Abstract

This non-experimental quantitative study sought to determine a relationship between perceptions of leadership style and employee job satisfaction. The research design was a cross-sectional survey administered to 1,567 participants with 354 usable responses obtained. The research question that guided this study was: Do millennial generation employee perceptions of leadership style have an association with job satisfaction for college-educated, full-time employee at a mid-sized professional services firm in the United States? Data collected via a survey demonstrated there is a relationship between perceptions of leadership style and job satisfaction ($r_s = .32, p < .01$), and that the relationship is stable regardless of gender, tenure, ethnicity, or age ($\beta = .059, .069, .093, .025$ respectively, all $p > .05$). The findings from this study support previous studies of various generational cohorts and extend the knowledge base specifically to a millennial subgroup. Implications include opportunities for organizations to implement leadership development programs focused on specific behaviors that will increase employee satisfaction.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Introduction and Background

The phenomenon of job satisfaction and its impact on voluntary employee turnover has been studied numerous times beginning with the seminal work of Bills (1925) who published the first empirical study of turnover of clerical workers at an insurance company in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Bills (1925) gathered family data from employee applications of clerical hires at an insurance company in 1922. She conducted a follow up in 1924 to determine how many of the 59 hires were still working and determined that the role of the father was a determinant in tenure for the clerical employee identifying that if the clerical job was higher in social status than the fathers occupation, the employee was likely to stay, but if it was lower in social status, the employee was likely to leave. This began a wave of research related to employee turnover.

More recently, Hom, et al. (2017) detailed one hundred years of research about turnover from 1917 to the present day and divided the history into six stages. The birth of turnover research in 1917, the formative years of the 1920s to 1960s, foundational models of the 1970s, theory testing of the 1980s, the unfolding model of the 1990s, and 21st century research of the 2000s to present day. Throughout this history, researchers identified and studied various aspects of turnover and its antecedents. An area of specific interest to this study is how perceptions of leadership style impact millennial’s job satisfaction, a critical component of employee turnover. The leadership styles under consideration are those identified by Antonakis, et al. (2003) as transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant.
This section discusses the background of and relationship between turnover, employee job satisfaction, and leadership. I outline the real-world business problem that turnover creates and how this study sought to understand one contributing aspect by evaluating the relationship between employee satisfaction and perceptions of leadership style. I list the aim of the research question and hypotheses that frame the remainder of this study and discuss the methods used to conduct the review. I present relevant terms with definitions and discuss the delimitations and limitations of this review and then end this section with the role of leaders in the study and why this study is important.

Various organizational and management aspects impact how an employee perceives their job and thus determines their willingness to stay. These conditions are under the complete control of the organization and influence employee satisfaction through the operationalization of various management programs. Leadership style is one of the organizational components that have an impact on employee satisfaction. Wang, et al. (2016) evaluated the link between leadership style and turnover intention for authoritarian leadership styles in China and found that authoritarian leadership significantly increases employee turnover intention. Tse, et al. (2013) evaluated transformational leadership, leader-member exchange (LMX), and affective commitment and found that LMX and affective commitment both mediate the inverse relationship between transformational leadership and employee turnover intention. Alatawi (2017) found similar results with a review of transformational leadership style and its association with turnover intention. “Managers who adopt this style of leadership can expect lower rates of turnover; thus, they can stay competitive in an unstable economy and achieve enhanced productivity, improved performance, and reduction in expenses” (Alatawi,
2017, p. 1). Casida and Parker (2011) demonstrated how leadership style impacted employee satisfaction with their leaders. The studies above demonstrate a relationship between the type of leadership style and the impact it has on employee satisfaction, whether positive for transformational type behaviors, or negative for passive/avoidant behaviors.

Constant pressures on employees exist both from within and external to organizations. Lavoie-Tremblay, et al. (2010) confirmed the link between turnover and job satisfaction, and they identified specific drivers of job satisfaction which may differ for millennial generation employees. Understanding how the millennial generation perceives leadership style will help organizations develop policies and programs that enhance the workplace to increase job satisfaction for the millennial generation and thereby increase tenure and reduce voluntary employee turnover.

**Statement of the Problem**

Businesses, both public and private, experienced total voluntary turnover at a rate of 26% on average in 2016 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018) and by the most conservative estimates, turnover costs the employer 21% of an employee’s annual salary (Boushey & Glynn, 2012). Allen, et al. (2010) estimated costs range as high as 90% to 200% of an employee’s annual salary. At present, millennials make up the largest portion of the labor force in the United States at 35% (Fry, 2018). Lambert and Hogan, (2009) recognized the costs to be both direct and indirect citing direct items such as recruiting costs, lost productivity, training costs, and administrative costs. They identify the indirect costs as loss of social networks, use of inexperienced staff, insufficient staffing, and decreased morale. They also note that turnover can lead to more overtime for remaining
staff which in turn can cause yet more attrition for the organization. This leads to the complexity of truly understanding the full cost of voluntary turnover and why the referenced ranges of cost can vary greatly.

Past research has shown a strong association between turnover and employee job satisfaction while also highlighting that job satisfaction is one component of turnover that explains only a portion of the variance in turnover (Mobley et al., 1979). Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979) evaluated previous studies grouped by common predictor variables and confirmed that satisfaction was a reliable predictor of turnover. Carsten and Spector (1987) conducted a meta-analysis of previous studies that associated job satisfaction with turnover to determine whether unemployment rates impacted the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover and found that turnover increases when unemployment is low and there are abundant job alternatives. Researchers identified and studied other components that comprise job satisfaction such as autonomy, variety, and task identity (Hytti et al., 2013), as well as perceptions of leadership style (Wells & Peachey, 2011). Still, other studies have evaluated the differences in generational attitudes and workplace outcomes, including turnover (Ertas, 2015). Understanding how perceptions of leadership style impact job satisfaction, and thus turnover for millennial generation employees, has the potential to save companies substantial non-productive costs.

This study focused on understanding the extensively researched area of leadership and the relation to job satisfaction applied to a generational cohort studied less thoroughly in the leadership literature. Wells and Peachey (2011), and Chiok Foong Loke (2001), cite the need to study perceptions of leadership and satisfaction more broadly across other organizations, and Ertas (2015) calls for more study of millennial attitudes
toward work and the antecedents of turnover. As job satisfaction is a key component of turnover, understanding whether this association exists and how strong the association is within the millennial generation provides valuable insights to companies seeking to improve overall satisfaction and thus employee retention and adds to the scholarly literature on the topic.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine whether perceptions of leadership style impact employee job satisfaction for millennial generation, college-educated, full-time employees working in a mid-sized consulting company in the United States via a survey of employees. The independent variable of perceptions of leadership style refers to employee views of their individual leader’s behaviors. The dependent variable of job satisfaction is “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). The control variable is generational cohort defined as the millennial generation, or those born between the years of 1981 and 1997 (Fry, 2018).

**Research Question and Hypotheses**

Building on the established association between perceptions of leadership style and employee job satisfaction, the following research question guided this quantitative study:

Do millennial generation employee perceptions of leadership style have an association with job satisfaction for college-educated, full-time employees at a mid-sized professional services firm in the United States?
This study investigated the following hypothesis to evaluate the research question stated above.

Hypothesis #1: There is a significant relationship between perceptions of leadership style and job satisfaction for millennial employees.

Hypothesis #2: The relationship between perceptions of leadership style and job satisfaction for millennial employees will be consistent between genders, age groups, and ethnicities regardless of tenure.

**Aim of the Study**

The aim of this study was to determine whether perceptions of leadership style impact millennial employee job satisfaction. Understanding if there is a difference may lead to a new emphasis on professional development requirements for leadership and management personnel to maximize job satisfaction of the millennial generation.

**Methods Overview**

Creswell and Creswell (2018) outline three components that comprise a research approach, the world view, design, and research method. I conducted this study from a postpositivist world view as it was a non-experimental quantitative analysis that sought to determine a relationship between concepts by reducing the idea into a testable hypothesis comprised of discrete variables. The research design was a cross-sectional survey that gathered data from a sample of a defined population. This was a predetermined study and thus quantitative in nature, used instrument-based items, and statistically analyzed and interpreted the attitude data gathered (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The population for this study was all millennial generation employees in good standing at the time of the study (October, 2019) within the selected United States based,
mid-sized consulting firm. The human resources department of the company provided the population of employees who fit the criteria for participation. I administered the survey to the entire population of employees who met the specified criteria of being within the millennial generation and an employee in good standing with a minimum of six months of service (\( N = 1,567 \)).

**Definition of Relevant Terms**

I use the following terms throughout this study defined below:

*Good standing:* an employee who is performing as expected and is not on a performance improvement plan nor has announced a pending change in employment status.

*Job satisfaction:* “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1304).

*Millennial:* those born between the years of 1981 and 1997 (Fry, 2018).

*Perception of leadership style:* the explicit and implicit actions performed by a leader as viewed by the employee (Newstrom & Davis, 1993) also referred to as perceptions of behavior by Bass and Avolio (2004).

*Instrument:* The satisfaction survey (MSQ) and leadership survey (MLQ) that comprise the survey instrument.

*Category:* The three groupings that comprise the MLQ comprised of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership styles.

*Scale:* The nine subcategories of the MLQ comprised of individualized idealized influence, both in attributes and behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual
stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, management by exception active, management by exception passive, and laissez-faire.

**Delimitations and Limitations**

A select group of millennial employees in a single consulting company with similar qualities comprised the population for this study. All had college degrees; the degrees clustered around accounting, finance, and management information systems and most were in their first job after graduation from college. Additionally, as the company under study is a matrix organization, a management style where each individual can report up through multiple units of the company simultaneously, the leader who the employee will be evaluating could be from various levels or roles. For instance, the employee’s leader could be a business unit leader, a regional leader, a market leader, or a project leader. Because of this, the study may not apply to other geographies, industries, or populations of employees.

Limitations of this study are largely due to the survey format. The results identified whether there was an association between perceived leadership styles and job satisfaction. The study did not provide information on why such an association exists. Furthermore, because the results were based on employee perceptions of their leader, the actual leadership style of the individual the participant rated may differ from how the participant perceives their leadership style. The ability to link the actual leadership style to the perceived leadership style was beyond the scope of this study. Additionally, this survey was a cross-sectional survey conducted over a three-week period. If an employee had a singular bad experience, or a bad day, the survey results may reflect their current mood and not truly be indicative of their overall satisfaction. Liu et al. (2012) evaluated
the longitudinal nature of satisfaction and how it relates to turnover and demonstrated that the change in job satisfaction over time, whether positive or negative, had a significant impact on the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover beyond a point in time satisfaction measure.

I am an employee of the company and some of the individuals who received the survey report to me personally. Almost all the population solicited to participate in the survey were aware of my role in the company. This may have created a situation where people felt obligated to respond to the survey and may have altered their responses knowing who was asking for their perspectives. To mitigate this bias, the survey was electronic and provided the capability for the participants to remain anonymous. I knew the names of the individuals who received the survey but had no way to identify who responded. I clearly communicated the anonymity of their response in the information provided to the participants with the survey listed in Appendix C. Additionally, I surveyed 100% of the population, which further reduced my ability to identify specific individuals who responded. Finally, I notified the participants they were participating in a research study and management may use the results of the study to implement programs to manage the business. To combat potential bias in the analysis, the study used a known instrument and I defined the test method prior to the survey.

**Leader’s Role and Responsibility in Relation to the Problem**

Leadership is the ability to influence groups to achieve a set of goals by developing a vision and aligning resources to achieve the vision (Robbins & Judge, 2013). This study evaluated employee perceptions of leadership style. In that context, the style of the leader has a direct influence on the satisfaction of the employee. The role of
leadership in this study is how it relates to the actions of individual leaders and how those actions influence employee job satisfaction.

**Significance of the Study**

Employee job satisfaction is a multi-faceted construct that is integral to retaining a productive workforce. Leadership is a significant influence on employee job satisfaction and can impact an employee’s decision to remain with the organization, or to seek employment elsewhere.

Considerable research has established the association between job satisfaction and tenure, and between job satisfaction and leadership. This study expanded the existing literature by demonstrating that the type of perceived leadership style had an association with millennial generation employee job satisfaction.

**Summary**

Leadership impacts employee job satisfaction and thus employee turnover which is a costly and disruptive event for organizations. The literature I presented provides some history of the topic as well as demonstrates both an established relationship between leadership and employee job satisfaction and the cost to employers of a workforce that is either not engaged or exits the organization. While many items impact employee job satisfaction, leadership style has an established correlation in the literature.

The remainder of this study provides context around the existing literature related to employee satisfaction and the organizational, external, and individual characteristics that impact employee satisfaction in Chapter Two. It also covers other leadership theories that act to influence satisfaction more broadly as well as the context of the professional setting that applies to the population of employees that I studied. Chapter Two concludes
with a review of the Full Range of Leadership Theory (FRLT), a discussion of employee satisfaction, and support for the use of survey methods in leadership studies.

Chapter Three details the method used to analyze the results covering how data was collected, the instrument used, the initial coding of the data, how the validity and reliability of the instrument were evaluated, the tests performed for the specific hypothesis testing, and the tests that were performed to ensure the data were appropriate for the analysis performed. Chapter Four details the data analysis performed in line with the method outlined in Chapter Three.

The concluding chapter, Chapter Five, outlines recommendations that organizations should consider as part of their leadership training to address the findings of this study. I provide detail beyond the hypothesis testing to evaluate some of the underlying themes in the data and to outline specific professional development opportunities to address them. The dialog also covers implications for the profession and future research opportunities.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The following literature review presents a discussion about leadership styles and their impact on job satisfaction and tenure. It begins with a review of the various items that impact turnover and categorizes them as internal, external, and individual. There are other items that affect all three of the categories that warrant a category of their own as well as a review of employee satisfaction which is a central theme throughout the dialog and given individual consideration. A separate section discusses the survey method and the benefits and drawbacks of using a survey for data gathering. The chapter concludes with a review of the professional practice the survey participants work in and a review of the Full Range of Leadership Theory (FRLT) that guided this study as well as other popular leadership theories such as Leader Member Exchange (LMX), Complexity Leadership Theory (CLT), authentic leadership, distributed leadership, hybrid leadership, and so forth, and how they inter-relate.

