

## Exploring the Impact of Leader's Motivating Language on Job Outcomes: A Case Study of a Private School in the Southern Region of Pakistan

**Dr. Rakhshinda Ahmed**

Deputy Director , QEC , HAND Institute of Developmental Studies  
[dr.rakhshinda.khurram@gmail.com](mailto:dr.rakhshinda.khurram@gmail.com)

**Dr. Zobia Zaman**

Trainer at IQCS Innovative Solutions Ltd. South Australia  
[zobiazaman@yahoo.com](mailto:zobiazaman@yahoo.com)

### Abstract

*Communication plays a pivotal role in efficient and successful leadership. Organizations these days are more concerned about every aspect of leadership as it has a major impact on shaping employees' attitudes and behaviours while helping organizations to gain desired organizational outcomes. This research design attempts and endeavors to examine and investigate the Leaders' Motivating Language Theory proposed by Dr. Sullivan in 1988. The Leaders' Motivating Language Scale developed by Mayfield & Mayfield (1995,2015) has been used to examine the impact of the aforementioned dimensions and job outcomes. This is a case study where the research has targeted a private school in the Southern Region of Karachi. The school has 50 teachers working in the primary and secondary levels, and since the population is small, therefore, every member of the population was part of the sample. An online survey questionnaire based on the scale developed by Mayfield & Mayfield (1995,2015) was used to examine the three dimensions of Leader Motivating Language while job performance and job satisfaction were self-evaluated by the teachers. All the components of the survey were explained to the participants, and they were given ample time to turn in their responses. The responses were analyzed through SPSS software, and descriptive and inferential statistics were performed. Paired sample T-test, independent sample T-test, Linear Regressions, and Correlation Coefficients were calculated. The results indicated that the three dimensions of Leader Motivating Language have a positive impact on job performance and job satisfaction. This shall help institutions to focus on training the Principals/Coordinators to be effective leaders and use verbal communication as a strategic tool, allowing teachers to be more responsible, confident and accountable for their tasks. This will create a positive environment for the teachers where they can be more aware of their job performance and job satisfaction.*

**Keywords:** *Communication, Leadership, Motivating Language Theory, Job performance. Job satisfaction, Verbal communication*

## **Introduction**

The Motivation Language Theory focuses on how leaders use language to influence their subordinates' attitudes and behaviors, particularly job satisfaction and performance. The theory highlights the importance of verbal communication in shaping job outcomes, which has often been overlooked by other popular employee motivation theories. The Motivation Language Theory is built on the Speech Act Theory, which emphasizes the use of language as speech acts. This theory constitutes three dimensions: Direction-Giving Language, Empathetic Language, and Meaning Making Language. By modifying or shaping their subordinates' attitudes, leaders can influence their job outcomes in social and organizational settings. The study of leadership and communication is not new and has its roots in various theories such as the Speech Act Theory by Austin (1965), which analyzes speech acts in human language and how language can be used to perform certain actions. Searle (1969) further developed this theory and emphasized the need to use language in a manner that informs the receivers of the words. Other researchers like Scandura and Graen (1984) highlighted the importance of leadership training and oral communication to yield positive job outcomes and performances. Sullivan (1988) proposed the Motivation Language Theory, which consists of three dimensions: Direction-Giving Language, Empathetic Language, and Meaning-Making Language. Direction-Giving Language focuses on reducing confusion and ambiguity around task and job roles, Empathetic Language aims to establish trust and bond with employees, and Meaning-Making Language conveys information about the organization's culture, values, and goals to enable employees to blend in with the organization.

Mayfield (1995) developed the Motivation Language Scale, which was validated for all three dimensions. Other researchers like Alqahtini and Santora used the scale, resulting in its generalizability. Zeb & Yasmin (2016) state that through the use of the Motivation

Language theory, employee attitudes can be transformed and modified. Theoretical support for the Motivation Language Theory includes the Leader-Member Exchange Theory, which emphasizes social exchanges and their influence on job outcomes, and the Social Exchange Theory by George Homans, which looks at human interaction beyond economic gains. The Employee-Organization Relationships Theory presents the idea that any social exchange should yield benefits for both parties, fostering employees' trust in the organization.XXXX

### **Problem Statement**

For some time now, the implication of the Motivation Language Theory has been researched in sectors like health, media, corporate sector, undermining and neglecting its efficacy in the education sector. In our education sectors, teachers perform the important role of educating and transforming the youth of a country, which is the real asset of the nation. In doing so they are involved in several tasks and are assigned many responsibilities. Many teachers have reported a lack of efficient management and strong leadership, which causes the purpose of education to deviate from its agenda. Teachers are often burdened with work without any proper guidance and support from their supervisors/ principals which demotivates them having a negative impact on their job satisfaction and job performance. There is no guidance system for the teachers and although some institutes claim to pay their teachers well, it is the lack of motivation by the leaders that causes teachers to not do their jobs well. Teachers seek clarity, guidance, constructive feedback and empathy in order to grow both professionally and personally. Unfortunately, schools are not considered as important as they should be and there is no leadership training or management which can look into these serious issues. This study attempts to pave way for school management and leaders to face these challenges by employing the tools of Motivation Language Theory and benefit from its strategic and conscious use of the three components that are Direction-Giving Language, Empathetic Language and Meaning-Making Language to build a positive and

secure environment for its teachers so that teachers are more determined to perform their duties and educate the youth of this country.

