribute to leader practices and hence using different leadership styles. This variety in practicing different leadership styles could be good in itself as the best leadership styles is the best for the situation. This is supported by Marquis and Huston (2005) and Huber (2010). In addition, this variety could indicate to using "differentiated leadership" or leader-member-exchange (LMX), as both referring to treating work group members in different/variant ways (Wu et al., 2010; Buch et al., 2015). That is significantly correlated with effective leadership (Hassan et al., 2013). All these studies results assure on that the best situation of the current study could be in the average using of all leadership styles.

There was negative correlation between work engagement and its attributes with traditional leadership styles in contrast to innovative ones except vigor. It had negative correlations with all leadership styles except servant. This is without statistical significant correlation. The current study results partially agree with many of studies conducted on innovative leadership styles and work engagement especially transformational style such as Perko et al. (2016), Pourbarkhordari et al. (2016), and Schmitt et al. (2016) that showed correlations ranged from weak to moderate, and higher than transactional leadership style (Strom et al., 2014). In addition, other studies conducted on authentic leadership style showed positive significant correlation with work engagement such as Maximo (2015) and Stander et al. (2015). Besides, some other studies conducted on servant leadership style showed positive significant correlation with work engagement that its strength is higher than others such as Villier (2015) and Jafai et al. (2016).

Also, the present study results regarding correlation partially agree with number of studies conducted on traditional leadership styles and work engagement especially autocratic with negative significant correlation. In this regards, Cenkci and Özçelik (2015) showed a negative correlation between vigor and dedication as elements of work engagement and austere as a part of one of the authoritarian leadership style. Also, the negative correlation with laissez faire, it is expected to be as a result of its characters that may make staff less committed to the organization and its work. In this regards, the study results of Buch et al. (2015) indicated to a negative correlation between laissez faire leadership style and affective commitment that has positive significant correlation with work engagement (Albrecht and Andreetta, 2011). Besides, the negative correlation in literature review is assured by Soieb et al. (2015) although the situation in their study causes a different result. However, it is expected that democratic style could positively contribute to work engagement as a result of its positive strong association with innovative styles that was highest with transformational followed by servant in the present study, in addition to its characters too. It considers subordinates as a partner in decision making. This is assured by the study results of Sarti (2014) that showed positive significant correlation between all elements of engagement and participative leadership style.

Finally, the non-statistical significant correlation may be as a result of the average level of work engagement and its attributes especially vigor combined with the average used leadership styles in practice by academic managers. Besides, this may be referred to stressful environment (Kim et al., 2009) in addition to excessive job demands (Schaufeli et al., 2009) especially with the actual shortage in nursing academic staff at both faculties of nursing. These causes in addition to lack of personal resources (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007; Consiglio et al., 2016) could be contributing negatively with healthy work environment and hence less chance for work engagement (Hu et al., 2013). This is also supported by (Akhtar et al., 2015) who indicated that about 70% of workforce are not work engaged. All that; lack of job and personal resources combined with job demands especially workload may energize the average results of the present studied variables contributing more to the non-significant correlations especially when putting into consideration that leadership is just only one of job resources in building work engagement (Bakker and Demerouti 2007, 2008; Schaufeli, 2011; Hu et al., 2013).

Methodological considerations:-

Low sample size was a limitation, but all target population had been involved in the present study. Nevertheless, generalization of result could be applied on both of faculties in nursing whether of Port Said or Suez Canal universities. Low scores of reliability of some subscales than 0.70 (0.68 for vigor in UWES and 0.66 for transformational and 0. 67 for servant in leadership styles questionnaire) could be another limitation. But, Cronbach's alpha value for vigor in the present study is equal to value of the original study results (Schaufeli et al., 2002) that had tested the psychometric characteristics of UWES on larger sample. Besides, Cronbach's alpha values for total scale were 0.86 for UWES and 0.78 for leadership styles questionnaire in present study.