Literature about the Professional Practice Field

One of the primary challenges’ businesses face is voluntary employee turnover. Bills (1925) published the first empirical study related to employee turnover and linked turnover to the profession of the workers’ father. Bills (1925) gathered family data from employee applications of clerical hires at an insurance company in 1922. She conducted a follow up in 1924 to evaluate how many of the 59 hires were still working and determined that the profession of the father was a determinant in tenure for the clerical employee identifying that if the clerical job was higher in social status than the fathers occupation, the employee was likely to stay, but if it was lower in social status, the
employee was likely to leave. This initiated a wave of turnover research that continues to this day. Hom, et al. (2017) detailed the history of turnover research and identified foundational articles across six phases of research over time. Researchers have identified and studied various reasons for turnover throughout this timeline. These reasons can be categorized into the logical groupings of external elements, internal organizational elements, and individual characteristics which is similar to the Muchinsky and Morrow (1980) model that identified economic, individual and work-related items that correlate with job turnover.

Demonstrated throughout this literature review, leadership theories, employee satisfaction, and turnover are complex interrelated concepts and have multiple contributing aspects. This study evaluated the perceptions of leadership style of the millennial generation and how those perceptions are associated with job satisfaction. Figure 1 depicts the relationship between tenure, job satisfaction, and perceptions of leadership style along with many of the other items that influence each component discussed in this literature review. Figure 1 is a graphical representation of a synthesis I created based on the items identified as part of this literature review.
External Elements

External elements influence employee satisfaction, and thus, turnover. The organization cannot influence external elements and has no control over when or if these present themselves yet these external elements impact organizations because they exert influence on an employee. Employees influenced by external elements may experience reduced job satisfaction leading to job seeking behaviors, heightening the intent to leave, and eventually leading to voluntary separation. External elements include the availability of alternate employment, the compensation of the alternative, fringe benefits at competitors and so on. Swider, et al. (2011) demonstrated how the availability of job alternatives, or lack thereof, impacted job search behavior of staff employees at a large

Figure 1

Theoretical Construct of how Leadership Style Relates to Turnover
university in the southwestern United States which is supportive of the phenomenon identified in the meta-analysis by Griffeth et al. (2000). As more alternatives are available, the instance of job seeking behavior and eventual turnover increases. Similarly, Rusbult et al. (1983) evaluated how job satisfaction and job commitment impacted turnover. One of the variables they studied was the availability of job alternatives and their impact on employee commitment. Their testing showed “alternative quality seems to exert significant influence on commitment from the beginning of a job onward” (p. 434).

Wage growth is another external element that has been evaluated as a cause for turnover. Munasinghe (2000) evaluated jobs with high wage growth potential and found those jobs experienced less turnover than jobs with low wage growth potential. However, Munasinghe (2000) determined the wage growth potential of alternate jobs impacted the retention of individuals within high wage growth jobs if the alternative was seen as providing greater benefit. In this way, while an individual organization can influence the wage growth of the specific job, the external environment can exert influence on employee retention by increasing the attractiveness of the job alternatives by increasing the difference between the employee’s current wage and the wage of the alternative job.

**Internal Organizational Elements**

In addition to external elements, there are organizational and management elements that impact how an employee perceives their job and thus determines their willingness to stay. These elements are controllable by the organization and can be influenced by various management programs designed to change employee satisfaction. Leadership style is one of the organizational elements that have an impact on employee
satisfaction. Wang, et al. (2016) evaluated the link between leadership style and turnover intention for authoritarian leadership styles in China. They found authoritarian leadership significantly increases employee turnover intention. Tse, et al. (2013) evaluated transformational leadership in relation to leader-member exchange (LMX), the dynamic relationship between leaders and followers, and affective commitment, the employee’s positive attachment to the company, and demonstrated both mediate the inverse relationship between transformational leadership and employee turnover intention. Alatawi (2017) found similar results with a review of transformational leadership style and its correlation with turnover intention. “Managers who adopt this style of leadership can expect lower rates of turnover; thus, they can stay competitive in an unstable economy and achieve enhanced productivity, improved performance and reduction in expenses” (p. 1). This all builds on the early finding by Fleishman and Harris (1962), where people who left the company had more negative perceptions of leadership styles than those who stayed. The studies above demonstrate a relationship between the type of leadership style and the impact it has on employee turnover.

Leadership style may set the tone of the organization, but several other aspects of the organization, including structure, role design, and human resources processes have demonstrated an impact on turnover. Delobelle et al. (2011) evaluated turnover of nurses in South Africa and established strong negative correlation between job satisfaction, tenure, and rank. Other studies have evaluated the link between quality of work life and turnover. Almalki et al. (2012) studied the phenomenon across a nursing population in Saudi Arabia and confirmed a strong negative correlation between quality of work life and intent to turnover. They also observed negative correlations between professional
tenure, organizational tenure, and pay supporting some of the findings from Delobelle et al. (2011). Lavoie-Tremblay, et al. (2010) highlighted two of the needs expressed by millennial generation nurses as recognition and adequate supervision. They specifically highlighted compensation as the primary component of recognition. While I discussed wage level and wage growth rate in the context of external elements, it certainly has an impact from an organizational perspective as alternatives look less attractive if the wage paid by the current organization seems in line with the market. It is clear that the organization can take directed action to design and implement programs that will enhance the job satisfaction of their employees.

**Individual Characteristics**

Salahuddin (2011) suggested that generational norms have an impact on leadership style. He identified four generations in the workplace as follows: (a) Veterans born between 1922 and 1943, (b) the Baby Boomers, 1943 – 1960, (c) Generation X, 1960 – 1980, and (d) the Nexters born between 1980 and 2000. Salahuddin (2011) identified character traits for each generation that impact their leadership style. Veterans are command and control and believe in the hierarchy while baby boomers embrace consensus building and work ethic. Baby Boomers heavily influenced Generation X who base their leadership style on fairness, competence, and straightforwardness, while Nexters, referred to as Millennials in this study, are more focused on ethics and core values (Salahuddin, 2011). There may be a mismatch between the leadership styles of the previous generations and the needs of the millennial generation that impact how the millennial generation experiences job satisfaction. Lavoie-Tremblay et al. (2010) identified specific criteria that influence job satisfaction in Millennials such as the need
for recognition, stability in work assignments, flexibility in job scheduling, the desire to be challenged, access to training, and consistent coaching and feedback.

Millennials continue to express different values than previous generations (Lyons & Kuron, 2014), placing more emphasis on leisure values, and less importance on workplace centrality (Twenge et al., 2010; Wray-Lake et al., 2011). Liking their manager is a key determinant in millennial commitment and one study found that when millennial employee needs are not met, they are more likely to leave the organization than previous generations (Lu & Gursoy, 2016). Adding to this is the declining altruism and increasing individualism compared to prior generations (Anderson et al., 2017). These are the behaviors that, in part, led to labeling the generation the “Me” generation. How managers inspire and motivate a generation of workers who are internally focused, value time outside of work, want individual attention, care less about the welfare of their fellow workers, and are willing to leave the organization on a whim creates real challenges for existing leadership paradigms.

Although these studies suggest there may be a difference between generations and the workplace outcomes of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to turnover, other studies have shown little difference. For instance, Costanza, et al. (2012) conducted a meta-analysis to evaluate the linkage between generation and workplace outcomes and found no meaningful correlation. Their research suggested there are broad norms that differ by generation as it relates to what employees need from leadership and what aspects impact their job satisfaction, just that the outcome was not significantly different by generation. Alternatively, Park and Gursoy (2012) found there is a measurable difference between Generation X, Baby Boomers, and Millennials as it
relates to work engagement with younger employees, Millennials, demonstrating lower engagement than either Generation X or Baby Boomers. This is consistent with the discussion in Spector (1997) that age and job satisfaction are correlated.

Job embeddedness may be part of what leads to higher engagement for the employees of Generation X or the Baby Boomers who have more tenure. Job embeddedness incorporates the ties the employee has to the organization through their relationships with other individuals and the institution itself, how comfortable the employee fits into the organization, and the cost, both psychological and material, the employee would incur by leaving the job (Swider et al., 2011). They evaluated how job embeddedness is related to job search behaviors and eventual turnover and demonstrated that people with low embeddedness were more likely to initiate job search behaviors and leave the organization than those who had high embeddedness. One element that influences job embeddedness and has been shown to have a positive relationship with job embeddedness is tenure (Abelson & Guion, 1987; Forrester, 2019; Singh et al., 2018). A meta-analysis conducted by Ng and Feldman (2010) demonstrated that employee tenure led to embeddedness lending credence to the idea that people of Generation X or the Baby Boom have higher engagement simply because they had been on the job longer. Studies suggest that increased satisfaction with age may stem from either the changing nature of worker expectation over time as older workers are more satisfied with their jobs because they expect less, or workers who have been on the job longer have deeper skills and thus better jobs than younger workers (Wright & Hamilton, 1978; Clark et al., 1996).
Concepts that impact External, Internal, and Individual Elements

Leader-member exchange (LMX), a relationship-based approach focused on the two-way interaction between leaders and followers, has indicated an impact on the relationship between leadership and turnover intention. Collins et al. (2014) used LMX theory to demonstrate the impact of gender on leadership relationships. Collins et al. (2004) leveraged the work of Liden and Maslyn (1998) that defined four aspects of LMX as *Affect* and *Loyalty*, that demonstrates the communal aspects, and *Contribution* and *Professional* aspects that demonstrate the agentic aspects of leadership behaviors. The outcome of the Collins et al. (2014) study was to demonstrate that while both genders value agentic aspects of leadership similarly, female employees valued communal aspects of leadership more than men did. This demonstrates how LMX is unique to the individual. LMX can also be organizational in that it is the supervisor relationship that provides the basis for follower benefits of increased loyalty and work effort, and reduced turnover in high quality relationships (Tse et al., 2013). Shamir et al. (1993) bring this back to the leadership context by suggesting that charismatic behaviors influence follower beliefs and feelings which may lead to increased participation in LMX (Howell & Shamir, 2005).

Lee and Mitchell (1994) developed the unfolding model as a new theory of turnover. The unfolding theory suggests that various shocks happen at points in time and cause a decision point for the employee. This is a departure from previous theories because it expands the separation event from historic precursor items such as job dissatisfaction and better employment opportunities to include alternatives that may not rely on individual employee satisfaction with the current job. These shocks can be
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internal, external, or personal to the employee. Lee and Mitchell (1994) outline four types of shocks as 1) events that put a pre-existing plan in motion such as someone leaving because they are starting a family, 2) an event that highlights a value or culture difference between the employee and the company such that the employee reconsiders their involvement with the company, 3) an unsolicited employment opportunity that is deemed better than the current job, and 4) the traditional path of turnover where an employee is dissatisfied and seeks a new employment opportunity. Items one and two allude to the idea that satisfaction may not have a role in a voluntary turnover decision, but items three and four are clearly impacted by the current satisfaction level of the employee. The unfolding model demonstrates the complexity of the satisfaction turnover relationship and reveals the importance of job satisfaction as a basis of the turnover decision in some circumstances.

Employee Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an important element of employee retention and is the “most frequently studied variable in organizational behavior research” (Spector, 1997, p. 1). Parvin and Kabir (2011) reference several different definitions of job satisfaction ranging from how people feel about their jobs, to how much they like their job, to the sum of satisfaction with various components of their job, to how well a job meets their needs. All of these have the common understanding that job satisfaction is uniquely individual, Spector (1997) refers to job satisfaction as an attitudinal variable based on an individual’s interpretation of various aspects that equate to their satisfaction. There are a number of various items that contribute to job satisfaction which include, but are not limited to, age,
tenure, task identity, variety, and autonomy, and it is a complicated topic to summarize in a single encompassing definition.

Adding to the complexity is the uniquely individual nature of job satisfaction and the number of items that impact satisfaction for each individual that are not specifically related. Spector (1997) evaluated the intercorrelations among the nine subscales of the Job Satisfaction Survey (pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, communication) and identified relatively small correlations ranging from \( r = .10 \) to \( r = .58 \) with 30 of the 36 measurements falling below .50 (all significant at \( p < .001 \)). This means that while pay may be the primary driver of satisfaction for one employee, another employee may care very little about pay, instead deriving their satisfaction from the nature of the work they perform.

Spector (1997) outlined three reasons why job satisfaction is important to organizations as 1) it is a measure of how fairly the organization treats its employees, 2) it affects the general attitude, behaviors, and performance of employees which affects organizational performance, and 3) evaluating differences in job satisfaction across the organization can identify trouble spots for management attention. Griffeth et al. (2000) also highlighted the importance of fair treatment in their meta-analysis stating that “just procedures have as much - if not more - to do with encouraging employees to stay as fair pay amounts” (p. 480).

The first published paper establishing a link between job satisfaction and turnover appeared in 1955 (Weitz & Nuchols, 1955). Hulin (1966) narrowed their research by focusing only on those who left voluntarily, evaluating turnover at the individual level,
and using a process that was psychometrically sound to test job satisfaction. A considerable amount of research has since been conducted relating to turnover and its various antecedents including job satisfaction as one of the most prominent determinants. A meta-analysis identified 67 studies and over 24,000 observations related to employee job satisfaction and turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000) that yielded a weighted average correlation corrected for measurement error in the predictors of $r = -.19 (Q = 271.23, p < .05)$ which demonstrated that as job satisfaction increases, turnover decreases. Overall job satisfaction showed the most correlation among job attitudes at $r = -.19$, versus work satisfaction $r = -.16$, and met expectations $r = -.15$ in the meta-analysis affirming the link between job satisfaction and turnover.