### **Research Questions**

- How are leaders' use of motivation language and subordinates' performance related, as stated by the Motivation Language Theory constituted by Dr. Sullivan in 1988.?
- Does leaders' use of motivating language impact subordinates' job satisfaction according to the Motivation Language Theory proposed by Dr. Sullivan in 1988?
- Is direction-giving language linked to job performance and job satisfaction, as highlighted by the Motivation Language Theory, which was formulated by Dr. Sullivan in 1988?
- Is empathetic language linked to job performance and job satisfaction as stated by Motivation Language Theory proposed by Dr. Sullivan in 1988??
- According to the motivation language theory proposed by Dr. Sullivan in 1988, is meaning-making language linked to job performance and job satisfaction?

### **Research Objectives**

The following are the objectives of this study:

- To examine how the leaders' use of motivation language and subordinates' performance are related as stated by the Motivation Language Theory constituted by Dr. Sullivan in 1988.
- To measure the impact of leaders' use of motivating language on employees' job satisfaction according to Motivation Language Theory constituted by Dr. Sullivan in 1988
- To study the impact of Direction-Giving Language on employees' job satisfaction and job performance as proposed by Motivation Language Theory constructed by Dr. Sullivan in 1988.

- To examine the impact of Empathetic Language on employees' job satisfaction and job performance as highlighted by Motivation Language Theory proposed by Dr. Sullivan 1988
- To measure the influence of Meaning-Making Language on employees' job satisfaction and job performance as proposed by Motivation Language Theory constructed by Dr. Sullivan in 1988.

### **Literature Review**

Gronn (1983) stated that leaders in various settings rely heavily on their oral language, which consumes most of their time and energy. Luca (2013) emphasized the importance of managing a diverse workforce in today's globalized world, where challenges such as employee demotivation, conflicts, performance, and turnover are crucial for efficient management. According to Bindu (2016), studies have shown that the strategic use of Motivation Language theory can positively affect individual outcomes.

Robbins and Judge (2014) established that the verbal language used by leaders is crucial for successful job outcomes of the organization. Mayfield and Mayfield (2015) highlighted the importance of leaders' use of motivating language to shape and influence positive behavioral and job outcomes of employees. According to Borman and Puth (2017), the ability to motivate subordinates has gained immense popularity among the many leadership abilities. Hogan and Coote (2014) studied the impact of leaders' motivating language on employees' outcomes, including job satisfaction, job performance, job commitment, absenteeism, and other organizational behavior aspects. Graen and Scandura (1987) identified the oral communication skills of leaders and their effective use of verbal language as crucial factors that can heavily influence the outcomes of an organization.

Leaders who want to succeed and make an impact on their subordinates pay close attention to not only their actions but also on the language they use while communicating

with their subordinates to produce positive job outcomes in the organization (Woodward & Shaffakat, 2017). Drake and Moberg (1986) claim that oral communication tools used by leaders have gained importance in recent years. House, Javidan, and Hanges (2002) found that employees' attitude and behavioral outcomes were heavily influenced by the effective use of verbal language by their leaders. Hammond, Clapp-Smith, and Palnski (2017) revealed that 87% of employees felt that their attitude and behaviors were directly shaped by the verbal language used by their leaders, emphasizing the importance of communication in leadership.

According to Yulk (2013), the success of an organization depends significantly on exceptional leadership that is able to provide varied concepts and effective language suitable to the prevalent situations. Motivating Language (ML) is a compass that aligns follower aspirations with organizational vision using leader talk. Mayfield and Mayfield (2017) state that Leadership Motivating Language (LML) theory suggests that effective, appropriate, and thoughtful communication by leaders can encourage and support subordinates to achieve both personal and organizational goals. Research now focuses on the style of oral communication and its impact on subordinates in an organization. Ulrich and Smallwood (2007) suggest that language is a significant characteristic that assists leaders in transforming attitudes and behaviors of employees. Sullivan (1988) highlights LML as a tool that can enhance outcomes such as job commitment and satisfaction. LML can be used as a strategic communication strategy to accomplish organizational goals.

Mayfield and Mayfield (2018) explain that motivation refers to the spoken language used by leaders to foster determination and passion in employees towards job outcomes, resulting in highly motivated and self-driven employees. The Leaders' Motivating Language (LML) theory draws from other motivational theories, including the Goal Setting Theory (Locke and Latham, 1990) and the Model of Task-People Oriented leadership (Yulk, 2012).

The LML theory by Sullivan (1988) consists of three categories of speech acts performed by leaders: Direction-Giving Language, Meaning-Making Language, and Empathetic Language. The Direction-Giving Language component provides clear instructions to reduce confusion and ambiguity, while Meaning-Making Language provides insight into the organizational environment and aligns personal goals with organizational goals. Lastly, Empathetic Language establishes trust, provides emotional support, and solves employee problems, making employees feel valued and secure.

Language is a crucial factor in shaping behaviors and attitudes in a given society. Despite its importance, linguists have not studied the effective and meaningful use of language by leaders in organizational settings to influence job outcomes of subordinates. The Motivation Language theory refers to the effective and strategic use of leaders' speech that positively modifies employees' attitudes towards organizational goals and expectations. This theory has three main dimensions, drawing heavily from the Speech Act Theory by Austin (Ewald & Stine, 1983), and its impact on job outcomes has been gauged using the Leaders' Motivating Language Scale developed by Jacqueline and Milton Mayfield.