Conclusions and implications for higher education management:-

There is no dominant leadership style/s whether the traditional or innovative. That could be good, but when combined with average level of work engagement revealed no significant correlations. This means that work engagement level should be improved mainly based on/geared to vigor and dedication improvement measures. This could be implemented through increasing all job resources such as regular performance feedback associated with opportunities to learn, social support, improving autonomy combined with other measures to improve self-efficacy, responsibility, optimism, and organizational-based self-esteem. This is in addition to benefiting from the higher number of employee in both faculties according to their qualifications in doing the non- academic tasks as a one step in decreasing workload of academic staff. Also, the faculty administration boards have to take more all needed official measures to increase the numbers of nursing academic staff in their faculties.

References:-

1. Abdelsalam, A. D. (2013): Leadership styles of academic managers in relation to job satisfaction of assistant teaching staff at Faculty of Nursing. Un-published thesis, M.Sc., Nursing Administration Dept., Faculty of Nursing, Port Said University, Egypt, pp. 27-28.
2. Akhtar, R., Boustani, L., Tsivrikos, D. and Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2015): The   engageable personality: Personality and trait EI as predictors of work engagement. Personality and Individual Differences, 73: 44-49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.08.040.
3. AL Zaabi, M. S. A., Ahmad, K. Z. and Hossan, C. (2016): Authentic leadership, work engagement and organizational citizenship behaviors in petroleum company. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 65 (6): 811-830. doi:10.1108/IJPPM-01-2016-0023.
4. Albrecht, S.L. (2015): Work engagement and the positive power of meaningful work. Advances in Positive Organizational Psychology, 1: 237-260. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S2046-410X(2013)0000001013.
5. Albrecht, S. L. and Andreetta, M. (2011): The influence of empowering leadership, empowerment and engagement on affective commitment and turnover intentions in community health service workers, Test of a model. Leadership in Health Services, 24 (3): 228-237. doi: 10.1108/17511871111151126.
6. Alzyoud, A. A. Y., Othman, S. Z. and Isa, M. F. M. (2015): Examining the role of job resources on work engagement in the academic setting. Asian Social Science; 11 (3): 103-110. doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003.
7. Babalola, S. S. (2016): The effect of leadership style, job satisfaction and employee- supervisor relationship on job performance and organizational commitment. The Journal of Applied Business Research, 32 (3): 935- 946.
8. Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K. and Fletcher, L. (2015): The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. International Journal of Management Reviews, 00: 1-23. doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12077.
9. Bakker, A. B. (2009): Building engagement in the workplace. In R. J. Burke & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), The peak performing organization. Oxon, UK: Routledge, pp. 50-72.
10. Bakker, A. B. and Demerouti, E. (2007): The Job Demands-Resources model: state of the art. J. Managerial Psychology, 22 (3): 309-328. doi: 10.1108/02683940710733115.
11. Bakker, A. B. and Demerouti, E. (2008): Towards a model of work engagement. Career Development International, 13 (3): 209-223. doi: 10.1108/13620430810870476.
12. Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1995): MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Technical Report, Mind Garden, Redwood City, CA.
13. Breevaart, k., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. and van den Heuvel, M. (2015): Leader Member Exchange, work engagement, and job performance. J. Managerial Psychology, 30 (7): 754-770. doi: 10.1108/JMP-03-2013-0088.

14. Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., Sleebos, D. M. and Maduro, V. (2014): Uncovering the underlying relationship between transformational leaders and followers' task performance. J. Personnel Psychology, 13 (4): 194-203. DOI: 10.1027/1866-5888/a000118

15. Buch, R., Martinsen, Ø. L. and Kuvaas, B. (2015): The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior: The mediating role of economic Leader Member Exchange relationships. J. Leadership & Organizational Studies, 22 (1): 115-124. doi: 10.1177/1548051813515302.

16. Burch, T.C. and Guarana, C. L. (2014): The comparative influences of transformational leadership and Leader-Member Exchange on follower engagement. J. Leadership Studies, 8 (3): 6-25. doi:10.1002/jls.21334.

17. Cenkci, A. T. and Özçelik, G. (2015): Leadership styles and subordinate work engagement: The moderating impact of leader gender. GBMR, 7 (4): 8-20.