As referenced in Curivan (1999), several studies (Bluedorn, 1982; Mowday et al., 1982; Shore et al., 1990) sought to understand the relationship between satisfaction, commitment, and turnover. These studies allude to the effect of satisfaction and commitment as an intermediary between the external and internal determinants of turnover. The key conceptual difference between satisfaction and commitment is that satisfaction is developed sooner (Lambert & Hogan, 2009) and is based on how much an employee likes their job, and commitment is defined as loyalty to an organization (Curivan, 1999). The results from the Curivan (1999) study found no relationship between commitment and loyalty over time as it relates to turnover, but did identify strong support between supervisor support, which is analogous to transformational leadership, and both commitment and satisfaction.

Employee job satisfaction as a standalone topic is uniquely personal and can be based on any number of antecedents, or events, that change in their relative level of
importance to the individual over time. While organizations cannot control for every aspect that impacts employee satisfaction, it is clear from the research that organizations can control some of the items, for instance leadership behaviors.

**Survey Methods**

A survey is a selection of a sample of people from a large population resulting in the collection of a small amount of data from the sample participants (Kelley et al., 2003). Researchers use surveys when attempting to describe attitudes of a population and associations among variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). They allow for a standardized, uniform data collection commonly used in descriptive studies, to explain a phenomenon, or to collect data to test a hypothesis and are conducted as either cross-sectional, at a single point in time, or longitudinal, collected at more than one point in time (Kelley et al., 2003). Across the social sciences, surveys are frequently used as a method of data collection and are the best method of collecting data from a large population that cannot be directly observed (Babbie, 2017).

In addition to the various benefits of the survey method, there are risks that researchers need to evaluate. Kelley et al. (2003) described the benefits as collecting data based on real world observations, the ability to acquire data from a large sample, and the speed and relatively low cost of the method. Babbie (2017) notes that collecting data from a large population leads to survey samples that support exploratory analysis. He also identifies the strength of measurement capability resulting from standardized questionnaires.

For all the advantages of surveys, Kelley et al. (2003) also points out the risks of the method. Surveys can produce little evidence behind why a researcher observed a
certain phenomenon or trend, can be difficult to get an appropriate response rate, and can lead researchers to spend more time on the method than on analyzing the results. Babbie (2017) discussed how standardized questionnaires, while good for analysis, compromise the data that can be collected by crafting questions that apply to everyone, essentially surveying the least common denominator. Surveys only obtain information about the question asked, they are not well suited to gather information about an individual’s life context that may impact how a person responds to a survey (Babbie, 2017).

Surveys also present some unique ethical challenges. The instrument often collects personal data that would not be available publicly about an individual that could be embarrassing, or in some way cause them harm, for example, loss of employment, removed from consideration for promotion, and so on (Babbie, 2017). This enhances the requirement for confidentiality if it is determined that question responses pose this type of risk to the respondent. Another concern researchers must consider is the psychological harm that could occur to the participant from being asked certain questions. Asking someone to respond to questions causes them to think about the event or feeling behind the question. Depending on the topic, this could be psychologically damaging to the respondent (Babbie, 2017).

The use of surveys as a data collection tool in leadership studies is very common. Part of the reason is the availability of established instruments designed as surveys. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is such an instrument as well as the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Spector (1997) acknowledged that most satisfaction research is via survey questionnaire. Bernerth et al. (2018) conducted an analysis of leadership research and control variables from articles published between
2003 to 2014 in prominent journals excluding studies based on qualitative research methods, meta-analyses, and laboratory experiments. They only included articles dealing with the Full Range of Leadership Theory (FRLT), any subcomponents of the FRLT, LMX, authentic leadership, ethical leadership, and shared leadership. They identified 290 published leadership studies based on survey research.

**Leadership Literature**

This section broadly discusses the concept of leadership and then focuses on the Full Range of Leadership Theory (FRLT) and its subcomponents of transformational, transactional and passive/avoidant. I included a presentation of other prominent leadership theories and a table depicting how those theories relate to the FRLT along with a discussion on the merits of behavior-based models.

Lowney (2003) discussed the outputs of leadership that are visible as recognized leadership activities. These include establishing direction, aligning people, motivating and inspiring others, and producing change. These outcomes are the product of an individual filling a leadership role that may or may not directly relate to the actions of the individual. Robbins and Judge (2013) similarly define leadership as creating a vision for the future and marshaling and inspiring the resources to achieve the vision. Gunderman (2009) relates leadership style to emotional intelligence comprised of self-awareness, management of moods, self-motivation, empathy, and the management of relationships which are leadership traits that are unique to the individual. When employees rank individuals by their own leadership perceptions, they are evaluating both the outcome of leadership and the unique qualities of the individual leader.
Historical Perspectives

This study uses the Full Range of Leadership Theory (FRLT) (Bass, 1985) as the foundation of evaluation that is based on the Transformational-Transactional Leadership Theory first introduced by Burns (1978). The Transformational-Transactional Leadership Theory as originally conceptualized was dichotomous. Bass’s contribution was to expand the behavioral traits that comprise the leadership style and to add a third element of non-leadership as well as to argue that individual leaders operate at their best when they exhibit behaviors from both transformational and transactional behaviors (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Bass (1985) saw leadership as a continuum versus a mutually exclusive set of behaviors. Max Weber (1947) originated the theory when he first introduced rational-legal leadership as “the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge” (p. 339) that would later become known as transactional leadership. Downton (1973) then expanded on this definition by including the concept of followers when he defined transactional leadership as “both leader and follower are viewed as bargaining agents trying to maximize their profits” (p. 84).

The origins of the transformational–transactional leadership paradigm began with the works of Weber (1947), and then evolved with Downton (1973), to Burns (1978), culminating with Bass (1985). There are differences in how the authors defined the leadership types that evolved with the theory. Khanin (2007) evaluated the differences between Burns’ and Bass’ leadership writings and notes that whereas Burns’ approached leadership as a conjoined journey between leaders and followers to achieve collective goals, Bass took a more militaristic view of leadership as the role of the leader to direct followers to an organizational goal using an array of behaviors from contingent reward to
inspirational motivation. The use of various methods of leadership led Bass to see the transformational–transactional paradigm as a continuum where leaders could operate in either mode, or exhibit behaviors from both, depending on the situation (Khanin, 2007). This is the exact opposite of how Burns viewed the interaction as he defined transformational leadership as a moral undertaking working with followers and transactional leadership as an underhanded action taken by leaders to coerce followers. In the mind of Burns, the two types of leadership are mutually exclusive (Khanin, 2007). This results in two different views of leadership, one more trait based and one more situational based that build off the same theoretical foundations. This study views leadership as trait based and thus aligns with Bass’ view of leadership. The next section describes the FRLT and its subcomponents of transformational, transactional and passive/avoidant.

The Full Range of Leadership Theory

The FRLT is a widely recognized and accepted model of leadership that has received significant public acclaim (Oberfield, 2014). The FRLT identifies three categories of leadership as transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant divided into nine discrete components with two scales of transactional leadership, five scales of transformational leadership, and two scales of passive/avoidant leadership. A number of studies have used the FRLT to evaluate leadership style and satisfaction and demonstrated a strong relationship between transformational leadership and increased satisfaction (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). In their meta-analysis of 87 separate studies, they determined transformational leadership was positively related to the leadership criteria of: (a) follower job satisfaction, (b) follower leader satisfaction, (c) follower motivation, (d)
leader job performance, (e) group or organization performance, and (f) rated leader
effectiveness. However, they also found that contingent reward, a component of
transactional leadership, was as effective as transformational leadership. Additionally, the
Judge and Piccolo (2004) analysis yielded a composite corrected correlation of .44 for
transformational leadership which is significantly lower than previous studies that
reported .73. Judge and Piccolo (2004) theorized that the maturation of research
techniques and sample size between the earlier study by Lowe et al. (1996), of 22 sample
studies, and the validities calculated by Judge and Piccolo (2004) across 87 sample
studies led to the difference in reliability scores. The FRLT categories, and the scales that
comprise each category, provide the best understanding of the theory and is how I
evaluated the impact of leadership style on employee job satisfaction.

**Transactional Leadership**

Transactional leadership focused on setting objectives and achieving defined
outcomes (Antonakis, et al., 2003) and was originally described by Max Weber in 1947
and then expanded on by Bass (1985) and incorporated into the FRLT. This definition
maps to Lowney’s (2003) description of the outcome expectations of leadership but is
often more in line with management activities versus leadership. This led Bass to
acknowledge that transactional leadership is a necessary component of achieving
objectives at a company but is not the leadership style that will lead an organization to
achieve its full potential (Oberfield, 2014).

The subcomponents of transactional leadership are *active management by
exception* and *contingent reward* (Bass, 1985). Active management by exception is where
leaders monitor the progress of a process or activity and act when the progress deviates
from what is expected. The importance of active management by exception is the timing of the management action. Stafford (2009) highlights the negative connotation of managing by exception and how followers may view the action as negative and something that becomes a barrier to both communication between leaders and followers and a source of dissatisfaction with employees. He summarizes a leader using active management by exception as someone who monitors processes and takes corrective action when needed, avoids trying to get involved in processes that are working, creates an environment where followers attempt to maintain the status quo, and whose interaction with followers is mostly based on instructing them how to resolve an issue.

Contingent reward is when leaders set clear direction, communicate expectations, and then link the achievement of the defined objectives to an incentive for reaching them. The success of contingent reward systems is based on knowing what reward is deemed valuable by the potential recipients and an understanding that while these systems may motivate someone to achieve what is required for the reward, it offers no incentive to go above and beyond the basic requirement. Stafford (2009) describes a leader using contingent reward as someone that sets clear goals and objectives, provides clear feedback, incentivizes followers to achieve objectives, and offers support for the followers if they are working towards achieving the objectives.

A number of studies have shown (Casida & Parker, 2011; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Horwitz et al., 2008) that components of transactional leadership are related to various aspects of employee satisfaction. Trottier et al. (2008) evaluated the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and employee satisfaction in a study of government employees and found that contingent reward ($\beta = .023$, $p < .001$) and
management by exception ($\beta = .022, p < .001$) are positively associated with employee satisfaction. Similarly, Wells and Peachy (2010) identified that both transformational and transactional leadership styles had a significant inverse association with employee intent to leave.

**Transformational Leadership**

Antonakis et al. (2003) broadly defined transformational leadership as a leader who is charismatic and helps followers achieve their goals. These attributes incorporate many of the activities that align with Gunderman’s (2009) articulation of emotional leadership. Transformational leaders are charismatic and inspire followers to rise above their own self-interest and achieve “optimal levels of performance” (Antonakis et al., 2003, p. 264). The subcomponents of transformational leadership are idealized influence, both in attributes and behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration.

Idealized influence relates to both the charisma of the leader and whether followers view them as confident and championing the ethics of the organization via the attributed component, and the actions taken by the leader that advance those attributes of ethics and values of the organization via the behavior component (Antonakis et al., 2003). Followers are looking to determine whether the leader says what they will do and do what they say in line with the ethics and values of the company culture. Idealized influence leaders exhibit traits that are credible and trustworthy, convey a clear sense of integrity, create a desire to be emulated by followers, and whose actions demonstrate what they said they would do (Stafford, 2009).
Antonakis et al. (2003) describes inspirational motivation as the activities taken by the leader to paint a vision for the future that contains ambitious goals and creates a sense of optimism for the vision through effective communication with the organization. Stafford (2009) differentiates inspirational motivation from idealized influence as the difference between “walking the talk” and “talking the talk.” He goes on to summarize inspirational motivation as a leader who clarifies the vision for the future, aligns organizational goals with individual goals, creates an environment where followers will achieve beyond expectations, and is seen by followers as someone who is working alongside them to achieve the organizational goals.

Intellectual stimulation is the approach by the leader to problem solving that exhibits logic and reason, and individual consideration is the mentoring activity performed by the leader, the empathy they employ by advising and getting to know the personal needs of the followers so they can achieve their individual goals (Antonakis et al., 2003). Leaders that express intellectual stimulation challenge existing norms, create an environment that supports changing current thinking and encourages followers to adopt new ways of thinking, and bring new perspective to the organization along with examples or methods to change organizational perspectives (Stafford, 2009).

Individual consideration behaviors emphasize advising and supporting followers to allow their development (Antonakis et al., 2003) which is consistent with how Burns (1978) describes the goal of leaders is to develop future leaders. Stafford (2009) describes leaders possessing individual consideration as understanding leaders that prioritize development, that coach individuals, and create an environment where followers want to continuously improve themselves.
Researchers have studied transformational leadership extensively. Judge and Piccolo (2004) found that “A search of keywords in materials published from 1990 to 2003 in the PsycINFO database revealed that there have been more studies on transformational or charismatic leadership than on all other popular theories of leadership (e.g., least preferred coworker theory, path-goal theory, normative decision theory, substitutes for leadership) combined” (p. 2). Since inception, transformational leadership has received extensive theoretical and methodological review and has emerged as a dominant leadership theory (Banks et al., 2016).

Transformational leadership has shown a consistent positive relationship with employee satisfaction. Horwitz et al. (2008) identified significant correlation between the transformational scales of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and individual consideration with employee satisfaction ($r = .67, .63, .68, p < .01$). This is consistent with a meta-analysis conducted by Judge and Piccolo (2004) that produced an estimated true score correlation of .58 between the transformational leadership category and employee satisfaction. Because transformational leaders predominantly focus on helping followers achieve their goals, it is not surprising that those followers would experience higher satisfaction.