Homes and Scull (2019) used the Leader Motivating Language Theory by Dr. Sullivan to gauge the impact of leaders' use of Motivating Language on job performance. The MLT questionnaire developed by Mayfield in 2017 was used, and the results indicated that when leaders use motivating Language with their employees, it provides them with a voice, and employees feel safe. Guo and Yue (2019) examined the impact of Leaders' use of motivating Language on employees' job satisfaction. The HR managers in each company selected the supervisors and subordinates randomly, and the results showed a significant positive impact of leaders' use of motivating language on employees' job satisfaction.

Linjuan Rita Men, Yufan Sunny Qin, Jie Jin (2021) used the Leader Motivating Language

Model to examine the impact of Leaders' use of motivating Language on job satisfaction and job performance. The results showed a fairly positive relationship between motivating language and job satisfaction and job performance.

The Motivation Language Theory consists of three dimensions: Direction-Giving Language, Empathetic Language, and Meaning-Making Language. Direction-Giving Language focuses on reducing confusion and ambiguity around task and job roles. Empathetic Language aims to establish trust and bond with employees, and Meaning-Making Language conveys information about the organization's culture, values, and goals to enable employees to blend in with the organization. Sabir and Sara Bucha (2018) examined the role of school principal's use of motivating language in promoting school climate. The statistical analysis showed that the principal's use of Direction-Giving Language had a correlation of 0.783, and there is a strong and significant relationship between Direction-Giving Language and job satisfaction.

Empathetic Language plays a pivotal role in conveying the passion of a leader through well-distributed expression of emotions, disapproval, compliments, and feedback. It centers and focuses around general human caring rather than solely focusing on expressing sympathy towards task related occasions alone. By exhibiting and consciously maintaining amiable attitudes, understanding and encouragement towards subordinates, leaders can build strong and lasting relationships with them. Mayfield (2010) performed Partial Least Square Analysis to study the impact of empathetic language on job satisfaction and job performance.

Meaning Making Language aims to convey the organizational guidelines, framework, culture, and core values to its workers. It serves as a powerful tool for effective and

meaningful communication in times of organizational changes. The statistical analysis of the data indicated a significantly high mean of Meaning-Making Language, which was 6.74, and a correlation coefficient of 0.625 for job performance and Meaning-Making Language and 0.603 for job satisfaction.

Conclusively, LML has laid down the foundations for assisting the leaders to understand and practice the strategies at their disposal to strive for the overall progress of the organization by motivating the employees, using language, which provides them clear instructions so the employees comprehend the task and can perform it according to the desires of the leaders. The leaders provide support, concern, and encouragement to their employees fostering and nurturing the work environment where the employees feel emotionally safe and protected.

### **Research Methodology**

. In this study, we focus on the three pivotal and integral components of the Motivating Language Theory which are Direction-Giving Language, Empathetic Language, and Meaning-Making Language, and their influence in directing and impacting two aspects of job outcomes which are job satisfaction and job performance of teachers from a selected school in Defence area of Karachi, Pakistan. This is a case study where the researcher focuses on using the Motivating Language Theory on teachers of primary and secondary levels in a particular school where a minimum of 40 respondents were required to examine the research objectives and hypothesis. For this research, a survey was conducted in a private school in the southern region of Karachi, Defence Phase 8. This survey was based on the questionnaire designed by Mayfield & Mayfield (2017). This questionnaire is derived from the Motivation Language Theory proposed by Jeremiah Sullivan in 1988. It is a 24-item questionnaire based on the Likert Scale encompassing the three components of the Motivating Language Theory.

For the dependent variable which is job performance questionnaires by William & Anderson, 1991 and George & Brief, 1992 were used.

### **Research Type and Design**

This is causal research as it aims at examining the impact of Motivating Language Theory on the job outcomes that are job performance and job satisfaction of teachers in a private school belonging to both primary and secondary levels. The teachers in this research have self-evaluated the use of the Motivating Language Theory by the coordinators and principals. This is the most significant aspect of the research. They also self-evaluate their job performance and job satisfaction. This approach has helped teachers to participate easily and answer questions with accuracy at their own pace. All the respondents received the same questions.

### **Population and Survey**

The survey questionnaire has three components. The first component encompasses the three components of the Motivating Language Theory which are Direction-Giving Language, Empathetic-Language, and Meaning Making Language. Each question is based on a Likert Scale consisting of 24 items in total. The second part of the questionnaire survey encompasses self-evaluation of the respondents' job satisfaction followed by their and the last component where the teachers fill the questionnaire by self-evaluating their job performance.

The main target population of this research is school teachers of both primary and secondary levels. This is a case study where the target population is teachers working in a private school in Defence Phase 8, Southern region of Karachi, Pakistan. The minimum number of respondents required was 25% of the total respondents in the organization. The minimum number for a case study is a minimum of 40 respondents.

Since this research is a case study where the focus was to gain an in-depth analysis of the impact of the Motivating Language Theory on job performance and job satisfaction of a particular private school in Karachi. The sample size was kept higher than the minimum requirement and the questionnaire was distributed to all the teachers working at the primary and secondary levels.

### **Demographic features of the Respondents**

The demographic features of the respondents consisted of two main components. The first component was to select from the gender profile which had two discrete categories (male and female). The second component focused on the number of years in service. This component had five categories to choose from. It started from 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21-25 years and the last option was 26-30 years. The distribution of the number of years was done keeping in mind that the school had been operational for 30 years and no employee could have worked there for more than 30 years.