18. Cherry, B. and Jacob, S.R. (2014): Contemporary nursing issues, trends, & management. 6th ed., Missouri: Mosby, pp. 290, 291.

19. Clark, D. (1998): Leadership style survey. http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/leader/survstyl.htm

20. Consiglio, C., Borgogni, L., Di Tecco, C., Schaufeli, W. B. (2016): What makes employees engaged with their work? The role of self-efficacy and employee's perceptions of social context over time. Career Development International, 21 (2): 125-143. doi.10.1108/CDI-03-2015-0045.

21. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., De Jonge, J., Janssen, P.P.M. and Schaufeli, W.B. (2001): Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control. Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health, 27: 279-86.

22. Den Hartog, D. N. and Belschak, F. D. (2012): Work engagement and Machiavellianism in the ethical leadership process. J Bus Ethics 107: 35-47. doi: 10.1007/s10551-012-1296-4.

23. De Villier, D. (2015): Top management team members' perception of executive servant-leadership and their work Engagement: Impact of gender and ethnicity. Dissertation, Master of Business, AUT Business School, Auckland University of Technology.

24. El-Sayed, K. A. (2005): Leadership style, empowerment and job satisfaction among nursing leaders. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Nursing Administration, Fac. Ng, Ain Shams Un., Egypt.

25. Ghadi, M. Y., Fernando, M. and Caputi, P. (2013): Transformational leadership and work engagement; the mediating effect of meaning in work. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34 (6): 532- 550. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-10-2011-0110.

26. Gilbert, S., Horsman, P. and Kelloway, E.K. (2016): The motivation for transformational leadership scale: an examination of the factor structure and initial tests. Leadership & Organization Development J., 37 (2): 158-180. doi:10.1108/LODJ-05-2014-0086.

27. Gillet, N., Fouquereau, E., Bonnaud-Antignac, A., Mokounkolo, R. and Colombat, P. (2013): The mediating role of organizational justice in the relationship between transformational leadership and nurses' quality of work life: A cross-sectional questionnaire survey. Int. J. Nurs. Stud. , 1-9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2012.12.012.

28. Greco, P., Laschinger, H.K.S. and Wong, C. (2006): Leader empowering behaviours, staff nurse empowerment and work engagement/burnout. Nursing Leadership, 19 (4): 41-56.

29. Guerrero, S., Lapalme, M. E. and Séguin, M. (2015): Board chair authentic leadership and nonexecutives' motivation and commitment. J. Leadership & Organizational Studies, 22(1): 88-101.

30. Hassan, A. and Ahmed, F. (2011): Authentic leadership, trust and work engagement. International Journal of Human and Social Sciences, 6 (3):164-170.

31. Hu, Q., Schaufeli, W.B. and Taris, T.W. (2013): Does equity mediate the effects of job demands and job resources on work outcomes? An extension of the job demands-resources model? Career Development International, 18 (4): 357-376. doi:10.1108/CDI-12-2012-0126.

32. Huber, D. L. (2010): Leadership and nursing care management. 4th ed., Missouri: Saunders, pp. 12, 17, 18, 20, 27.

33. Hussein A, A, A. (2009): Relationship between leadership styles and span of control of the head nurses at Zagazig University hospitals. Unpublished thesis, M.Sc., Fac. Ng, Zagazig Un., 2-6.

34. Jafai, M., Moghadam, E. and Hosseini, S. M. (2016): The relationship between servant leadership style and work engagement with managers' efficiency in Zahedan Medical Sciences University hospitals. International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies, 1835-1847. http://www.ijhcs.com/index.php/ijhcs/index 7.

35. Joseph, E. E. and Winston, B. E. (2005): A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 26 (1): 6-22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730510575552.

36. Kim, H. J., Shin, K. H. and Swanger, N. (2009): Burnout and engagement: A comparative analysis using the Big Five personality dimensions. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 28: 96-104. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.06.001.

