

---

Dissertations

---

Spring 5-20-2018

## A Quantitative Correlational Study between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Job Satisfaction among California Card Room Casino Employees

Lydell H. Hall  
Brandman University, hall4104@mail.brandman.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.umassglobal.edu/edd\\_dissertations](https://digitalcommons.umassglobal.edu/edd_dissertations)



Part of the [Gaming and Casino Operations Management Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Hall, Lydell H., "A Quantitative Correlational Study between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Job Satisfaction among California Card Room Casino Employees" (2018). *Dissertations*. 182.  
[https://digitalcommons.umassglobal.edu/edd\\_dissertations/182](https://digitalcommons.umassglobal.edu/edd_dissertations/182)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by UMass Global ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UMass Global ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [christine.bombaro@umassglobal.edu](mailto:christine.bombaro@umassglobal.edu).

A Quantitative Correlational Study between Transformational Leadership Behavior and  
Job Satisfaction among California Card Room Casino Employees

A Dissertation by  
Lydell H. Hall

Brandman University  
Irvine, California  
School of Education

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

May 2018

Committee in charge:

Jalin B. Johnson, Ed.D., Committee Chair

Doug DeVore, Ed.D.

Len Hightower, Ph.D.

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY

Chapman University System

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership


The dissertation of Lydell H. Hall is approved.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, Dissertation Chair

Jalin B. Johnson, Ed.D.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, Committee Member

Doug DeVore, Ed.D.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, Committee Member

Len Hightower, Ph.D.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, Associate Dean

April 2018

A Quantitative Correlational Study Between Transformational Leadership Behavior and  
Job Satisfaction Among California Card Room Casino Employees

Copyright © 2018

by Lydell H. Hall

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this time to acknowledge my wife, Adelina; my son, Justice; my daughter, Leyenda; my parents, siblings, and extensive family; my close friends and coworkers; and God almighty through whom all things are made possible. Thank you all for your continued support throughout my doctoral journey.

This journey would not have been possible without the love and support of everyone that kept pushing me and offering support, all the way to the finish line. A coworker of mine once said to me that “seeing the finish line is not the same as crossing the finish line”, and it was due to the collective team effort that I was able to achieve this goal.

I want to especially extend a sincere level of gratitude to my wife and children for sacrificing their quality family time, and allowing me to complete this study.

This completed study was also made possible with the expert assistance of my committee chair Dr. Jalin B. Johnson; my dissertation committee members, Dr. Doug DeVore and Dr. Len Hightower; my cohort mentor, Dr. Myrna R. Coté; my cohort Gamma Irvine 2; and all of the Brandman faculty and staff.

Finally, I dedicate this study to my father, Lloyd H. Hall, I; my late mother, Theresa White; and all of my other parental figures and role models in my life who instilled the importance of education in me ever since I was a young child; I know that they are all extremely proud of me and this great accomplishment.

Thanks to all for your continued support and believing that this dream of achievement could become a reality.

## ABSTRACT

### A Quantitative Correlational Study between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Job Satisfaction among California Card Room Casino Employees

by Lydell H. Hall

**Purpose:** This study had two purposes. The first purpose was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees. The second purpose of this study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire leadership styles exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees.

**Methodology:** This quantitative, non-experimental, correlational study involved utilizing two Likert-type scale survey instruments to measure leadership styles and employee job satisfaction. Data was collected from 127 card room casino employees located in the Los Angeles County area. Requested demographic data included the following: gender, age bracket, ethnicity, job type, number of years employed at the casino, and if the participant was currently employed in a position of leadership.

**Findings:** This study's primary focus was to examine the correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction among California card room employees. The information determined from the survey responses indicated that the highest statistical relationship identified were between idealized influence (attributed) and the work itself at .68, and the lowest statistical relationship identified were between active management-by-exception and fringe benefits at .01.

**Conclusions:** This research led to the conclusion that the more casino employees perceive their leaders as exhibiting transformational leadership styles, the higher their job satisfaction level. However, the more casino employees perceive their leaders as exhibiting transactional or laissez-faire leadership styles, the less the relationship is positive; and laissez-faire leadership has a negative effect on job satisfaction.