## **Results**

### **Descriptive Statistics**

According to Bonner et al., (2018), the descriptive statistics provides with the assessment of the nature of respondents who have participated in the research process. Descriptive statistics provides a summary of the sample data set in terms of mean, median and mode, and also standard deviation, variance, minimum and maximum variables, and kurtosis and skewness.

### ***Summary Statistics for Independent Demographic variables:***

The statistical data collected for the sample population will help in analyzing the representativeness of the respondents. The following demographic variables were studied: age and years of service. The tables below demonstrate an analysis on the summary statistics of the different variables.

**Table 2**

*Gender*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	8	16.0	16.0	16.0
Valid Female	42	84.0	84.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

**Table 3**

*How long working situation*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 6-10 years	12	24.0	24.0	24.0
Valid 26-30 years	3	6.0	6.0	30.0
Valid 21-25 years	1	2.0	2.0	32.0
Valid 16-20 years	2	4.0	4.0	36.0
Valid 11-15 years	8	16.0	16.0	52.0
Valid 0-5 years	24	48.0	48.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

**Table 4**

*Descriptive statistics of subcategories of Motivating Language Scale*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Direction giving	50	10.00	34.00	20.7800	7.68590	.047	.337	-1.043	.662
Empathetic Language	50	6.00	19.00	11.7200	4.55820	.107	.337	-1.405	.662
Meaning making Language	50	9.00	37.00	24.3800	8.27065	-.512	.337	-.549	.662
Valid N (list wise)	50								

After doing descriptive analysis of sub categories of motivation language scale, it was found for Direction giving (M= 20.78, SD=7.68), Empathetic Language (M= 11.72, S. D=4.56) and Meaning making Language (M=24.38, S. D= 8.27).

**Table 5**

*Descriptive statistics of job satisfaction and job performance*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Job performance	50	10.00	30.00	19.3400	7.17880	.125	.337	-1.424	.662
Job satisfaction	50	16.00	62.00	41.4400	11.92863	-.497	.337	.270	.662
Valid N (listwise)	50								

After doing descriptive analysis of job performance, it was found (M= 19.34, S. D=7.18) with skewness of .125 and for job satisfaction (M=41.44, S. D=11.92) with skewness of -.496.

Furthermore, a value which less than -1, there is the presence of left skewed data.

**Inferential Statistics**

*Test for Normality*

A normality test was carried out to confirm whether the sample data was obtained from a normally distributed population. The normality tests were performed on the job satisfaction, job performance and Motivating Language Scale. These tests are depicted in the below tables

**Table 12**

*Tests of Normality*

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Job performance	.143	50	.052	.897	50	.350
Job satisfaction	.105	50	.200*	.962	50	.106
Total motivation language	.119	50	.073	.927	50	.140
Direction giving	.120	50	.071	.933	50	.076
Empathetic Language	.135	50	.053	.900	50	.056
Meaning making Language	.190	50	.060	.927	50	.081

**Linear Regression**

*H1: Motivation language is a predictor of job performance*

**Table 13**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.466 <sup>a</sup>	.217	.201	6.41841	.217	13.298	1	48	.001	1.612

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	547.814	1	547.814	13.298	.001 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1977.406	48	41.196		
	Total	2525.220	49			

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance
(Constant)	8.961	2.988		2.999	.004	2.954	14.967		
Total motivation language	.182	.050	.466	3.647	.001	.082	.283	1.000	1.000

H1 was that Motivation Language has an impact on job performance. Linear regressions are applied to job performance-based motivation language to analyze the data. Overall, the model was significant  $F(1,48) = 13.298, p < .01$ , with an R value of .466 and R<sup>2</sup> value of .217. The value of R<sup>2</sup> represents that the model accounted for 21 % variance between groups of job performance and motivation language. However, motivation language ( $\beta = .182, P = .001$ ). On this case our alternative hypothesis is accepted, which is motivation language are predictors of job performance and our null hypothesis is rejected.

**H2: Motivation Language has an impact on job satisfaction**

**Table 14**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics	Durbin-Watson
1						

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	Durbin-Watson
1	.659 <sup>a</sup>	.435	.423	9.06228	.435	36.899	1	48	.000	1.973

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	3030.320	1	3030.320	36.899	.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	3942.000	48	82.125		
Total	6972.320	49			

**Coefficients**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	17.028	4.218		.000	7.854	25.509		
Total motivation language	.429	.071	.659	.000	.287	.571	.000	1.000

H2 was that Motivation Language has an impact on job satisfaction. To analyze the data, linear regressions are applied to job satisfaction based on motivation language. Overall, the model was significant  $F(1,48) = 36.899, p < .01$ , with an R value of .659 and R<sup>2</sup> value of .435. The value of R<sup>2</sup> represents that the model accounted for 43% variance between groups of job satisfaction and motivation language. However, motivation language ( $\beta = .429, P = .001$ ). On this case our alternative hypothesis is accepted, which is motivation language are predictors of job satisfaction and our null hypothesis is rejected.