Table 1 depicts the differences between transactional and transformational leaders. It is apparent that transactional leadership is a short-term focused barter system where the leader is promising some incentive for a level of performance that the leader needs. Alternatively, transformational leadership is a longer term “higher-order” (Antonakis et al., 2003, p. 264) style focused on the inspirational impact of the leader to
influence followers to support and work toward the vision of the organization (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Table 1

**Difference Between Transactional and Transformational Leaders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership is responsive</td>
<td>Leadership is proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works within the organizational culture</td>
<td>Works to change the organizational culture by implementing new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leaders make employees achieve organizational objectives through rewards and punishment</td>
<td>Transformational leaders motivate and empower employees to achieve company’s objectives by appealing to higher ideals and moral values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates followers by appealing to their own self-interest</td>
<td>Motivates followers by encouraging them to transcend their own interests for those of the group or unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table recreated from managementstudyguide.com, by Juneja Prachi (2019), https://managementstudyguide.com/transactional-leadership.htm

**Passive/avoidant Leadership**

Passive/avoidant leadership is comprised of two scales, *laissez-faire*, and *passive management by exception*. Laissez-faire is essentially the absence of leadership. Leaders are not present, do not get engaged, and actively avoid making decisions. Hinkin et al. (2008) defined laissez-faire leadership to include various forms of non-leadership such as “avoiding responsibility, not responding to problems, being absent when needed, failing to follow up, resisting expressing views, and delaying responses” (p. 1235). Stafford (2009) described this leader as someone who practices delaying action, attempts to divert
attention from hard decisions, leaves followers disengaged, and is generally absent. Passive management by exception is when leaders wait until an outcome or performance expectation is not met to act. Leaders allow the process to function independently, evaluate results and then act if the desired action is not present. These leaders are essentially equivalent to active management by exception leaders with the only difference being the lack of monitoring that goes on.

The absence of leadership is based on a non-response by the leader to follower activity and can include both reward omission and punishment omission (Hinkin et al., 2008). Pithers (1985) studied the absence of feedback and identified that non-response to a desired behavior led to reduced performance, a process labeled omission conditioning. Hinkin et al. (2008) extrapolated this to an organizational setting and linked it to the FRLT as a subcategory of laissez-faire leadership. Their research concluded that reward omission showed strong negative association with supervisor effectiveness ($\beta = -.26, p < .01$) and satisfaction with the supervisor ($\beta = -.31, p < .01$) while punishment omission was negatively associated with role clarity ($\beta = .16, p < .05$).

Passive/avoidant leadership has proven to be detrimental to employee satisfaction through various negative workplace outcomes including illegitimate absenteeism (Frooman et al., 2012) and turnover (Raup, 2008). Judge and Piccolo (2004) focused on the laissez-faire scale and found significant negative correlations with both leader effectiveness ($r = -.54$) and follower satisfaction ($r = -.58$) with a 90% confidence interval excluding zero. In a recent study, (Westerlaken & Woods, 2013) the FRLT was evaluated against a four-scale structure of psychopathy and demonstrated a meaningful correlation between the passive management styles of passive management by exception
and laissez faire and the composite psychopathic traits score \( r = .43, p < .01 \) and \( r = .18, p < .01 \), respectively). It is evident in these studies that the passive/avoidant leadership styles are detrimental to both organizations and individual employees when practiced as the primary form of leadership.

**Other Leadership Theories**

In addition to the Full Range of Leadership Theory (Bass, 1985), there are several other theories that have developed over time to describe aspects or types of leadership that all fall under the category of competency-based leadership. Landis et al. (2014) detail several leadership theories that have developed over time depicted in Table 2 along with a short description.
In addition to the theories presented in Table 2, there are also a number of leadership styles discussed in the leadership literature. Anderson and Sun (2017) highlight several of the most popular leadership styles widely considered as alternatives or extensions to the existing transformational–transactional paradigm to include “ideological, pragmatic, servant, authentic, ethical, spiritual, integrative public and shared/distributed” (p. 77). Each of these leadership theories or styles are reliant on some type of behavior or competence of the leader. For that reason, the FRLT (Bass, 1985) is a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Men Inheritance</td>
<td>Leaders are great men that leave a lasting impact on society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Situational Political</td>
<td>Personality traits of character define leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place and circumstance create the environment for great leaders to emerge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders that possess the right traits need to be in the right situation to express leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The wealthy, military, church and state develop leaders that compete for people’s approval to lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory X</td>
<td>People have to be directed in an organization to achieve goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Y</td>
<td>People are self-motivated and will achieve goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity-immaturity Leader-role</td>
<td>People are self-motivated and the organization provides an opportunity to contribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>Situations and individuals come together to create a leadership opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Outcomes are based on how well a leadership style is matched to the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Attribution</td>
<td>The leader offers something to the follower group as reward for their compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader behaviors influence follower actions more than rewards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader views of employee performance are influenced by the cause of the performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
conduit to evaluate the leader based on their behaviors regardless of the style or theory asserted and is relevant across several theories. Anderson and Sun (2017) highlight the high degree of overlap between the various leadership styles. While there are some characteristics not covered in the FRLT, it is the only modern theory based on a paradigm that broadly covers many of the leadership behaviors resident across various styles. Table 3 highlights some of the specific overlaps that Anderson and Sun (2017) discuss.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Overlap Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideological</td>
<td>Charismatic, Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>Transformation, Transaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>Transformation, Ethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>Transformation, Servant, Charismatic, Spiritual, Ethical, Pragmatic, Ideological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>Ethical, Transformation, Authentic, Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Public</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While leadership theories based on competence have received broad support both academically and throughout organizations, they are not without criticism. In a series of letters between leadership theorists, the merits of competency models are debated between Hollenbeck and McCall who do not support competency models, and Silzer who defends competency models (Hollenbeck et al., 2006). Hollenbeck and McCall argue that competency model-based theories are unattainable best practice models that do not define successful leaders. They argue that competency models are based on four flawed assumptions as follows:

- Leaders can be described with a discrete set of characteristics;
- Characteristics are treated individually such that having more makes one a better leader ignoring how they may interact and the context of the situation;
- Senior management accepts competency models and thus creates an environment that supports their adoption and use assuming they are an effective way to think about leadership; and
- Tying human resource systems to competencies creates systems that work better.

Silzer counters the argument by first highlighting the benefits to organizations of competency models as providing a summary of the experience and insight of leaders, articulating a list of behaviors that are useful for leadership, providing a roadmap for future leaders to self-develop, and providing a framework that organizations can use to identify and select leaders. Silzer goes on to specifically address the four assumptions outlined by Hollenbeck and McCall by characterizing competency models as guidelines that assume people have various skills and capabilities deployed in various situations working together to achieve the stated goal. He broadens this into a statement regarding overall leadership effectiveness as “related to what competencies a person uses in different situations and how those competencies get balanced and integrated depending on the situational context” (Hollenbeck et al., 2006, p. 404). This is like the benefits of competency models outlined by Fulmer and Conger (2004) which include communicating clear expectations for roles and performance, linking development activities to goals, providing a development framework, providing a way to quantify performance management, and creating a common language for leadership.
One key point of agreement resulting from the exchange between Hollenbeck, McCall and Silzer (2006) is the focus on outcomes. Both sides agree that competency models focus on characteristics of leaders who operate within the context of organizational situations, but that the confluence of those forces may not lead to positive outcomes which is the entire goal of leadership.

There are other emerging theories that extend leadership beyond competency models, and in some instances beyond individual leaders. Complexity Leadership Theory (CLT) is an emerging area of study that proposes a social capital emphasis where leadership adapts to everyday situations within their situational context, not as individuals, but as interdependent agents across organizations (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). Arena and Uhl-Bien (2016) identify how CLT bridges the gap between the bureaucratic and entrepreneurial sides of the business to create adaptive space where innovation can occur and incubate in the organization to drive organizational change. There are also hybrid configurations of leadership that capture distributed leadership, horizontal leadership, and an all-encompassing category of hybrid leadership. Bolden and Petrov (2014) evaluated leadership across a university environment and identified leadership practices across the five dimensions of persona, social, structural, contextual, and developmental that occur at the individual, group and organizational level. They call for the expansion of leadership frameworks to “include an inter-organizational level to account for multi-institutional contexts” (p. 415).

With the addition of CLT and hybrid leadership, one can see a distinct challenge to the concept of individual leaders who exhibit certain behaviors that drive success in organizations. With the proliferation of technology in organizations that is extending the
concept of the organization beyond the geographical limits of the office through
collaboration tools, and beyond the organization itself with the integration of supplier
networks, concepts such as “wirearchy” (Husband, 2008) move beyond the individual
completely to dynamically self-formed teams around real time evolving ideas to drive
organizational value.

While the argument against competence-based models has merit, their use in both
academic studies and organizations continues to flourish for want of an alternative that
more completely explains the linkage between leadership behaviors and organizational
outcomes. Recognizing that no model can be all encompassing and that some latitude
should exist in interpreting how much leader behaviors or competencies contribute to an
outcome; this study is specifically based on evaluating an outcome, employee
satisfaction, and linking employee satisfaction to leadership behaviors. For this reason,
coupled with the broad use and academic acceptance of the FRLT as a viable leadership
model, as well as the flexibility of the model in acknowledging that successful leaders
have various competencies across the paradigm, I chose to use the FRLT as a basis for
this study.

**Literature about the Professional Practice Setting**

The population for this study was millennial employees at a mid-sized
professional services firm in the United States. The consulting industry provides
professional advice by knowledge workers across a few specialized areas including,
accounting, tax, management, information technology, human resources, and regulatory
compliance (Statista, 2019). The estimated size of the industry is $262 billion globally
and employs roughly 684,470 professionals in the United States (Statista, 2019). The firm
that comprises the population for this study focuses on the risk management segment of the consulting industry comprised of business risk, technology risk, and internal audit, commonly referred to as *advisory services*. Major firms providing similar services include Accenture, IBM, EY, PWC, Deloitte, KPMG, Bain & Company, and McKinsey & Company.

Many of the consulting firms follow a similar employment strategy, especially the large accounting firms comprised of EY, Deloitte, KPMG, and PWC, commonly referred to as the *Big 4*. The firms are limited liability partnerships structured as a pyramid with partners at the top of the pyramid, and consultants hired directly from universities at the bottom of the pyramid. A common ratio is 15 or more employees per partner. Table 4 lists career titles and years of experience.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Level</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>0 – 2 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2 – 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>5 – 7 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>7 – 14 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>14+ Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The typical time from university graduate to partner is roughly fourteen years.

Based on internal communications (Company, personal communication, April 24, 2019), there are approximately 2,300 employees in the United States of which approximately 1,500 are members of the millennial generation within the selected organization.

Summary

This literature review outlined the problem businesses face today stemming from turnover and the negative impacts to the organization. I discussed the antecedents to
turnover and demonstrated how perceptions of leadership style relate to employee satisfaction which in turn relates to turnover. Also reviewed were the items impacting turnover in the context of those items external to the organization, those internal to the organization, and those dealing with individual characteristics. I reviewed yet other aspects that affect all three categories. Satisfaction is foundational to this study and I reviewed it separately as well as the basis and support for survey methodology as an approach to conducting this research. I focused on the FRTL during my review of leadership literature and the various components that comprise it followed by some dialog related to other leadership theories. The chapter concludes by discussing the professional practice setting.

Leadership, and the perceptions thereof, are an important aspect in employee job satisfaction, and thus turnover. There have been numerous studies related to employee satisfaction over the last several decades (Bills, 1925; Casida & Parker, 2011; Lavoie-Tremblay et al., 2010) that have both established the association between employee job satisfaction and turnover, as well as identified several determinants that influence employee job satisfaction, including leadership style. Harter et al. (2002) reported a search of PsycINFO through the year 2000 identified over 10,000 publications related to job satisfaction.

Additionally, there have been more recent studies related to the millennial generation and their work attitudes (Purba & Ananta, 2018; Park & Gursoy, 2012; Deal et al., 2010). Studies evaluating millennial generation employees specifically and the association between leadership style and job satisfaction have detailed the continued
association in various employment sectors (Young et al, 2013; Cheeseman & Downey, 2012).

The consulting industry employs a significant number of millennial generation workers with as much as two-thirds of employees coming from this one generational segment (PwC, 2013). Leadership style is a key component of how employees feel about the work environment and the Full Range of Leadership Theory comprised of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership is an accepted theory to evaluate leadership style. These styles represent a paradigm of leader behaviors that impact the work environment and satisfaction of the follower community in various ways. Understanding how this generation perceives leadership, and how those perceptions influence employee job satisfaction, is significant for an industry segment so heavily reliant on millennial employees.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine whether perceptions of leadership style impact employee job satisfaction for millennial generation, college-educated, full-time employees working in a mid-sized consulting company in the United States via a survey of employees. I defined the independent variable of perceptions of leadership style as employee views of their individual leader’s behaviors. I defined the dependent variable of job satisfaction as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). The control variable was generational cohort defined as the millennial generation, or those born between the years of 1981 and 1997 (Fry, 2018).

This chapter outlines the method I followed to gather and analyze the data collected to test the research question and hypotheses posed. It begins with a review of the research question and hypotheses, the research design, research participants, and data collection methods. I cover the data collection tools and procedures in detail along with the analysis plan that entails descriptive statistics, validity and reliability testing, and the specific analyses performed to test both hypotheses. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the ethical considerations contemplated during this research.

Research Question and Hypotheses

This quantitative study expanded upon the established association between perceptions of leadership style and employee job satisfaction by evaluating the following research question:
Do millennial generation employee perceptions of leadership style have an association with job satisfaction for college-educated, full-time employees at a mid-sized professional services firm in the United States?

The following hypotheses guided the testing performed to evaluate the research question:

Hypothesis #1: There is a significant relationship between perceptions of leadership style and job satisfaction for millennial employees.

Hypothesis #2: The relationship between perceptions of leadership style and job satisfaction for millennial employees will be consistent between genders, age groups, and ethnicities regardless of tenure.

Testing of these hypotheses allowed me to draw conclusions on the nature of the relationship between employee job satisfaction for millennial employees and their perceptions of leadership style examined for differences in age, ethnicity, gender, and tenure.

**Research Design**

Creswell and Creswell (2018) outlined three components that comprise a research approach, the world view, design, and research method. I conducted this study from a postpositivist worldview as it is a non-experimental quantitative analysis that sought to determine a relationship between concepts by reducing the idea into a testable hypothesis comprised of discrete variables. The predetermined design allowed me to statistically analyze and interpret attitude data from the instrument-based items I used (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). I used cross-sectional survey research to gather data from a defined population at a single point in time.
I used deductive reasoning to determine that the correct course of evaluation for this study was to examine turnover in the context of employee job satisfaction based on perceptions of leadership style. The process started with a business issue, costs of turnover, and led to an understanding of what causes turnover, one component being job satisfaction, which led to knowledge of the various items that comprise job satisfaction, one of which is leadership style. Deductive reasoning leads from why something exists, in this case voluntary employee turnover, to whether something is causing the outcome (Babbie, 2017). The “whether” for this study related to leadership styles and their impact on employee job satisfaction. In this way, the line of questioning started with a general concept and through data gathering and generating an understanding of the literature moved to a specific item that was the focus of this research.