37. Kopperud, K. H., Martinsen, O. , and Humborstad, S.I.W. (2014): Engaging leaders in the eyes of the beholder on the Relationship between transformational leadership, work engagement, service climate, and self-other agreement. J. Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21(1): 29- 42.

38. Langelaan, S., Bakker, A.B., van Doornen, L. J.P. and Schaufeli, W.B. (2006): Burnout and work engagement: Do individual differences make a difference? Personality and Individual Differences, 40: 521-532. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.07.009.

39. Laschinger, H.K.S., Wilk, P., Cho, J. and Greco, P. (2009): Empowerment, engagement and perceived effectiveness in nursing work environments: does experience matter? JNM, 17: 636- 646.

40. Ludviga, I. and Kalvina, A. (2016): Exploring the relationships between job satisfaction, work engagement and loyalty of academic staff. International Scholarly and Scientific Research & Innovation, 10 (1): 1-7. scholar.waset.org/1999.10/10003355.

41. Marquis, B. L. and Huston, C. J. (2005): Leadership roles and management functions in nursing: Theory and application. 5th ed., Philadelphia: Williams & Wilkins, pp. 50-51, 54.

42. Maximo, N. (2015): Authentic leadership, trust and work engagement: the mediating role of psychological safety. Mini-dissertation for the degree Magister of Commerce, Industrial Psychology, the School of Behavioural Sciences, North-West University, the Vaal Triangle Campus, pp. 35.

43. McDonald, J. S. (2015): The relationship between university employees' work engagement and the perception of their influence on student integration and retention. Dissertation Ph.D, The University of Southern Mississippi, pp. 72,82,83,86.

44. Mencl , J. , Wefald , A. J. and van Ittersum , K. W. (2015) : Transformational leader attributes: Interpersonal skills, engagement, and well-being. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 37 (5): 635- 657. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-09-2014-0182.

45. Omira, O.D. (2015): The effect of leadership Styles and organizational culture on organizational performance of the public sector in Saudi Arabia. Dissertation, Ph.D., Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business, University Utara, Malaysia.

46. Perko, K. , Kinnunen, U. , Tolvanen , A. and Feldt, T. (2016): Back to basics: The relative importance of transformational and fair leadership for employee work engagement and exhaustion. Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 1(1): 6, 1-15, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.16993/sjwop.8.

47. Pourbarkhordari, A., Zhou, E. H. and Pourkarimi, J. (2016): How individual-focused transformational leadership enhances its influence on job performance through employee work engagement. International Journal of Business and Management, 11(2): 249-261. doi:10.5539/ijbm.v11n2p249

48. Regan, S., Laschinger, H. K. S. and Wong, C. A. (2016): The influence of empowerment, authentic leadership, and professional practice environments on nurses' perceived inter-professional collaboration. Journal of Nursing Management, 24: 54- 61.

49. Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A. and Crawford, E. R. (2010): Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. AMJ, 53: 617- 635.

50. Roberts, R. G. (2014): Assessing the relationship between leadership trust and work engagement at a university. Mini-dissertation for the degree Magister, Business Administration, North-West University, Potchefstroom Campus, pp. 27-34, 59.

51. Sarti, D. (2014): Leadership styles to engage employees: evidence from human service organizations in Italy. J. Workplace Learning, (26): 202- 216. doi.org/10.1108/JWL-09-2013-0066.

52. Schaufeli, W. B. and Bakker, A. B. (2003): UWES (Utrecht Work Engagement Scale) Preliminary Manual. Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University, The Netherlands, pp.4-5, 7, 8, 9, 37, 39.

53. Schaufeli, W. B. and Bakker, A. B. (2010): Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A.B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research. Hove: Psychology Press, pp.10-24.

54. Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V. and Bakker, A.B. (2002): The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. J. Happiness Studies, 3, 71–92. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326

55. Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B. and Van Rhenen, W. (2009): How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. J. Organiz. Behav., 1-25. doi: 10.1002/job.595. www.interscience.wiley.com

56. Schaufeli, (2011): Work engagement: What do we know? Utrecht University, The Netherlands, Int. OHP workshop, Timisoara, December.