**H3: Direction-giving language has an impact on job satisfaction and job satisfaction**

**Table 14**

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.659 <sup>a</sup>	.435	.423	9.06228	.435	36.899	1	48	.000	1.973

	.588 <sup>a</sup>	.346	.332	9.74	.346	2	1	4	.000	1.80
			998			5.345	8			4

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.462 <sup>a</sup>	.213	.197	6.43	.213	1	1	4	.001	1.58
			316			3.017	8			7

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2409.343	1	2409.343	25.345	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	4562.977	48	95.062		
	Total	6972.320	49			

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	538.714	1	538.714	13.017	.001 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1986.506	48	41.386		
	Total	2525.220	49			

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance
(Constant)	22.482	4.010		5.606	.000	14.418	30.545		
Direction giving	.912	.181	.588	5.034	.000	.548	1.277	1.000	1.000

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance
(Constant)	10.375	2.646		3.921	.000	5.055	15.696		

Direction giving	1	.430	.12	.462	.6083	.001	.191	.672	1.000	1.000
------------------	---	------	-----	------	-------	------	------	------	-------	-------

Hypothesis three was that direction language has an impact on job satisfaction and job performance. To analyze the data, linear regressions are applied to job satisfaction and performance satisfaction based on direction language. Overall, the model was significant for job satisfaction  $F(1,48) = 25.345, p < .01$ , with an R value of .588 and  $R^2 .346$ . The value of  $R^2$  represents that the model accounted for 34% variance between groups of job satisfaction and Direction language. However, Direction language ( $\beta = .912, P = .001$ ). On this case our alternative hypothesis is accepted, which is Direction language is predictor of job satisfaction and our null hypothesis is rejected. For job performance, Overall, the model was significant  $F(1,48) = 13.017, p < .01$ , with an R value of .462 and  $R^2 .213$ . The value of  $R^2$  represents that the model accounted for 21% variance between groups of job performance and Direction language. However, Direction language ( $\beta = .431, P < .001$ ). On this case our alternative hypothesis is accepted, which is Direction language is predictor of job satisfaction and our null hypothesis is rejected.

**H4: Empathetic language has an impact on job satisfaction and job performance**

**Table 15**

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.575 <sup>a</sup>	.330	.316	9.86313	.330	23.672	1	48	.000	2.053

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.397 <sup>a</sup>	.157	.140	6.65865	.157	8.954	1	48	.004	1.733

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2302.816	1	2302.816	23.672	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	4669.504	48	97.281		
	Total	6972.320	49			

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	397.013	1	397.013	8.954	.004 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	2128.207	48	44.338		
	Total	2525.220	49			

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Partial	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	Lower Bound		Upper Bound	Tolerance
(Constant)	3.813	3.882		6.134	.000	6.008	1.619			
1 Empathetic Language	.504	.309	.575	4.865	.000	.882	1.125	.575	.000	.000

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	Lower Bound		Upper Bound	Partial
(Constant)	.021	2.621		4.587	.000	6.752	17.291			
Empathetic Language	.24	.209	.397	2.992	.004	.205	1.044	.397	.000	.000

Hypothesis four as that empathetic language has an impact on job satisfaction and job performance. To analyze the data, linear regressions are applied to job satisfaction and performance satisfaction based on empathetic language. Overall, the model was significant for job job satisfaction  $F(1,48) = 23.672, p < .01$ , with an R value of .575 and  $R^2 .330$ . The value of  $R^2$  represents that the model accounted for 33% variance between groups of job

satisfaction and empathetic language. However, empathetic language ( $\beta = 1.504, P=.001$ ). On this case our alternative hypothesis is accepted, which is empathetic language is predictor of job satisfaction and our null hypothesis is rejected. For job performance, Overall, the model was significant  $F(1,48) = 8.95, p<.01$ , with an R value of .397 and  $R^2.157$ . The value of  $R^2$  represents that the model accounted for 15% variance between groups of job performance and empathetic language. However, empathetic language ( $\beta = .624, P<.005$ ). On this case our alternative hypothesis is accepted, which is empathetic language is predictor of job satisfaction and our null hypothesis is rejected.

**H5: Meaning MAKING language has an impact on job performance and job satisfaction**

**Table 15:**

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.598 <sup>a</sup>	.357	.344	9.66396	.357	26.656	1	48	.000	1.976

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.384 <sup>a</sup>	.148	.130	6.69672	.148	8.309	1	48	.006	1.565

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2489.495	1	2489.495	26.656	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	4482.825	48	93.392		
	Total	6972.320	49			

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	372.607	1	372.607	8.309	.006 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	2152.613	48	44.846		
	Total	2525.220	49			

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance
(Constant)	20.429	4.293		4.759	.000	11.797	29.060		
Meaning making Language	.862	.167	.598	5.163	.000	-.526	1.197	.100	1.000

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	Lower Bound		Upper Bound	Partial Tolerance
(Constant)	1.211	2.975		1.769	.000	5.230	7.193			
Meaning making Language	.333	.161	.384	2.082	.006	-.101	.566	.384	.100	

H5 was that meaning making language has an impact on job satisfaction and job performance. To analyze the data, linear regressions are applied to job satisfaction and performance satisfaction based on meaning making language. Overall, the model was significant for job satisfaction  $F(1,48) = 26.656, p < .01$ , with an R value of .598 and  $R^2 = .357$ . The value of  $R^2$  represents that the model accounted for 35% variance between groups of job satisfaction and meaning making. However, meaning making language ( $\beta = .862, P = .001$ ). On this case our alternative hypothesis is accepted, which is meaning making is predictor of job satisfaction and our null hypothesis is rejected. For job performance, Overall, the model was significant  $F(1,48) = 8.309, p < .01$ , with an R value of .384 and  $R^2 = .148$ . The value of  $R^2$  represents that the model accounted for 14% variance between groups of job performance and meaning making language. However, meaning making ( $\beta =$

.33,  $P < .05$ ). In this case, our alternative hypothesis is accepted, which is that making is a predictor of job satisfaction, and our null hypothesis is rejected.