Having identified the variables of leadership style and employee job satisfaction as key components of understanding the leadership–satisfaction–turnover phenomenon, I began researching instruments to measure the variables identified. The Full Range of Leadership Theory (FRLT) is a paradigm of leadership behaviors grouped into three primary leadership styles and evaluated using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Scholarly studies routinely use the FRLT and recognize it as a leading model of leadership (Bass, 1985; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Oberfield, 2014). In addition, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is one of several common frameworks used to assess satisfaction (Spector, 1997) and was the only common framework I evaluated that offered a 20-item instrument that was also based on a five-point Likert scale. Both criteria were important as the MLQ is 36 items and is based on a Likert scale and matching the scales was a criterion for evaluation.
I based this investigation on the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 2004), comprised of 36 items, to evaluate the independent variable of perceptions of leadership style defined as employee views of leader behaviors. The MSQ short form from Vocational Psychology Research, University of Minnesota (Weiss, 1967) comprised of 20 items to evaluate employee satisfaction with their job was used to evaluate the dependent variable of job satisfaction defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). The control variable was a generational cohort defined as the millennial generation, or those born between the years of 1981 and 1997 (Fry, 2018). The instrument gathered additional demographic information used in the statistical analysis including age, gender, ethnicity, and tenure.

**Participants/Data Sources**

The population for this study was all millennial generation employees in good standing as of September 2019 within the selected United States based mid-sized consulting firm. The human resources department provided the population of company employees who met the predefined criteria of the participating organization. The human resources department applied the “good standing” criteria to the population of employees prior to sending me the list which narrowed the population to those employees anticipated to be employed throughout the survey period. There were 1,567 employees within the specified age range in the selected professional services firm in the United States, geographically dispersed across 23 offices. The entire population received a link to the electronic form of the survey instrument via email on September 30, 2019.
Data Collection Tools

Participants provided responses via a survey administered electronically using Qualtrics, an on-line survey application. A researcher uses surveys when attempting to describe attitudes of a population and associations among variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The participants are both geographically distributed and numerous making other methods of data collection both cost and time prohibitive. I obtained permission from the Vice President of Human Resources to solicit survey responses from employees.

The survey was a consolidation of two separate surveys, the MLQ and MSQ, along with four demographic variables. The demographic variables were age, gender, ethnicity, and tenure. I outlined the structure of the instrument in Table 5 followed by an explanation of the MLQ and MSQ surveys.

Table 5

Structure of the Survey Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Instrument Category</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Idealized Attributes (IA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Idealized Behaviors (IB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (IM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Individual Consideration (IC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive/Avoidant</td>
<td>Contingent Reward (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active Management by Exception (MBEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSQ</td>
<td>Passive Management by Exception (MBEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laissez-faire (LF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Survey

This survey assessed the independent variable of perceptions of leadership style by utilizing the MLQ developed by Bass and Avolio (2004). The MLQ is a mature instrument used in hundreds of peer reviewed studies (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Participants responded to 36 items in the MLQ using a 5-point behavioral response scale (1 = not at all, 2 = once in a while, 3 = sometimes, 4 = fairly often, and 5 = frequently, if not always). The components that make up the MLQ are in Appendix D and are comprised of nine scales that support the three leadership style categories of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant. Antonakis (2001) supported the nine-scale leadership model and its stability in homogeneous situations and showed that the model exhibited consistency in a diverse array of 6,525 samples across 18 independent studies. In a study performed by Bass and Avolio (2004) using a 1999 data set (N=1,498), reliability scores for the MLQ scales produced Cronbach’s coefficient alpha scores of .63 to .92. Similarly, Wells and Peachey (2011) calculated a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha between .70 and .96 for each scale of the MLQ.

Various studies have criticized the construct validity of the MLQ as a measure of the FRLT (Northouse, 1997; Yukl, 1998; Charbonneau, 2004). Some of the criticisms relate to the intercorrelation between the various scales (Yammarino & Dubinsky, 1994; Tracey & Hinkin, 1998; Kelloway et al., 2000) while others related to the goodness of fit in the scale to category construct of the model (Tepper & Percy, 1994). Carless (1998) concluded that the instrument measured a single construct of transformational leadership. Heinitz et al. (2005) evaluated the nine-scale model and concluded that only three of the nine scales related to overall leadership and subsequent analysis using a three-scale
model showed minimal difference in the predictability of the model from the nine-scale model. Table 6 presents a comparison of the confirmatory factor analyses completed by Rowald (2005) and Bass and Avolio (2004). While the analyses differ, and in some cases differ substantially, both depict a few individual items that have poor item to scale loading underscoring the arguments that the instrument has some variability below the broad categories of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant in how the items relate to each other, and to their categories.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IM9</td>
<td>.74 (.69)</td>
<td>II(A)10</td>
<td>.72 (.75)</td>
<td>II(B)6</td>
<td>.41 (.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM13</td>
<td>.63 (.77)</td>
<td>II(A)18</td>
<td>.55 (.71)</td>
<td>II(B)14</td>
<td>.52 (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM26</td>
<td>.65 (.75)</td>
<td>II(A)21</td>
<td>.69 (.83)</td>
<td>II(B)23</td>
<td>.67 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM36</td>
<td>.66 (.75)</td>
<td>II(A)25</td>
<td>.73 (.44)</td>
<td>II(B)34</td>
<td>.64 (.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS2</td>
<td>.32 (.52)</td>
<td>IC15</td>
<td>.45 (.70)</td>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>.62 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS8</td>
<td>.74 (.58)</td>
<td>IC19</td>
<td>.39 (.63)</td>
<td>CR11</td>
<td>.56 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS30</td>
<td>.78 (.78)</td>
<td>IC29</td>
<td>.68 (.68)</td>
<td>CR16</td>
<td>.48 (.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS32</td>
<td>.56 (.74)</td>
<td>IC31</td>
<td>.76 (.82)</td>
<td>CR35</td>
<td>.61 (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA4</td>
<td>.53 (.65)</td>
<td>MBEP3</td>
<td>.54 (.62)</td>
<td>LF5</td>
<td>.64 (.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA22</td>
<td>.67 (.56)</td>
<td>MBEP12</td>
<td>.82 (.82)</td>
<td>LF7</td>
<td>.49 (.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA24</td>
<td>.60 (.72)</td>
<td>MBEP17</td>
<td>.27 (.32)</td>
<td>LF28</td>
<td>.69 (.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA27</td>
<td>.49 (.66)</td>
<td>MBEP20</td>
<td>.56 (.73)</td>
<td>LF33</td>
<td>.71 (.66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items in parentheses are from Bass and Avolio (2004), items not in parentheses are from Rowald (2005).

Muenjohn & Armstrong (2008) identified these criticisms and conducted an analysis of the MLQ short form by evaluating three separate models, a single leadership rating, a three-scale model comprised of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant, and the full nine-scale model of the MLQ. They found that the
goodness of fit (GFI) increased from the one-scale model (GFI = .73) to the nine-scale model (GFI = .84) allowing them to conclude that there is support for the full nine-scale model and that it provides a reasonable fit to the data.

**Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Survey**

This survey evaluated the dependent variable of job satisfaction using the MSQ (Weiss, 1967). The MSQ measures job satisfaction and is available in a long form consisting of 100 items and a short form made up of 20 items. I used the 20-item short form to measure employee satisfaction in this study. Participants responded to the items using an adjusted Likert-type, five-point behavioral response scale (1 = not at all, 2 = once in a while, 3 = sometimes, 4 = fairly often, and 5 = frequently, if not always) (Likert, 1932). For the purposes of this study, and to aid in the analysis between MLQ and MSQ scales, the response scale for the MSQ was converted to “Not at all” to “Frequently if not always” so that the scales of the two instruments would be the same for analysis purposes. I provided the 20 items of the MSQ in Appendix E. Spector (1997) discussed the MSQ as a popular research questionnaire for determining employee satisfaction and the applicability of the short form for an overall satisfaction score concluding that it has shown to be reliable and appropriate at measuring employee satisfaction. Hancer and George (2003) deemed the instrument reliable with a calculated Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of .90. The following section outlines how I used the MLQ and MSQ to collect the data for this study.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The data collection for this study was via an electronic survey. The population was all millennial generation employees in good standing with at least six months of
service. The instrument contained three sections, biographical information, perceptions of leadership borrowed from the MLQ (categories listed in appendix D), and job satisfaction from the MSQ (20 items listed in appendix E) distributed electronically with two and a half weeks given to complete. As the survey was not designed to identify the respondent there was no way to determine who had responded and who had not, a generic reminder was sent at the end of the first week thanking those who had participated and extending the deadline by one additional week for those who had not responded. I sent a second follow up email thanking everyone for their responses and reminding those who had not responded at the end of the second week to respond by the deadline date. I sent a final reminder notifying everyone that the survey would close in two days, thanking everyone who had responded, and encouraging those who had not responded to do so by the deadline.

I required a minimum of 309 responses to achieve a 95% confidence level with an error rate of 5% (Babbie, 2017). Because I did not achieve the minimum number of responses required during the initial response window, the survey remained open one additional week and I sent an email to the population of respondents thanking those who had responded, along with an informational message around the importance of completing all the items, as well as a statement that the minimum number had not been reached. The survey closed October 24, 2019 with a total of 506 responses of which 354 (22% of population) were complete and usable. I compared the actual responses received (354), with the minimum required (309) to determine if I had received enough responses to continue the study by evaluating the responses received against the population. I exported the raw survey data from Qualtrix into Microsoft Excel, coded the data to
change the dichotomous demographic variables into number form, created scale, category, and instrument mean columns, and loaded the dataset into IBM SPSS version 26 for statistical analysis.

**Data Analysis**

The data analysis was comprised of a three-step process as follows: step 1, descriptive analytics; step 2, validity and reliability analysis; step 3, hypothesis testing (Field, 2013).

**Step 1: Descriptive Analytics**

I conducted statistical evaluation using IBM SPSS 26 on data gathered from the electronic survey which captured perspectives of leadership style, employee satisfaction, age, tenure, gender, and ethnicity. I started the analysis by creating descriptive statistics of the responses by scale (9 MLQ), category (3 MLQ), and instrument (1 MLQ and 1 MSQ) to evaluate the mean, standard deviation, and error rate of the data for each item. The data were ordinal in nature; thus, I did not expect nor require normally distributed data. I generated tables that described the sample population by age, tenure, ethnicity, and gender, and provided descriptive statistics around each item.

**Step 2: Validity and Reliability Analysis**

I explored validity of the instrument through factor analysis by analyzing the items in the questionnaire against their a priori scales. Since my study essentially created a new instrument by combining the MLQ with the MSQ, and only using the short form of the MSQ, I explored construct validity via an exploratory factor analysis. Prior to conducting the exploratory factor analysis, I evaluated the data by performing Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (Stevens, 1992) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling
adequacy (KMO) to ensure the dataset was suitable for factor analysis (Walker & Maddan, 2009). Based on the results of the factor analysis, I removed items as appropriate to achieve item-to-factor alignment.

Reliability testing used Cronbach’s alpha coefficient to determine whether the instrument measured the criteria under review. I conducted an evaluation of the modified dataset Cronbach alpha coefficients post factor analysis and did not remove any items as all instruments and categories scored above the cutoff value and any removals would not have improved the reliability score.

**Step 3: Hypothesis Testing**

I evaluated the hypotheses by tabulating the results from the raw data to develop a single mean per item MSQ score for job satisfaction and a mean score for each of the nine scales, the three categories and the one instrument of leadership style. Respondents rated each scale by answering three or four items depending on the items remaining post factor analysis. I created a mean score by participant for the MSQ instrument.

Each demographic variable acted as a dichotomous moderator (Baron & Kenny, 1986) variable classified into the following nominal categories:

- Age – Early millennial (born between 1981 and 1989) or late millennial (born between 1990 and 1997)
- Gender – Male or Female
- Ethnicity – White, Non-White
- Tenure – Less than 5 Years, Over 5 Years

I assigned a numerical value for each demographic variable such that female equals 0, male equals 1, non-white equals 0, white equals 1, tenure of less than five years equals 0,
tenure of more than five years equals 1, and born before 1990 equals 0 while born 1990 or later equals 1. The instruments and subscales yielded acceptable results for reliability and validity and I evaluated a composite index at the category levels of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant by calculating the mean of the scales under each category. I evaluated hypothesis one by calculating a Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient between each of the nine scales, three categories and the instruments of the MLQ and the MSQ to determine if the independent variable of perceptions of leadership style had a significant relationship with the dependent variable of employee satisfaction.

I determined that a statistically significant correlation existed between perceptions of leadership style and employee satisfaction, thus I performed a multiple regression analysis to evaluate the influence of the moderator variables of age, gender, ethnicity, and tenure for hypothesis two. I used an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression method even though both the independent and dependent variables were ordinal as both ordinal multiple regression and OLS have shown good type 1 error controls and similar statistical power when evaluating ordinal data (Kromrey & Rendina-Gobioff, 2002). I evaluated the variance inflation factors (VIF) to test for multicollinearity (Field, 2013) prior to executing the regression analysis to ensure values of less than 10 which would indicate no significant multicollinearity (Field, 2013).

I tested the moderator variables at the category level by performing a multiple regression between the category variables with each moderator individually to determine whether any of the moderator variables impact the relationship between perceptions of leadership style and employee satisfaction as well as at the scale level. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) identified that in a multiple regression with multiple independent variables
the sample size needs enough size to produce meaningful results. They used the model $N > 50 + 8m$, where $N$ is the number of participants and $m$ is the number of independent variables, to calculate the sample size required. For this study, the number of participant responses (354), is significantly larger than the minimum required participants to support a multiple regression with up to thirteen independent variables (nine scales and four moderators) which equated to 154 required samples using the Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) formula.