**Recommendations:** Further research is advised; this research was limited to one card room in the Los Angeles County area, and this study should be replicated in other areas of the State to examine comparable data. Additionally, it is advised that the study be done as a mixed method study to increase the scope of data to be analyzed. This research could be the catalyst for generating strategic action plans for the executive leadership team to create training platforms that focus on transformational leadership, mentoring and coaching, and developmental programs for current industry professionals.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	3
Organizational Commitment and Employee Turnover.....	4
Employee Job Satisfaction.....	6
Leadership Behavior.....	8
Transactional leadership behavior.....	8
Transformational leadership behavior.....	9
Statement of the Research Problem.....	12
External Environment.....	13
Employee Motivation and Job Satisfaction.....	14
Purpose Statement.....	16
Research Questions.....	16
Significance of the Problem.....	16
Definitions.....	18
Delimitations.....	20
Organization of the Study.....	20
 CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	 21
Employee Turnover.....	21
Costs Associated with Employee Turnover.....	23
Job Satisfaction.....	25
Pay.....	28
The Work Itself.....	28
Coworkers.....	29
Opportunity for Promotion.....	29
Supervision.....	29
Management versus Leadership.....	29
Management.....	30
Leadership.....	31
Leadership Styles.....	33
Laissez-Faire Leadership.....	35
Transactional Leadership.....	37
Contingent reward.....	39
Management-by-exception (active).....	40
Management-by-exception (passive).....	40
Transformational Leadership.....	44
Idealized influence (attributed to leaders by the followers).....	50
Idealized influence (behavior of leaders as observed by followers).....	51
Inspirational motivation.....	52
Intellectual stimulation.....	54
Individualized consideration.....	55
Summary.....	60
Synthesis Matrix.....	61



CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY .....	62
Purpose Statement.....	62
Research Questions.....	63
Research Design.....	63
Population .....	65
Target Population.....	66
Sample.....	66
Instrumentation .....	67
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).....	67
Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS).....	69
Pilot Study.....	69
Validity and Reliability.....	70
Validity .....	70
Reliability.....	71
Data Collection .....	72
Data Analysis.....	73
Limitations .....	74
Summary.....	75
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND FINDINGS.....	76
Overview.....	76
Purpose Statement.....	77
Research Questions.....	77
Research Methods and Data Collection Procedures .....	77
Population .....	78
Sample.....	79
Demographic Data .....	79
Descriptive Statistics.....	81
Transformational leadership subscales .....	81
Transactional and passive-avoidant subscales .....	82
Job satisfaction subscales.....	83
Presentation and Analysis of Data .....	84
Correlation of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction .....	84
Research Question 1 .....	86
Idealized influence (attributed)/pay .....	86
Idealized influence (attributed)/promotional opportunities .....	86
Idealized influence (attributed)/supervision .....	86
Idealized influence (attributed)/fringe benefits.....	86
Idealized influence (attributed)/contingent rewards .....	87
Idealized influence (attributed)/operating conditions .....	87
Idealized influence (attributed)/coworkers .....	87
Idealized influence (attributed)/nature of the work .....	87
Idealized influence (attributed)/communication .....	88
Idealized influence (behavior)/pay .....	88
Idealized influence (behavior)/promotional opportunities.....	88
Idealized influence (behavior)/supervision.....	88
Idealized influence (behavior)/fringe benefits .....	88