## **Discussion, Conclusion**

### **Discussion**

The study found that leaders' use of Motivation Language significantly impacts the job performance of teachers. Clear and transparent language, along with constructive feedback and reducing ambiguity, makes employees feel motivated and secure. When principals use this language in schools, teachers feel empowered and passionate about their tasks, aligning their goals with the vision set by the principals. This leads to better performance, as teachers feel more responsible and dedicated to their tasks and understand the rewards linked to them. Empathetic language and meaning-making Language also play significant roles in positively impacting job performance by making teachers feel emotionally safe and connected to the institution's mission and culture.

Motivation Language impacts teacher job satisfaction. Using the three significant components of the MLT model (clarity and transparency in task allocation, linking rewards, and reducing uncertainty in discourse) results in satisfied and high performing teachers. Feedback, both negative and positive, that preserves the teacher's respect and position in the organization also increases job satisfaction. Open communication that considers the emotional well-being of the teachers adds to their satisfaction. Finally, meaning-making language that emphasizes the teachers' significance and understanding of the organization's culture boosts job satisfaction.

Our results indicate that the model has a significant R-value of .588, which supports our hypothesis that leaders' use of direction-giving language has a positive impact on job performance and job satisfaction. Clear task explanation reduces uncertainty and ambiguity and provides clarity regarding the connections between tasks, rewards, resources, and

authority. This clarity positively affects job performance and job satisfaction among teachers by helping them understand the purpose of tasks and how they are expected to perform them.

The study found that empathetic language significantly impacts job performance and job satisfaction. It is important for principals to be mindful of the language they use when interacting with teachers, including expressing their passions, concerns, and feedback. This can lead to high-performing and satisfied teachers who feel respected and heard in the institution they work at.

The analysis of the data confirms that meaning-making language has a significant impact on the job performance and satisfaction of teachers. When principals communicate the organization's mission, culture, guidelines, and core values to teachers, it helps them feel like an integral part of the organization and understand how they can positively contribute to its progress. This understanding of the culture and positive contribution leads to improved job performance and teacher satisfaction.

## **Conclusion**

This study examined the impact of Motivation Language Theory on job performance and job satisfaction of teachers in a private school in Karachi, Pakistan. The results showed that the three dimensions of Motivation Language Theory positively influenced job performance and job satisfaction. This research highlights the importance of verbal communication in leadership and its impact on employee attitudes and behaviors. It also suggests the need for training programs for leaders to promote positive and conducive working environments in educational institutions in Pakistan. The study had its limitations in terms of population and sample, and future research can be conducted in a wider scope to fill the gaps and study different job outcomes and behaviors. Overall, the study establishes the importance of motivational language in improving job satisfaction and performance.

## References

- Abedjan, Z., Golab, L., & Naumann, F. (2015). Profiling relational data: a survey. *The VLDB Journal*, 24(4), 557-581.
- Abdullah, A. B. M. (2017). Cultural Context. In *Managing the Psychological Contract* (pp. 23-41). Springer International Publishing.
- Alqahtani, A. (2015). Teachers' perceptions of principals' motivating language and public-school climates in Kuwait. *Management In Education*, 29(3), 125-131.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020615584104>
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, (pp. 267-300). New York: Academic Press.
- Afaq, A., Sajid, M. A., & Arshad, A. (2017). Examining the impact of servant leadership on teachers' job satisfaction. *Pakistan Business Review*, 18(4), 1031-1047.
- Agha, K., Azmi, F. T., & Irfan, A. (2017). Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction: An Empirical study Focusing on Higher Education Teachers in Oman. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 7(3), 164-171.
- Alegre, I., Mas-Machuca, M., & Berbegal-Mirabent, J. (2016). Antecedents of employee job satisfaction: Do they matter? *Journal of Business Research*, 69(4), 1390-1395.
- Alfayad, Z., & Arif, L. S. M. (2017). Employee Voice and Job Satisfaction: An Application of Herzberg Two-factor Theory. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(1), 150-156.
- Bartels, J., Pruyn, A., De Jong, M. & Joustra, I. (2007) Organizational identification levels and the impact of perceived external prestige and communication climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(2), 173-190.
- Basak, S. K. (2015). Theoretical Framework of The Factors Affecting University Academics' Job Satisfaction. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 14(2), 317-326.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218.
- Behery, M., Behery, M., Abdallah, S., Abdallah, S., Parakandi, M., Parakandi, M., & Kukunuru, S. (2016). Psychological contracts and intention to leave with mediation effect of organizational commitment and employee satisfaction at times of recession. *Review of International Business and Strategy*, 26(2), 184-203.
- Benoliel, P., Barth, A., & Barth, A. (2017). The implications of the school's cultural attributes in the relationships between participative leadership and teacher job satisfaction and burnout. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(6), 640-656.
- Biasutti, M., & Frate, S. (2017). A validity and reliability study of the Attitudes toward Sustainable Development scale. *Environmental Education Research*, 23(2), 214-230.