Wells and Peachey (2011) performed a similar analysis between the nine scales of the MLQ and a single rating for organizational turnover and Trottier et al. (2008) at the scale and category level. Likewise, Casida and Parker (2011) evaluated the nine scales of the MLQ with three leadership outcome dependent variables via a multiple regression as did Rothfelder et al. (2012) with two demographic variables and three leadership categories demonstrating multiple regression as a common method for evaluating the MLQ against a dependent variable.

**Ethical Considerations**

I obtained Institutional Review Board approval (Appendix B) for this study as human subjects were involved. I sent a cover email that included the link to the survey, along with an acknowledgment of the participants’ informed consent (Roberts, 2004), an explanation of the study, its purpose, the voluntary nature of the response, and the procedures to keep the information confidential and anonymous to each participant. The text of the cover letter is in Appendix C.

The survey instrument provided anonymity for the individual respondent. This reduced the ethical considerations for the study. There is a potential that leadership could
make decisions based on the outcome of the study that could negatively impact the entire population. For example, if the study were to show the millennial generation will not be happy at work no matter what management does, the company could make decisions to outsource more work, use contract labor to fill certain roles, or over hire Generation Z that is now entering the job market. Alternatively, leadership could decide that certain types of leaders are detrimental to the business and decide to terminate their employment. The nature of the survey and the anonymity of the responses mitigates any action against a single individual. Because the survey respondent is rating a unique leader for their role i.e. the Chief Executive Officer, their regional leader, market leader, practice leader, account leader, or just about any other person they deem a leader, there is no way to determine which individual leader the scores pertain to, nor who provided them.

The potential for personal bias does exist. I am a leader in the company and known to almost all the participants in the survey. Many of them report directly to me. This may create a situation where people felt obligated to respond to the survey and may alter their responses. This risk existed regardless of who sent out the survey and due to the anonymity of the respondent, even if they felt a duty to respond, the responses should still be genuine. The widely used survey instrument is the consolidation of two known instruments and has tested as reliable and valid, which further limits bias in the analysis. There is a low likelihood of bias in the analysis, thus there were no mitigating strategies.

Summary

This study focused on how perceptions of leadership style impact employee job satisfaction. I started this chapter with a review of the research question and associated hypotheses that I analyzed. I also discussed the research design that guided this study.
The area under review lends itself easily to a quantitative method via a survey and was based on known instruments for the two primary variables under review, perceptions of leadership style via the MLQ, and employee job satisfaction via the MSQ. Both provide a way to create a numerical score and I described how each instrument is structured.

I explained the population of survey participants along with the method used to distribute the survey and collect respondent data. This included the communications I sent to the participants and follow up conducted to achieve the number of required responses. I explained how I created and analyzed the scale, category, and instrument scores, along with the demographic variables, used descriptive statistics and conducted reliability and validity testing. I also explained how I conducted a bivariate correlation analysis to evaluate the relationship between the variables followed by a multiple regression analysis to evaluate the effect of the moderator variables for hypothesis testing. This study adds to the literature surrounding leadership and job satisfaction for the millennial generation.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine whether perceptions of leadership style impact employee job satisfaction for millennial generation, college-educated, full-time employees working in a mid-sized consulting company in the United States via a survey of employees. I defined the independent variable of perceptions of leadership style as how an employee views their individual leader’s behavior. I used the definition from Locke (1976) for the dependent variable of job satisfaction as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (p. 1304). The control variable was generational cohort defined as the millennial generation, or those born between the years of 1981 and 1997 (Fry, 2018). The following two hypotheses evaluated the research question as follows:

Hypothesis #1: There is a significant relationship between perceptions of leadership style and job satisfaction for millennial employees.

Hypothesis #2: The relationship between perceptions of leadership style and job satisfaction for millennial employees will be consistent between genders, age groups, and ethnicities regardless of tenure.

This chapter details my analysis to support the research question and hypotheses proposed following the method outlined in Chapter Three. I followed a three-step process of 1) analyzing the survey data gathered via descriptive analytics, 2) validity and reliability testing, and 3) hypothesis testing. It is important to understand how the scales aggregate to categories, and how those relate to the instruments. Table 7 presents the flow of aggregation as well as a description of the abbreviations used throughout this chapter.
Table 7

**Aggregation and Description of Abbreviations of the MLQ and MSQ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument Category</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multifactor</td>
<td>Idealized Influence – Attributes (IA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (IM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MLQ)</td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Consideration (IC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingent Reward (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management by Exception – Active (MBEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive/Avoidant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management by Exception – Passive (MBEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Laisses Faire (LF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MSQ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey responses were at the item level. I calculated a mean score of the items for each scale to generate a mean score per scale. I then used the mean per scale score to calculate a mean per category score from the scales associated with their category, and then averaged the category scores to create an instrument level score for the MLQ.

**Presentation of the Findings**

One thousand five hundred and sixty-seven participants received the survey which comprised the entire population of millennial generation employees in good standing at the specified organization within the United States. The survey was an online survey distributed via Qualtrics. Upon completion of the designated period, I exported the raw data into Microsoft Excel where I sorted, coded, and evaluated the data for completeness. There were 506 responses gathered. I removed 152 responses from the data prior to coding due to incomplete responses which I identified by searching for any null values in the data. I conducted a review to look for nonsensical responses, for example every
response was the same, which yielded no results. The remaining 354 survey responses had all cells filled out completely and comprised the dataset used for further analysis.

I coded the responses to convert the item responses to numerical values. The demographic variables were dichotomous and were converted to either 0 or 1, and the Likert type scale responses were 1 = not at all, 2 = once in a while, 3 = sometimes, 4 = fairly often, and 5 = frequently, if not always. I expanded the data set by adding columns to reflect average scores for each of the nine scales of the MLQ, the three categories of the MLQ, and the instrument level ratings for both the MLQ and the MSQ (Hancer & George, 2003). I imported the resulting dataset into IBM SPSS 26 for further analysis.

Validity

I explored construct validity via an exploratory factor analysis because my study created a new instrument by combining the MLQ with the MSQ short form. A principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization determined the fundamental factor structure of items loading on their a priori scales. Prior to running the factor analysis, I evaluated the dataset to ensure there was correlation between the variables by running Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (Field, 2013). This test evaluated the dataset to ensure it was not an identity matrix. Bartlett’s was significant ($\chi^2$ (1540) = 10325.99, $p < .01$) which indicated that it was appropriate to factor the dataset (Stevens, 1992). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) evaluated the proportion of variance among variables that might be common variance (Field, 2013). Acceptable KMO values are those greater than .50 (Walker & Maddan, 2009). The KMO value for this dataset (KMO = .93) was above the threshold thus indicating the sample was adequate to support factor analysis.
Table 8 presents the rotated component matrix. The analysis resulted in the removal of 5 items (1 IA, 1 IB, 1 IM, 1 MBEP, and 1 LF) that fell below the cutoff value of .45 in their a priori scale within the MLQ, and 14 items that fell below the cutoff value of .45 in the MSQ instrument. I moved the contingent reward scale from the transformational to the transactional category because while it did not load on its a priori scale, it showed fair to excellent loading (.53, .54, .69, and .72) at the item level for the transformational category. The association between contingent reward and transformational leadership is consistent with prior findings (Judge & Piccolo, 2004) that showed strong correlation between contingent reward and transformational leadership. This is also supported by the original discussion in Bass and Avolio (1993) regarding the augmentation effect. They argue that leadership is comprised of both transactional and transformational components and that the transformational aspects build on the transactional behaviors. In other words, leaders displaying transformational behaviors are also likely to show transactional behaviors. Moving the factor into a different category has no bearing on the research question and hypotheses evaluated.

All remaining items loaded on their respective a priori scales at .45 or higher. The cutoff of .45 is supported by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) who follow previous work by Comrey and Lee (1992) and suggest the following scale for determining cutoff levels in factor analysis of 0.32 (poor), 0.45 (fair), 0.55 (good), 0.63 (very good) or 0.71 (excellent). For this analysis, I deemed fair as acceptable with 7 of the 37 items (19%) rated as fair, 5 of 37 (14%) rated as good, 9 of 37 (24%) rated as very good, and 16 of 37 (43%) rated as excellent.
I reduced the MSQ to six items based on the factor analysis. This does not change the method of scoring but does reduce the number of items that make up the score. The
revised MLQ is now comprised of 31 items with 21 in the transformational category reflecting the movement of the contingent reward scale, four in transactional, and six in passive/avoidant.

Reliability

Cronbach’s alpha is a mathematical formula used to determine how closely a set of items on a scale relate to one another (Field, 2013) with ratings that range from 0 to 1 with any score above .70 deemed satisfactory (Connelly, 2011). I applied a minimum internal consistency of .70 for both instruments as recommended by Nunnally (1978) for preliminary research. This minimum was supported by a meta-analysis of Cronbach’s alpha by Peterson (1994) that evaluated 832 articles containing 1,030 samples from over 300,000 individuals and 4,286 alpha coefficients resulting in coefficients that had a mean of .70 and ranged from .60 to .99 with seventy-five percent achieving .70 or greater indicating that .70 is acceptable for basic research.

I calculated Cronbach’s alpha on the modified instruments after validity testing by category and for each instrument in total to evaluate reliability as depicted in Table 9.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/Avoidant</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The satisfaction instrument (MSQ) and overall leadership instrument (MLQ) both achieved Cronbach’s alpha ratings greater than the minimum required of .70. At the category level, transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant exceeded the
minimum with Cronbach’s alpha ratings of .96, .74, and .81 respectively. Wells and Peachey (2011) reported alpha ratings of .70 for transactional, and .93 for transformational, Tse et al. (2013) reported reliability as .92 for the transformational leadership category. These ratings are within the range of .63 to .92 at the scale level reported by Bass and Avolio (2004). I evaluated items underlying each category and scale to determine if removing any would improve the reliability of the instrument. There were no items that if removed would improve the reliability.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Table 10 depicts the proportion of the responses along the four demographic variables.

Table 10

*Respondent Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born before 1990</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born 1990 or later</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years of more</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive analysis provided the mean, standard deviation, and standard error rate for nine MLQ scales, three MLQ categories, the MLQ instrument, and a single MSQ instrument rating depicted in Table 11.
Table 11

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MLQ Instrument</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MLQ Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/Avoidant</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MLQ Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MSQ Instrument</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 354. Response scale was 1 = not at all, 2 = once in a while, 3 = sometimes, 4 = fairly often, and 5 = frequently, if not always.

From the MLQ instrument categories, transformational leadership reflected the highest mean on a 1 to 5 response scale (M = 3.75) by category followed by transactional leadership (M = 3.01) with passive/avoidant leadership showing the lowest mean score (M = 1.91). This means that for the leaders rated, more people observed transformational leadership behaviors than transactional or passive/avoidant behaviors.

The satisfaction score is calculated per the MSQ manual (Weiss, 1967) which is to average the responses that used the scale of 1 = not at all, 2 = once in a while, 3 = sometimes, 4 = fairly often, and 5 = frequently, if not always. The lowest score possible is 1 indicating the respondent was very unsatisfied and the highest is 5 indicating the
respondent was very satisfied. The MSQ score ($M = 4.06$) indicated generally good satisfaction of the response pool.

**Hypothesis Testing**

I performed a simple correlation and multiple regression analysis on the reduced dataset after the factor analysis to evaluate the hypotheses.

A simple correlation evaluated hypothesis one to determine whether the perceptions of leadership style were correlated with job satisfaction. I evaluated the data using Spearman’s correlation coefficient (Field, 2013), a bivariate correlation used for ordinal datasets, between the MLQ at the scale, category, and instrument level, and the MSQ instrument.

Table 12

*Correlation between MLQ and MSQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$r_s$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01, IA = Idealized Influence – Attributes, IB = Idealized Influence – Behaviors, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS = Intellectual Stimulation, IC = Individual Consideration, CR = Contingent Reward, MBEA = Management by Exception – Active, MBEP = Management by Exception – Passive, LF = Laisses Faire*
The table shows that at the category level of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant, moderate correlation exists between the transformational leadership category and the MSQ instrument ($r_s = .41, p < .01$). There is statistically significant inverse weak correlation between the passive/avoidant category and employee satisfaction ($r_s = -.18, p < .01$), and no statistically significant correlation between the transactional leadership category and employee satisfaction. The relationship at the instrument level of the MLQ is positive and weak with statistical significance ($r_s = .32, p < .01$). The general interpretation of Spearman’s correlation coefficient is .00 -.10 negligible, .10 - .39 weak, .40 - .69 moderate, .70 - .89 strong, and .90 - 1.00 very strong (Schober et al., 2018). Transformational leadership has a stronger relationship with employee satisfaction than transactional, and passive/avoidant has a negative relationship. This gradient is consistent with the meta-analytic results reported by Judge and Piccolo (2004) and results in the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between perceptions of leadership style and employee job satisfaction of Millennials. Statistically significant correlation exists between employee perceptions of leadership style and employee satisfaction.

Additionally, the change of the relationship between leadership category and employee satisfaction from passive/avoidant to transformational is from -.18 to .41. This is a substantial change demonstrating fluctuation in satisfaction as perceptions of leadership behaviors change. Similar results were produced by Rothfelder et al. (2012) in a study of hospitality worker perceptions of leadership as they related to employee satisfaction, and by Jones and Rudd (2008) who reported a strong relationship between
transformational leadership and satisfaction, very little relationship with transactional leadership and a small negative relationship with passive/avoidant leadership.