Idealized influence (behavior)/contingent rewards.....	89
Idealized influence (behavior)/operating conditions .....	89
Idealized influence (behavior)/coworkers.....	89
Idealized influence (behavior)/nature of the work.....	89
Idealized influence (behavior)/communication .....	89
Inspirational motivation/pay .....	90
Inspirational motivation/promotional opportunities .....	90
Inspirational motivation/supervision .....	90
Inspirational motivation/fringe benefits.....	90
Inspirational motivation/contingent rewards .....	90
Inspirational motivation/operating conditions .....	90
Inspirational motivation/coworkers .....	91
Inspirational motivation/nature of the work .....	91
Inspirational motivation/communication .....	91
Intellectual stimulation/pay.....	91
Intellectual stimulation/promotional opportunities.....	92
Intellectual stimulation/supervision .....	92
Intellectual stimulation/fringe benefits .....	92
Intellectual stimulation/contingent rewards .....	92
Intellectual stimulation/operating conditions.....	92
Intellectual stimulation/coworkers .....	93
Intellectual stimulation/nature of the work .....	93
Intellectual stimulation/communication.....	93
Individual consideration/pay.....	93
Individual consideration/promotional opportunities.....	93
Individual consideration/supervision .....	93
Individual consideration/fringe benefits .....	94
Individual consideration/contingent rewards .....	94
Individual consideration/operating conditions.....	94
Individual consideration/coworkers.....	94
Individual consideration/nature of the work .....	94
Individual consideration/communication.....	95
Research Question 2 .....	95
Contingent rewards/pay .....	96
Contingent rewards/promotional opportunities .....	96
Contingent rewards/supervision.....	96
Contingent rewards/fringe benefits.....	96
Contingent rewards/contingent rewards .....	96
Contingent rewards/operating conditions .....	97
Contingent rewards/coworkers .....	97
Contingent rewards/nature of the work.....	97
Contingent rewards/communication .....	97
Active management-by-exception/pay .....	97
Active management-by-exception/promotional opportunities .....	97
Active management-by-exception/supervision.....	97
Active management-by-exception/fringe benefits.....	98

Active management-by-exception/contingent rewards.....	98
Active management-by-exception/operating conditions .....	98
Active management-by-exception/coworkers .....	98
Active management-by-exception/nature of the work.....	98
Active management-by-exception/communication .....	98
Research Question 3 .....	99
Laissez-faire/pay .....	99
Laissez-faire/promotional opportunities .....	99
Laissez-faire/supervision .....	100
Laissez-faire/fringe benefits.....	100
Laissez-faire/contingent rewards .....	100
Laissez-faire/operating conditions .....	100
Laissez-faire/coworkers .....	100
Laissez-faire/nature of the work .....	100
Laissez-faire/communication .....	101
Summary .....	101
CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	103
Purpose Statement.....	103
Research Questions .....	103
Research Methods and Data Collection Procedures .....	103
Population .....	104
Sample.....	105
Major Findings.....	105
Research Question 1 .....	106
Research Question 2 .....	108
Research Question 3 .....	110
Conclusions.....	112
Conclusion for Research Question 1.....	113
Conclusion .....	113
Conclusion for Research Question 2.....	114
Conclusion .....	114
Conclusion for Research Question 3.....	115
Conclusion .....	115
Implications for Action .....	115
Implication for Action 1: Improve Communication .....	116
Implication for Action 2: Non-monetary Rewards .....	116
Implication for Action 3: Optimize Retention Strategies .....	117
Implication for Action 4: Supervisor and Manager Training .....	117
Implication for Action 5: Transformational Leadership Training .....	118
Recommendations for Further Research.....	118
Recommendation 1 .....	118
Recommendation 2 .....	118
Recommendation 3 .....	119
Recommendation 4 .....	119
Recommendation 5 .....	119
Recommendation 6 .....	119

Recommendation 7 .....	119
Recommendation 8 .....	120
Concluding Remarks and Reflections.....	120
REFERENCES .....	123
APPENDICES .....	150

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Definitions of Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire .....	35
Table 2. Participant Demographics.....	80
Table 3. MLQ Leadership Styles - Mean Scores .....	81
Table 4. MLQ Leadership Styles - Transformational Subscales .....	82
Table 5. MLQ Leadership Styles – Transactional and Passive-Avoidant Subscales .....	83
Table 6. Job Satisfaction Survey Scale Scores .....	84
Table 7. Interpretation of Values .....	85
Table 8. Correlations for Transformational Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction.....	95
Table 9. Correlations for Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction .....	99
Table 10. Correlations for Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction .....	101
Table 11. Correlations for Transformational Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction...	107
Table 12. Correlations for Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction .....	110
Table 13. Correlations for Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction .....	111

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

As the gaming industry is expanding both nationally as well as internationally, gambling establishments, otherwise known as casinos, are faced with increased competition for employees with industry related experience (Stedham & Mitchell, 1996). Robinson & Associates, Inc., a customer service consulting firm to the gaming industry, states that employee turnover is one of the most serious problems facing casinos today (Baird, 2007). Casinos across the United States have endured continued losses of potential profit year over year due to the high cost of employee turnover. The cost of replacing a single minimum wage to midrange employee can run up to ten thousand dollars or more. This equates to about 16 to 20 percent of each employees' annual salary (Merhar, 2016). Casinos that experience high levels of employee turnover are forced to allocate resources towards filling open positions within their organization in a timely manner to stay competitive.