- Bornman, D. A. J., & Puth, G. (2017). Investigating employee perceptions of leadership communication: a South African study. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 14(1), 1-23
- Cho, H., Rau, P.L., Liu, J., & Jiang, C. (2017). Expectation of Manager-Subordinate Communication: A Comparison between Chinese, Korean and American Students. *Global Business & Management Research*, 9(1), 1-11.
- Christen, M., Iyer, G. and Soberman, D. (2006). Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, and Effort: A Reexamination Using Agency Theory, *Journal of Marketing*, 70, 137-150.
- Chughtai, A. A., & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment among Pakistani University Teachers. *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 11(1), 39-64.
- Dwivedula, R., Bredillet, C. N., & M'uller, R. (2017). Work Motivation in Temporary Organizations: A Review of Literature Grounded in Job Design Perspective. In *Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship as Driving Forces of the Global Economy* (pp. 609-618).
- Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 25(4), 439-459.
- Edelman, P. J., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2016). Training leader emotion regulation and leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1-11. Advanced Online Publication. Retrieved from: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/>
- Fazio, J., Gong, B., Sims, R., & Yurova, Y. (2017). The role of affective commitment in the relationship between social support and turnover intention. *Management Decision*, 55(3), 512-525.
- Feng, Y., Hao, B., Iles, P., & Bown, N. (2016). Rethinking distributed leadership: dimensions, antecedents and team effectiveness. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 38(2), In Press.
- Fernando, R. T. W., & Jayasekara, P. (2017). Determinants of Career Aspiration: An Empirical Study on Masters of Business Administration Students of Selected Two National Universities in Sri Lanka. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 3(2) 36-44.
- Gibson, P. K. (2017). Workforce education leadership in the twenty-first century. *Encyclopedia of Strategic Leadership and Management* (pp. 718-727).
- Girma, S. (2016). The relationship between leadership style and employee job satisfaction study of federal and Addis Ababa sport organizational management setting in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 2(3), 92-96.

- Guo, Y., & Ling, B. (2019). Effects of Leader Motivating Language on Employee Task and Contextual Performance: The Mediating Role of Feedback Quality. *Psychological Reports*, 123(6), 2501-2518. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294119862989>
- Hamilton, E. (2016). *Assessing the Relationship of Principals' Leadership Styles on Teacher Satisfaction and Teacher Turnover* (Doctoral dissertation), North central University.
- Hammond, M. M., Lester, G., Clapp-Smith, R., & Palanski, M. (2017). Age diversity and leadership: enacting and developing leadership for all ages. *The Palgrave Handbook of Age Diversity and Work* (pp.737-759). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harris, J. (2016). Speaking the culture: understanding the micro-level production of school culture through leaders' talk. *Discourse: Studies in The Cultural Politics of Education*, 39(3), 323-334. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2016.1256271>
- Hanse, J. J., Harlin, U., Jarebrant, C., Ulin, K., & Winkel, J. (2016). The impact of servant leadership dimensions on leader-member exchange among health care professionals. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 24(2), 228-234.
- Harari, M. B., Reaves, A. C., & Viswesvaran, C. (2016). Creative and innovative performance: a meta-analysis of relationships with task, citizenship, and counterproductive job performance dimensions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(4), 495-511. [doi/pdfplus/10.1108/LODJ-07-2015-0147](https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2015-0147)
- Holmes, W., & Scull, W. (2019). Reframing organizations through leadership communications: the four-frames of leadership viewed through motivating language. *Development And Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 33(5), 16-19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/dlo-09-2018-0107>
- Irving, J. (2011). Leadership reflection: A model for effective leadership practice: A biblically-consistent and research-based approach to leadership. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 3(2), 118-128.
- Janssen, O., & Gao, L. (2015). Supervisory responsiveness and employee self-perceived status and voice behavior. *Journal of Management*, 41(7), 1854-1872.
- Khalid, J., Ali, A. J., Khaleel, M., & Islam, M. S. (2017). Towards Global Knowledge Society; A SWOT Analysis of Higher Education of Pakistan in Context of Internationalization. *Journal of Business*, 2(2), 08-15.
- Khan, A., Yusoffa, R. B. M., & Azam, K. (2014). Factors of Job Stress among university teachers in Pakistan: A conceptual review. *Journal of Management Info*, 2(1), 62-67.
- Landy, F. J., & Conte, J. M. (2016). *Work in the 21st century, binder ready version: an introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. (Fifth Edition). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G.P. (2006). New direction in Goal-Setting Theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(5), 265-268.