57. Schaufeli, W.B. (2015): Engaging leadership in the job demands-resources model. Career Development International, 20 (5): 446-463. doi:10.1108/CDI-02-2015-0025.

58. Schmitt, A., Den Hartog, D. N. and Belschak, F. D. (2016): Transformational leadership and proactive work behaviour: A moderated mediation model including work engagement and job strain. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 89: 588- 610.

59. Sharoni, G., Shkoler,O. and Tziner, A. (2015): Job engagement: Antecedents and outcomes. J. Organizational Psychology, 15(1): 34-48.

60. Shuckl and Jr, 2014Shuck, B. and. ReioJr, T.G. (2014): Employee engagement and well-Being: A moderation model and implications for practice. J. Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21(1):43–58. doi: 10.1177/1548051813494240.

61. Shusha, A. A. and Abdelkader, A. (2016): Work engagement in higher education in Egypt: the influence on academic work performance. Int. J. Business Performance Management, 17 (2): 132-146.

62. Soieb, A.Z.M., Othman, J. and D'silva, J. L. (2015): Mediating influence of collaboration on the relationship between leadership styles and employee engagement among generation Y officials in Malaysian public sector. J. Applied Sci., 15(1): 7-31. doi:103923/jas.2015.7.31.

63. Stander, F.W., de Beer, L.T. and Stander, M.W. (2015): Authentic leadership as a source of optimism, trust in the organization and work engagement in the public health care sector. SA J. Human Resource Management, 13(1): 1-12. http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ sajhrm.v13i1.675

64. Stanislavov, I. and Ivanov, S. (2014): The role of leadership for shaping organizational culture and building employee engagement in the Bulgarian gaming industry. Tourism, 62 (1): 19 - 40. UDC: 338.486.3(497.2).

65. Strom, D. L., Sears, K. L. and Kelly, K. M. (2014): Work engagement: The roles of organizational justice and leadership style in predicting engagement among employees. J. Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21 (1): 71- 82.

66. Suan, C. L. and Nasurdin, A. M. (2016): Supervisor support and work engagement of hotel employees in Malaysia: Is it different for men and women? Gender in Management: An International Journal, 31 (1): 2-18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/GM-11-20140105.

67. Tims, M., Bakker, A. B. and Xanthopoulou, D. (2011): Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement? The Leadership Quarterly, 22: 121–131. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.12.011

68. Torp, S., Grimsmo, A., Hagen, S. Duran, A. and Gudbergsson, S. B. (2012): Work engagement: A practical measure for workplace health promotion? Health Promotion International, 28 (3): 387-396. doi:10.1093/heapro/das022.

69. Vincent-Hoper, S., Muser, C. andJanneck, M. (2012): Transformational leadership, work engagement, and occupational success. Career Development International, 17 (7): 663- 682. doi: 10.1108/13620431211283805.

70. Walker, K. M. (2015): Perceptions of Leadership: Impact of Leadership Style and Gender on Employee Motivation. Dissertation, Ph. D., Organizational Psychology, Walden University.

71. Wang, D. and Hsieh, C. (2013): The effect of authentic leadership on employee trust and employee engagement. Social Behavior and Personality, 41: 613- 624.

72. Wong, C.A. and Laschinger, H.K.S. (2012): Authentic leadership, performance, and job satisfaction: the mediating role of empowerment. JAN, 947-959.www.wileyonlinelibrary.com/journal/jan.

73. Wu, J. B., Tsui, A. S. and Kinicki, A. J. (2010): Consequences of differentiated leadership in groups. AMJ, 53 (1): 90-106. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2010.48037079.

74. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. and Schaufeli,W. B. (2007): The role of personal resources in the Job Demands-Resources Model. International Journal of Stress Management, 14 (2): 121-141. doi: 10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121.

75. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. and Schaufeli, W. B. (2009): Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. J. Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 82:183-200. doi:10.1348/096317908X285633.

76. Yahaya, R. and Ebrahim, F. (2016): Leadership styles and organizational commitment: literature review. Journal of Management Development, 35 (2): 190-216. doi 10.1108/JMD-01-2015-0004.