Each new hire requires company resources devoted to recruitment, orientation, training, and assimilation into the company's culture. Once the employee has been on boarded, the employee is tasked to learn their perspective duties, and perform those duties to the best of their ability. Hopefully, their efforts are in alignment with the organizations' expectations. For employees to stay motivated while working, their environment has to be one that is stimulating enough for them to be satisfied with what they are doing, who they are working with, and who they are working for.

Employees with low levels of job satisfaction in the gaming industry tend to move from one organization to another (Stedham & Mitchell, 1996). The high cost associated with employee turnover makes it important that leaders of casino organizations take note

of tools utilized to increase motivation levels, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of their employees (Self & Dewald, 2011). The attitudes of employees and their intention to stay with a particular organization greatly increase when transformational leadership behaviors are utilized by organizational leaders (Gill, Flaschner, Shah, & Bhutani, 2010). This suggests that transformational leadership behaviors can be used to positively influence gaming industry employees' attitudes and increase the odds of them staying within the organization.

It is also useful to consider that there are other types of leadership behavior and what potential impact that behavior has on employees and the organization. Current theories on leadership describe leadership behavior based upon traits, or how influence and authority are used to achieve organizational objectives (Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden & Hu, 2014). When using trait-based descriptions, leadership behavior may be classified as autocratic, democratic, bureaucratic, or charismatic. When looking at leadership behavior from the perspective of the exchange of power and its utilization to achieve results, leadership behavior is situational, transactional, or transformational; although not all leadership behaviors are equal in all circumstances (Germano, 2010). The quality of the leadership behavior may vary enormously across industries or organizations. In addition, ascertaining an individual leader's style is essential to evaluating leadership quality and effectiveness, especially as it relates to the goals of the organization (Srivastava, 2016).

Analysis of individual employees' needs and perceptions will provide valuable insight into which leadership style proves to be most beneficial within the organization. Nging & Yazdanifard (2015) state that that when different leadership styles are used, they

take up different kinds of roles and promote different actions when implementing organizational change. “Leadership style develops over time and is influenced by innate personality characteristics as well as a variety of skills” (Hickey, 2010, p. 72). Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (2000) argue that managers must use different leadership styles depending on the situation, as well as have a greater understanding of the needs and perceptions of different employees that may help fit a particular situation. Individuals who work in the gaming industry and hold a leadership position are challenged to perform a variety of roles and thus, knowledge of which particular leadership style works best within the organization will prove to be useful when it comes to employee job satisfaction (Agrusa & Lema, 2007). Research suggests that organizational leaders in the hospitality sector should make every effort to recognize what job-related needs employees have and strive towards fulfilling those needs in order to retain those employees (Maden, 2014). This researcher’s study built on the existing research in the hospitality industry and focused specifically on the gaming industry and California card room casinos.

### **Background**

The gaming industry in the United States dates back to the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In 1931, Las Vegas, Nevada legalized gambling; ending what was outlawed and banned by state legislation and social reformers of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (Schwartz, 2013). The gaming industry in the U.S. has grown exponentially over the last 25 years. During this time, the gaming industry has expanded from operating only in Las Vegas, Nevada and Atlantic City, New Jersey to operating 566 casinos in 22 states in 2010 (Bazelon, Neels, & Seth, 2012). A study conducted by the Brattle Group for the American Gaming Association



(AGA) found that the gaming industry supported approximately \$125 billion in spending and nearly 820,000 jobs in the U.S. economy in 2010, which is roughly equivalent to 1 percent of the \$14.5 trillion U.S. gross domestic product (Bazelon et al., 2012).

### **Organizational Commitment and Employee Turnover**

Hotels and casinos are segments of the hospitality industry, which is one of the largest job sectors in the United States. The U.S. hospitality industry is continually faced with the serious challenge of hiring and retaining qualified employees with industry related experience (Kim & Jogaratnam, 2010). Additionally, members of the International Society of Hospitality Consultants (ISHC) identified that “the hospitality industry faces labor and human resource challenges including the compression or shrinking of the labor force, union issues and escalating health care and benefit costs” (International Society of Hospitality Consultants, 2005). Most of the employees who work in the hospitality industry have reported that they are underpaid, have little job security, and have very few opportunities available to them for upward mobility (Shierholz, 2013). Motivating team members to achieve their work performance goals can be challenging when their position puts them in situations that promote undesirable conditions. Yuanlaie (2011), points out that it is very challenging for leaders who work in the hospitality industry to maintain high levels of motivation and staff morale in order to provide quality service; especially with frontline employees who have been working in the organization for a long time.