Hypothesis two evaluated the four moderator variables to determine the effect these variables have on the relationship established in hypothesis one. I evaluated collinearity of the variables by analyzing the variance inflation factors (VIF) to determine if the predictor variables had a strong linear relationship with the other predictor variables (Field, 2013). The VIF are acceptable if they are generally less than 10 (Myers, 1990). I evaluated the VIF at the scale level, the category level and instrument level in three separate analyses using each of the four moderator variables (age, gender, ethnicity, and tenure) with the MSQ instrument as the dependent variable. Values of collinearity ranged from 1.02 to 3.41 which are acceptable levels of collinearity, thus I did not make any adjustments. Table 13 presents the VIF for each item.
Table 13

*Variance Inflation Factors (VIF)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/Avoidant</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To evaluate the relationship between the dependent variable of employee job satisfaction and the independent variable of perceptions of leadership style with the demographic variables, I performed a multiple regression analysis.
Table 14

*Multiple Regression of Demographic Variables, MLQ Categories, and MSQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable (s)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.139*</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.438*</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.094*</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/Avoidant</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>-.240*</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.342*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Correlation (R)  
R²  
.465  
.217

*p < .05, N = 354

The regression indicates that the model is a better predictor of employee satisfaction than using the mean value of satisfaction alone ($F(8,345) = 11.93, p < .001$). To determine which of the demographic variables are independently associated with employee satisfaction, holding the MLQ items constant, I examined the standardized correlation coefficient ($\beta$) of the relationship between the MSQ and the four demographic variables and the three categories of the MLQ and the MLQ instrument. The simple correlation ($r$) corresponds to the bivariate relationship between the MSQ and the MLQ instrument and categories. The standardized regression coefficient ($\beta$) characterizes the same relationship when all other variables are mutually controlled. The coefficient of multiple correlation (R) indicates the multivariate relationship between the variables and the coefficient of multiple determination ($R^2$) indicates the proportion of variance in the MSQ and the MLQ scales and categories. (Field, 2013)
regression coefficient. All demographic variables are positive and all are insignificant with $p$ values greater than .05. This means that while correlation exists between the demographic variables of age, gender, ethnicity, and tenure, with employee job satisfaction, they have no statistically significant impact on employee job satisfaction. This supports hypothesis two that perceptions of leadership style as they relate to employee job satisfaction are stable between age groups, ethnicities, and genders regardless of tenure.

**Analysis and Synthesis of Findings**

There were two hypotheses evaluated related to the relationship between perceptions of leadership style and employee job satisfaction of millennial generation employees and then whether age, gender, ethnicity, and tenure impacted the relationship. The results of the analysis reflect that a statistically significant weak correlation between the dependent variable of employee job satisfaction and perceptions of leadership style does exist. The results also demonstrate that correlation improves to moderate if evaluated at the category versus the scale level for the transformational category of leadership. This is consistent with current literature regarding the Full Range of Leadership Theory (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Adding in the demographic variables of age, gender, ethnicity, and tenure, a multiple regression yielded very little difference in the predictability of the model indicating that the impact of these variables was not significant. The overall conclusion is that the employee base is generally satisfied, that employee job satisfaction is related to perceptions of leadership style, that the participants observe more transformational behaviors than transactional, and more transactional than passive/avoidant, and that demographics among the millennial generation do not have
much impact on how perceptions of leadership affect employee job satisfaction. These results support both hypotheses as valid.

Summary

I extracted data from the survey and evaluated it for consistency to achieve a final usable sample of 354 survey responses which exceeded the minimum required. I evaluated the data via descriptive statistics and then prepared for analysis by confirming several important conditions. This included performing Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity and the Keyser-Meyer-Olkin test to ensure the data was appropriate for factoring, and then a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization to evaluate factor loading. I reduced the number of items from 60 to 37 based on factor loading thus demonstrating validity. Cronbach’s alpha showed good reliability which led to hypothesis testing.

Spearman’s correlation coefficient demonstrated simple correlation for hypothesis one, and multiple regression, after evaluating the variance inflation factors, demonstrated predictability of the model and the minimal impact of the demographic variables in the equation. These tests supported both hypotheses of this study.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Voluntary employee turnover is expensive and disruptive for businesses and in part, caused by the influence of leadership style on employee job satisfaction. This study examined the perceptions of leadership style and how those perceptions relate to employee job satisfaction at a mid-sized consulting firm with locations across 23 cities in the United States. The size, geographical dispersion, and type of information required dictated a quantitative study. Results of the study demonstrated support that there is a relationship between perceptions of leadership style and job satisfaction for millennial generation employees and that the relationship remains constant between age groups, ethnicities, differing lengths of tenure, and different genders.

This chapter discusses how organizations can benefit from this information to improve employee retention as well as a discussion about future research opportunities based on the results of the study. I also examine the role of leadership and the practical implications to the profession.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether perceptions of leadership style impact employee job satisfaction for millennial generation, college-educated, full-time employees working in a mid-sized consulting company in the United States via a survey of employees.

Aim of the Study

The aim of this study was to determine whether perceptions of leadership style impact millennial employee job satisfaction. Understanding if there is a difference may
lead to a new emphasis on professional development requirements for leadership and management personnel to maximize the job satisfaction of the millennial generation.

**Proposed Solution**

The study exhibited a correlation between perceptions of leadership style and employee job satisfaction. The effect was positive for transformational and negative for passive/avoidant. Therefore, I concluded that as followers perceive more transformational behaviors from their leaders, and perceive less passive/avoidant behaviors, employee job satisfaction increases.

Organizations should begin by obtaining an understanding of what exists in the organization today by reviewing existing leadership development activities to determine whether the activities teach key behaviors that reinforce transformational leadership and de-emphasizes passive/avoidant behaviors. Organizations should also review the totality of the development activities to ensure they span the career of an employee with various touchpoints to continually develop and reinforce the desired behaviors.

Once a baseline understanding of the development opportunities for leaders exists, organizations should develop a leadership program that incorporates core components to include policies, processes, people, systems and data, and management reporting.

The solution I outline concentrates on adopting a professional development program focused on leadership behaviors to foster a work environment that promotes employee job satisfaction. The solution requires a well-defined curriculum grounded in the above core components. Figure 2 depicts the full development program of the proposed solution.
**Proposed Leadership Development Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Level</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>New Hire Orientation</th>
<th>Manager Milestone</th>
<th>Intro to Leadership Course</th>
<th>Leadership Course</th>
<th>Mastering Business Relationships</th>
<th>Senior Leadership Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager and above upon entry to the organization</td>
<td>Manager - 5+ Years of Experience</td>
<td>Senior to Senior Manager - 2 to 14+ Years of Experience</td>
<td>Senior Manager - 7 to 14+ Years of Experience</td>
<td>Senior Manager - 7 to 14+ Years of Experience</td>
<td>Partner - 14+ Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policies**

Policies provide a framework that includes guidelines and general principles that apply to how a function or process works. Policies enable various stakeholders to understand the intent of the organization. Policies related to the leadership development program should articulate the goals of the program, to whom it applies, the requirements to meet the policy and the process that management will use to determine compliance with the policy.

Update policies to reflect the requirement for leadership development activities by incorporating those activities across the development continuum of an individual’s career. This should include incorporating a baseline understanding of leadership and the supporting behaviors of the Full Range of Leadership Theory into key development
courses, a deeper dive into behavior scenarios during specific leadership classes, and a focus on reinforcing those behaviors in the senior leadership course. New hire orientation should reference elements of the program for experienced hires entering the organization that may not have attended prior courses in the curriculum. All the development opportunities listed at the target organization are multi-day instructor led in person courses.

**Procedures**

Procedures are the day to day processes that support the organization in achieving the policy directives. Procedures should address the identification and tracking of who should attend the various development opportunities, the tracking of who has attended which course, the maintenance and delivery of the development program, and the ongoing monitoring of the implementation of the behaviors across the organization.

Organizations should review the existing procedures to ensure they support all the objectives outlined in the policies. Where gaps exist a revamp of the procedures would be needed in order to address the deficiencies.

**People**

Policy objectives require organizational support in the form of people and funding to exercise ownership of the program. The procedures will dictate the roles required to support the program and outline the specific areas of accountability. Job descriptions should contain the goals of the individuals identified to develop, implement, facilitate, and assess the leadership development program.
Technology and Data

Technology and data support the operation of the program. Organizations should use a human resources system that contains employee information and facilitate a process to identify and track course requirements by level, role, and tenure as well as course completion. Also required are additional systems that mine data from employee feedback related to perceived leadership styles along with a system to facilitate a periodic assessment of perceived leadership styles across the organization.

Management Reporting

Management reporting provides the information that the personnel identified to own the program used to facilitate and monitor the program. Reporting should consist of reports by individual that show course completion, reporting that reflects perceived leadership qualities highlighted in 360-degree feedback by individual, and organizational level reporting on the status of leadership styles observed in the organization via surveys conducted. Use the reports to determine whether the leadership development program is meeting the needs of the various groups and where gaps exist, assess the development program, and adjust as necessary by either adjusting the development materials, or providing individualized coaching for individuals as needed.

Support for the Solution

This study presented a clear correlation between perceptions of leadership style and employee job satisfaction ($r(352) = .32, p < .01$) in millennial generation employees in this organization. This is similar to previous studies that have evaluated leadership and satisfaction (Casida & Parker, 2011; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Horwitz et al., 2008). Going one level deeper, the scales that make up transformational leadership (individualized
influence attributes, individualized influence behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and contingent reward) all have moderate correlations ranging from .30 to .40 (p < .01) with contingent reward ranking the highest. Evaluating the leadership categories (transformational, transactional, passive/avoidant) by the demographic variables presented in Figure 3 yields an additional layer of depth demonstrating how various constituencies value different leadership behaviors. Non-White, female, tenured, early millennials perceive the most passive/avoidant leadership behaviors ($M = 2.4$) and have the lowest satisfaction ($M = 3.26$). Alternatively, non-White, male, tenured, late millennials perceive the highest instance of transformational leadership ($M = 4.0$) and have the highest satisfaction rating ($M = 4.3$).
Figure 3

Leadership Style and Satisfaction by Demographic Variable
A question becomes do different groups perceive the same leadership behaviors differently, or do leaders behave differently when interacting with different groups? There is support that genders respond differently to leader behaviors (Collins et al., 2014) and that ethnicity impacts leader member exchange and job satisfaction (Chong & Thomas, 1997). Because this study was anonymous for both the participant and the leader they chose to rate, there is no way to answer that question within the context of this study. However, it is germane for the solution as it needs to contemplate the various groups within the organization and how their perspectives on leadership may differ.

While taken together the demographic variables of ethnicity, gender, tenure, and age did not show a difference in satisfaction as it relates to leadership style, when broken down into smaller units, some differences do exist. Accordingly, understanding the leadership behaviors resident in the organization and how different constituencies interpret those behaviors is an important component of improving leadership development going forward.

**Stakeholders and other Items Related to the Solution**

The organization participating in this study already recognizes the value of leadership with a defined leadership development program that has been operating for several years. The breadth of development opportunities offered to people in management and leadership roles spans the career continuum and has broad support throughout the organization. The opportunity is not about convincing the organization to institute leadership development, rather it is to harmonize the various development opportunities around a central theme anchored to leadership behaviors that builds on core concepts as people attend each element. Program funding is through the training organization that has
one dedicated person who facilitates the leadership development program. The 
stakeholders are numerous including company leadership, participants, clients of the 
organization, and the personnel in the organization affected by leaders. In other words, 
every employee of the company.

The proposed solution is based on an underlying assumption that leadership 
behaviors do, in fact, impact employee job satisfaction. Hypothesis one of this study 
demonstrated the correlation between the leadership instrument and the satisfaction 
instrument. However, prior researchers have reported underlying concerns with both the 
category to scale alignment, and how the items relate to the scales in the construct of the 
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). This study also demonstrated that 
significant correlation exists between some of the scales and that the items related more 
to the category level (transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant) than the scale 
level (idealized influence, contingent reward, inspirational motivation, and so forth). 
While one could debate the item to scale to category alignment, there is no doubt that the 
leadership styles at the category level are measurable by the items that underly them, 
even though they may relate to different scales. For the purposes of this study, the items 
were a means to rate perceived behaviors at the category level, which I demonstrated by 
the factor analysis, and how they relate to the individual scales under the categories were 
not germane to the overall analysis conducted or conclusions drawn.

**Policies and other Items Influenced/Influencing the Proposed Solution**

An existing policy structure exists within the organization that participated in this 
study. Where that is not the case, management should determine how leadership 
development could fit into the organization and then memorialize that strategic objective
into a policy directive that will guide the efforts of the organization. Policies should cover at a minimum, the importance for leadership development, the requirement to participate, the structure of the program along with identifying the individuals by title, or the functions of the organization that will be responsible for developing, implementing, facilitating, and assessing the organization.

While not a policy, there is an interesting trend in the industry that lends a sense of urgency to the concept of leadership development. Most firms in the industry experience double digit growth rates, and since growth is the number of people billing clients, headcount growth is often a requirement of firm growth. This puts enormous pressure on the pipeline of leadership candidates as organizations need to add 15% or more leaders annually to support the growth projections while replacing those who retire. Continually filling the leadership pipeline is often a strategic driver for many of the companies in the industry and creates an environment where leadership teams are not only cognizant of the need to grow leadership, but also interested in improving or maintaining the quality of leadership.

**Potential Barriers, Obstacles, and Progress to Proposed Solution**

The two primary barriers to implementing the proposed leadership development program are time and cost. Any organization that decides it matches their strategic objectives to undergo leadership development must allocate the appropriate resources. This not only includes funding for the infrastructure components discussed, but also the willingness to commit the time required to allow personnel to attend the courses. This requires support from executive leadership to make leadership an appropriate priority for the organization.
An additional barrier relates to the final aspect of the implementation plan of monitoring the effectiveness of the behaviors. This assumes that people internalized the development concepts and put in place new behaviors to adjust their personal leadership style. To be effective, this cannot entirely rest on the shoulders of the individual leader. A support mechanism must exist to provide meaningful feedback, encouragement, best practices, and other learned experiences amongst the cohort of leaders that reinforces the need and continued march toward new behaviors. Rogers (2003) defines a social system as a grouping of various parts of the organization aligned to solve a common problem or achieve a stated goal. The social system provides the informal structures of an organizational culture that support innovation processes and encourage adoption. In the context of the adoption of a leadership development program, this would be the support of executive leadership, the desire for participation among the leadership candidates, the cultural shift to embrace the importance of such a program, and the weaving into the common operating process support for the behaviors that leaders are expected to exhibit.