- McCarthy, J. M., Trougakos, J. P., & Cheng, B. H. (2016). Are anxious workers less productive workers? It depends on the quality of social exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(2), 279-291.
- Madlock, P. E., Martin, M. M., Bogdan, L., & Ervin, M. (2007). The impact of communication traits on leader-member exchange. *Human Communication*, 10, 451-464.
- Madlock, E. & Sexton, S. (2015). An application of motivating language theory in Mexican organizations. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 52(3), 255-272.
- Mathieu, C., Fabi, B., Lacoursi`ere, R., & Raymond, L. (2015). The role of supervisory behavior, job satisfaction and organizational commitment on employee turnover. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 22(1), 113-129.
- Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2002). Leader communication strategies: Critical paths to improving employee commitment. *American Business Review*, 20(2), 89-94.
- Mayfield, M., & Mayfield, J. (2004). The effects of leader communication on worker innovation. *American Business Review*, 22(2), 46-51.
- Mayfield, M., & Mayfield, J. (2008). Leadership techniques for nurturing worker garden variety creativity. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(9), 976-986.
- Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2009). The Role of Leader Motivating Language in Employee Absenteeism. *Journal of Business Communication*, 46(4), 455-479.
- Mayfield, M., & Mayfield, J. (2009). The role of leader-follower relationships in leader communication: A test using the LMX and motivating language models. *Journal of Business Inquiry*, 8, 6-85.
- Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2010). Leader-level influence on motivating language: A two-level model investigation on worker performance and job satisfaction. *Competitiveness Review*, 20(5), 407-422.
- Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2012). The Relationship between Leader Motivating Language and Self-Efficacy: A Partial Least Squares Model Analysis. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 49(4), 357-376.
- Mayfield, J., Mayfield, M., & Kopf, J. (1995). Motivating language: Exploring theory with scale development. *Journal of Business Communication*, 32(4), 329-344.
- Mayfield, J., Mayfield, M., & Kopf, J. (1998). The effects of leader motivating language on subordinate performance and satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 37(3&4), 235-248.
- Mayfield, J., Mayfield, M., & Sharbrough, W. C. (2015). Strategic vision and values in top leaders' communications: Motivating language at a higher level. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 52(1), 97-121.

- Mayfield, M. & Mayfield, J. (2015). The effects of leader motivating language use on employee decision making. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 53(4), 465-484.
- Mayfield, M., & Mayfield, J. (2017). Leader Talk and the Creative Spark: A Research Note on How Leader Motivating Language Use Influences Follower Creative Environment Perceptions. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 54(2), 210-225.
- Pi-Chuan, S., Fu-Tien, P., & Chien-Wei, H. (2016). Does motivating language matter in leader-subordinate communication? *Chinese Journal of Communication*, 9(3), 264 - 282. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/citedby/10.1080/17544750.2016.1206029>
- Refozar, R. G., Buenviaje, M. G., Encio, Perez, M. P., & Laguador, J. M. (2017). Extent of Leader Motivating Language on Faculty Members' Job Satisfaction from a Private Academic Institution in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 4(3), 99-107.
- Rice, R. E., & Ann, A. E. (2012). Higher faculty morale. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 20(2), 50-58.
- Safi, M. H., Torkaman-Nejad, S., & Arshi, S. (2016). Job Satisfaction and its Influencing Factors among Shomal Health Center of Tehran Personnel in 2014. *Community Health*, 2(1), 64-71.
- Sabir, S. (2018). The role of school principal's motivating language in promoting school climate: A comparative study of private and public schools. *International Journal of Education and Knowledge Management*, 1(3), 1-15.
- Schmitt, A., Den Hartog, D. N., & 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(3), 1-22
- Stephon, J., & Louis, A. (2022). The Effect of Perceived Organizational Support and Motivating Language of Leaders on Job Performance, Satisfaction and Commitment of Employees - UTAR Institutional Repository. [Eprints.utar.edu.my](http://eprints.utar.edu.my). Retrieved 16 April 2022, from <http://eprints.utar.edu.my/2415/>.
- Tong, C., Tak, W. I. W., & Wong, A. (2015). The Impact of knowledge sharing on the relationship between organizational culture and Job satisfaction: The perception of information communication and technology (ICT) practitioners in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 5(1), 19-47.
- Troy, L. U. (2012). A Study of the Job Satisfaction of Nebraska School Superintendents. (Master thesis). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/>
- Tsai, M. T., Chuang, S. S., & Hsieh, W. P. (2009). An integrated process models of communication satisfaction and organizational outcomes. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 37(6), 825-834.

- Vidyarthi, P. R., Anand, S., & Liden, R. C. (2014). Do emotionally perceptive leaders motivate higher employee performance? The moderating role of task interdependence and power distance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 232-244.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Misati, E. (2017). Does ethical leadership enhance group learning behaviour? Examining the mediating influence of group ethical conduct, justice climate, and peer justice. *Journal of Business Research*, 72(C), 14-23.
- Yuchtman, N. (2017). Teaching to the tests: An economic analysis of traditional and modern education in late imperial and republican China. *Explorations in Economic History*, 63, 70-90.
- Yu, K., Lin, W., Wang, L., Ma, J., Wei, W., Wang, H., & Shi, J. (2016). The role of affective commitment and future work self-salience in the abusive supervision job performance relationship. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 89(1), 28-45.
- Yulk, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289.
- Yulk, G. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. Eight Edition. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson Education.
- Yousef, D. A. (2017). Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Attitudes toward Organizational Change: A Study in the Local Government. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 40(1), 77-88.
- Yusuf, M. S., & Sim, C. C. (2017). Relationship between parenting satisfaction and parenting styles of working mothers in a University in Malaysia. *Psikoislamedia: Journal Psikologi (Psikoislamedia: Journal of Psychology)*, 1(2), 279-289.
- Zeb, S., & Yasmin, R. (2016). An Empirical Investigation into the Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction on the Linkage between Corporate Social Responsibility and Organizational Performance. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2), 454-478.
- Zhang, X., & Venkatesh, V. (2013). Explaining employee job performance: The role of online and offline workplace communication networks. *MIS Quarterly*, 37(3), 695-722.