The steps outlined in the recommendation assume that such social structures exist within an organization; to the extent these structures are deficient, the success of the development program will be less certain.

The addition of leadership behaviors to existing development courses has received support and does not require significant investment to implement. Similarly, the investment of time, budget for incidentals, and the funding for the program already exists. Adding leadership behaviors to the program will not increase any of the budget requirements for the program. The monitoring aspects proposed would have some initial budgetary requirements, but like the other components of the program are additions to
existing processes that are operating today. I am currently working with the Learning and Development team of the organization to develop and implement leadership behaviors into the curriculum.

*Change Theory*

Successful change is the result of an enablement program that helps the organization and its employees move from the status quo to the new normal. Rogers (2003) discussed the process and outlined four steps that allow organizations to implement new innovations as 1) the innovation, 2) communication channels, 3) time, and 4) a social system. For the organization under review to implement this specific change, much of the supporting infrastructure was already in place. The innovation, or change, is to add behavioral aspects of leadership to existing development materials and create a consistent theme throughout the curriculum. The communication channel is the in-class training that currently takes place and the time has already been allocated for the training. Additional avenues to reinforce communication exist within the 360-degree feedback system, and the annual review process of setting goals and reviewing performance. I discussed the social system in the potential barriers section.

The existing informal systems may not support the type of role they will need to fill for this change to become part of the culture. Because of this, monitoring of the leadership behaviors via a modified annual engagement survey should occur to determine whether the change is sustainable. Where deficiencies exist, management should evaluate the state of the social structures to determine if the broader culture of the organization embraces leadership development.
Implementation of the Proposed Solution

Within the context of the organization studied, implementation presented no significant barriers. The Vice President of Human Resources approved a project to create a steering committee for the purpose of updating the curriculum of all organized courses for personnel from manager to partner to incorporate a leadership theme based on leadership behaviors.

For organizations that do not have an existing leadership development program, they should consider whether improving leadership behaviors for the purpose of increasing job satisfaction is relevant to their strategic objectives, whether increased employee satisfaction would have a positive impact on their organization, whether this type of change could be supported in the organization, and whether the time and resources exist to develop and implement such change.

Stakeholders and other Items Related to the Implementation of the Solution

Lasting organizational changes take time and effort along with the support of executive management to fund and support the program appropriately, the people engaged to develop, implement, facilitate and assess the program, the various leaders and management personnel to prioritize these activities, and the participants themselves to approach the development program as an opportunity to improve their leadership capability. The following sections outline the role of leadership and the implications to the organization.

Leader’s Role in Implementing Proposed Solution

For leadership changes to be effective, the organizational leaders must embrace the change program. The leaders must identify and assign ownership and funding for the
program, they must invest in select individuals to attend the program, and they need to invest in mechanisms to measure the outcome of the program. To embrace a program, the organization needs to hear from their leadership how changing leadership behaviors relates to the long-term strategy of the organization. Leaders should consider the time and effort required to execute the program and whether that is in line with their strategic plan for the year. They should also consider the benefit to the organization and its stakeholders and determine if this type of activity is appropriate for their unique situation.

Global/External Implications for the Organization

The management consulting business is very competitive and the firms routinely recruit from competing firms. Investing in leadership not only signals to the individuals the value they possess, but also increases the effectiveness of their leadership which affects all employees. As the culture benefits from the increased satisfaction of the employees, the ability to retain existing employees increases, and the ability to attract top performers from competitors increases. Organizational reputation in the labor market is critical to attracting the best employees, and leaders that exhibit transformational behaviors impact the culture and thus the external reputation.

Evaluation and Timeline for Implementation and Assessment

Implementation of the enhanced development program is through the Learning and Development team via incremental updates to the existing leadership curriculum. The courses are continuous and updated throughout the year. I shared this research with the Learning and Development leaders who are responsible for the leadership curriculum and they have agreed to form a committee that I will participate on to evaluate adding leadership development into the curriculum.
The organization currently participates in a companywide annual engagement survey. The survey covers five broad categories: credibility, respect, fairness, pride, and camaraderie with a final single item on overall employee engagement. There are specific items in the engagement survey that evaluate satisfaction, engagement, and leadership. Examples include items such as: management keeps me informed; I can get straight answers to questions; management delivers on its promises, and I can be myself around here. The organization should update the survey to use the specific items from the MLQ to gather feedback regarding employee perspectives of leadership behaviors, and expand the current one question on satisfaction to the six items used in this study from the MSQ. Monitoring how the organization responds to these questions over time will provide some evidence of the efficacy of the training program. Additionally, the organization uses a real time 360-degree feedback application for all employees. The leadership training team should identify key words that relate to leadership and then develop reporting from the application that informs the team about the current state of leadership in the organization.

Implications

Practical Implications

Employee job satisfaction is a multi-faceted construct that is integral to retaining a productive workforce. Leadership characteristics are a significant influence on employee job satisfaction and can impact an employee’s decision to remain with the organization, or to seek employment elsewhere.

Considerable research has established the association between job satisfaction and leadership. This study expanded the existing literature by demonstrating that the type of
perceived leadership style had an association with millennial generation employee job satisfaction.

As organizations learn from studies such as this one, they can participate in the benefits by undertaking specific activities to improve leadership behaviors which will impact employee satisfaction and therefore reduce turnover. The reduction in turnover is the tangible, practical benefit that can result from a focus on leader behaviors potentially saving organizations from 21% of an employee’s annual salary (Boushey & Glynn, 2012) to as much as 200% of an employee’s annual salary (Allen et al., 2010).

**Implications for Future Research**

This study was cross sectional and focused on a single company in the United States. Future studies could continue to expand both geographically and across various types of organizations. Additional surveys could also be conducted with supplementary scales to evaluate the underlying components that associate with satisfaction, for example, pay, work assignment, work life balance, travel, fringe benefits, and other workplace characteristics to understand if a relationship exists for specific elements of satisfaction with the defined leadership behaviors. Quantitative studies, while good at understanding how people feel about a topic, need the balance of qualitative studies to understand why certain leadership behaviors relate to satisfaction and go beyond establishing the relationship that they do. Qualitative studies could expand our understanding of why followers react to certain behaviors. Studies could also explore behaviors from the leader’s perspective to understand what type of leadership behaviors they believe they are exhibiting and what they are doing to exhibit them.
Generational specifics deserve more study as it relates to perceptions of leadership. While this study confirmed many previous findings, the associations were not as strong as those presented in previous literature. This could be due to the changing nature of work attitudes between generations, to how people respond to surveys, or other items currently unknown. Future studies could also delve deeper into the demographic options to understand why the results reflect some variation among constituencies.

**Implications for Leadership Theory and Practice**

Leadership is the ability to influence groups to achieve a set of goals by developing a vision and aligning resources to achieve a stated vision (Robbins & Judge, 2013). The output of leadership often results in activities such as establishing direction, aligning people, motivating, and inspiring others, and producing changes that are tangible to the organization and recognized as leadership behaviors (Lowney, 2003). These activities are based on leader behaviors that cause an organization to respond in the desired way. This study evaluated a behavioral model of leadership and tested whether differences in behaviors impact employee job satisfaction. Proving that behaviors do matter is important to leaders because behaviors can be both taught and changed. Organizations that have a desire to improve their employee job satisfaction have a path to do so by understanding how their employees perceive their leaders and actively engaging leaders to evolve specific behaviors.

**Summary of the Study**

This was a quantitative study focused on determining whether perceptions of leadership style impact employee job satisfaction for millennial employees of a mid-sized consulting firm in the United States. I discussed the importance of this topic in the
context of employee turnover and the costs to organizations both in dollars, productivity, and the impacts to the culture. There has been a significant amount of research related to turnover over the last 100 years linking turnover to various antecedents, one of which is employee satisfaction. I also outlined the impact of leadership style on employee job satisfaction.

There is significant academic literature supporting the underlying topics evaluated as part of this study. I outlined the items that impact employee job satisfaction and categorized them as external, internal, and organizational and included items such as economic alternatives, pay, culture, leader member exchange, and generational values. I discussed satisfaction as a separate topic and covered some history of satisfaction research, how satisfaction is complex, unique to the individual, and comprised of various components including perspectives of leadership.

This study was quantitative in nature and based on a survey. I discussed why a survey was appropriate for this type of review and the makeup of the instrument which included two separate surveys modified into one based on the MLQ, the MSQ, and four demographic variables. I referenced other studies that have used similar surveys in leadership analyses.

The background concluded with a robust discussion of the literature related to leadership. I provided a history of the Full Range of Leadership Theory (FRLT) which was the basis of this study along with a discussion of the components that comprise the FRLT of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership. I also discussed various leadership theories and styles and how they relate to the FRLT along with some
criticisms of competency-based theories. Lastly, I reviewed emerging theories of leadership such as Complexity Leadership Theory and hybrid leadership.

The analysis I conducted focused on a simple correlation to evaluate whether perceptions of leadership style relate to employee job satisfaction, and a multiple regression to evaluate whether that relationship changes by age, tenure, ethnicity, or gender. I concluded that there is a correlation and that the demographic variables did not have a statistically significant effect on the relationship.

To help companies reduce turnover by increasing employee job satisfaction through the behavior of their leaders, I have proposed a development program that will educate leaders and give them suggestions for changing behaviors they need to interact effectively with followers. The program entails a level setting of what leadership behaviors exist in the organization, and identification of the areas of improvement between current state and future state, and monitoring mechanisms to ensure that the leadership development program is addressing the needs of the organization. The model also includes policy and funding opportunities to ensure it is sustainable over time.
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Appendix A

Bill of Rights for Research Participants

As a participant in a research study, you have the right:

1. To have enough time to decide whether or not to be in the research study, and to make that decision without any pressure from the people who are conducting the research.

2. To refuse to be in the study at all, or to stop participating at any time after you begin the study.

3. To be told what the study is trying to find out, what will happen to you, and what you will be asked to do if you are in the study.

4. To be told about the reasonably foreseeable risks of being in the study.

5. To be told about the possible benefits of being in the study.

6. To be told whether there are any costs associated with being in the study and whether you will be compensated for participating in the study.

7. To be told who will have access to information collected about you and how your confidentiality will be protected.

8. To be told whom to contact with questions about the research, about research-related injury, and about your rights as a research subject.

9. If the study involves treatment or therapy:
   
a. To be told about the other non-research treatment choices you have.

b. To be told where treatment is available should you have a research-related injury, and who will pay for research-related treatment.
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Thank you for your Initial Application submission materials for this project. The following items were reviewed with this submission:
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This project has been determined to be exempt from Federal Policy for Protection of Human Subjects as per 45CFR46.101 (b) 2.

All protocol amendments and changes are to be submitted to the IRB and may not be implemented until approved by the IRB. Please use the modification form when submitting changes.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB Office at 402-280-2126 or irb@creighton.edu. Please include your project title and number in all correspondence with this committee.
DATE: September 30, 2019

Dear Participant,

I am conducting research as part of my doctoral dissertation and am asking for your participation. The study is evaluating how your view as a millennial of various leadership behaviors relates to your overall job satisfaction. It has long been understood that various items impact job satisfaction and leadership has been proven to be one of those items.

The survey is organized into three sections and should take you no longer than 20 minutes to complete the 60 questions. All are straightforward, short statements. The first section is 3 quick demographic items to gather information about your age, tenure, gender and ethnicity. I am gathering these items to determine if your view of leadership behaviors differs between them. The second section is 36 items to evaluate your perceptions of leadership. For this section, it is important that you pick one leader and fill out the entire section based on your perspective of that leader. The leader can be anyone you choose, an executive team member, your office lead, industry lead, solution lead, project lead, engagement manager, and so forth. It should be someone that you work with somewhat regularly so that you have a good perspective on their leadership behaviors. The last section is 20 items to gauge your overall job satisfaction.

There is no risk in participating in this survey. The survey is 100% anonymous as I am not collecting your name, nor the name of the individual that you are rating. The demographic data requested is minimal and was designed purposefully to restrict the ability to identify the participant. Lastly, the survey is being sent to the entire population of millennial employees in the United States at the company which is over 1,000 employees.

This study will allow us to determine if specific leadership behaviors contribute more to job satisfaction than others. This is important because leadership training is something that we use at the company and it can be tailored to enhance any behaviors that might be identified. Your participation will help to shape the types of training that future leaders, including yourselves, might receive.

Your participation is completely voluntary and there is no compensation for participating.

If you have any questions about the research study, please contact me at 404.834.6331. If you have questions about research participants’ rights, please contact the Institutional Review Board at 402-280-2126. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you can review the Bill of Rights for Research Participants.

Sincerely,

David Brand
Appendix D

MLQ Items

The categories below depict the distribution of the 31 items remaining post factor analysis among the scales of the MLQ (Bass and Avolio, 2004). The license agreement from Mind Garden, Inc. does not allow replication of the items as part of a dissertation, hence the table only depicts the categories with the number of items per category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category / Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Number of Items Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attributes and Behaviors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Attributes (IA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Behaviors (IB)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (IM)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration (IC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Contingent Reward (CR)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/avoidant behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception: Passive (MBEP)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire (LF)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I moved this category from transactional to transformational as per the factor analysis results.
Appendix E

MSQ Items

The items below represent the 20 items assessed to determine employee satisfaction (Weiss, 1967).

1. *Being able to keep busy all the time.
2. *The chance to work alone on the job.
3. *The chance to do different things from time to time.
4. *The chance to be “somebody” in the community.
5. *The way my boss handles his/her workers.
7. *Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience.
8. The way my job provides for steady employment.
9. *The chance to do things for other people.
10. *The chance to tell people what to do.
11. *The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
12. The way company policies are put into practice.
13. My pay and the amount of work I do.
14. The chances for advancement on this job.
15. *The freedom to use my own judgment.
16. *The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
17. *The working conditions.
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other.
19. *The praise I get for doing a good job.
20. *The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.

* Denotes items removed after the factor analysis