Most Americans are largely familiar with the traditional types of frontline workers in the gaming industry such as dealers, pit bosses, cage cashiers, workers in customer relations and services, and food and beverage staff members (American

Gaming Association, n.d.). In addition to the frontline workers, there are countless other employees employed in the gaming industry that are virtually invisible to the public but are fundamental in the organization's survival (Kimes, 2011). The U.S. hospitality and gaming industries face serious challenges when it comes to hiring and retaining qualified hotel and casino employees (Kim & Jogaratnam, 2010). High general turnover in jobs of the gaming industry presents a significant business problem for establishment owners.

The U.S. hospitality industry annually endures increasingly high employee turnover rates, which range from 31 percent to 58.8 percent amongst various organizations (Dusek, Ruppel, Yurova, & Clarke, 2014). Employee turnover rates in the U.S. hospitality industry are almost twice as much as the average rates for other job sectors (Dusek et al., 2014). Some reported reasons for employees leaving their organizations in the hospitality industry were inadequate compensation, improper leadership direction, and poor supervision (Josiam, Clay, & Graff, 2011). In the year prior to leaving their jobs, many hospitality industry employees begin to show signs of mental stress and symptoms of behavioral problems (Gill, Mathur, Sharma, & Bhutani, 2011). Additionally, Gill et al. (2011) found a significant negative relationship between hospitality industry employees' intentions to leave their organization, and the lack of transformational leadership behavior within their organizations. Inspirational motivation using transformational leadership behavior has strong implications of reversing an employee's intention to leave the organization. Additionally, the use of transformational leadership behaviors has proven to be a proponent of providing greater clarification of organizational missions, objectives, and goals, and in reducing work-related frustrations (Gill et al., 2011).

## **Employee Job Satisfaction**

White (2017) found that employees desire to feel appreciated, valued, and fairly compensated for their contributions towards the organization's productivity and profitability. When organizations fail to meet employee's desires, it can create an unhealthy working environment (White, 2017). Pors (2003) discovered that when employees are exposed to less than desirable leadership styles, they become dissatisfied. Kaye and Jordan-Evans (1999) explained that this occurs because an employee's level of perceived job satisfaction is influenced by his or her employer's influence. Saari and Judge (2004) found that employees with low levels of job satisfaction are less productive, while employees with high levels of job satisfaction have greater morale and are willing to work harder toward the organization's goals (Gregory, 2011). "Branham (2005) relied on the Gallup study to show that businesses with high employee satisfaction have 86% higher customer ratings, 76% more success in lowering turnover, 70% higher profitability, and 78% better safety records" (Ross-Grant, 2016).

Even though employees that have high levels of job satisfaction tend to have increased morale, Macdonald and MacIntyre (1997) noted that employee morale is very different from employee job satisfaction. Macdonald and MacIntyre (1997) stated that employee morale centers more on how employees relate to an organization's future vision or sense of common purpose. Locke (1976) expressed that employee job satisfaction refers to a single individual and his or her job situation, and it more appropriately relates to past and present circumstances. Locke (1976) and Yuzuk (1961) suggested that employee job satisfaction is the most enduring yet subtle construct used in the study of employee relations. Locke's definition of employee job satisfaction is

described as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (p. 1304).

There is a significant relationship between employee job satisfaction and customer satisfaction for individuals who work in the hospitality industry (Gil, Berenguer, & Cervera, 2008). When customers interact with front-line employees, their impression of the employee and their attitude can often be associated to their level of satisfaction with the organization. The attitudes expressed by hotel and casino employees to customers, directly or indirectly, are likely to have an effect on the perceptions that customers have of the individual or the organization; and an employee’s poor attitude could negatively impact the customer’s perceived value of service (Gil et al., 2008). Since hotel and casino employees have such a significant role in instituting customer satisfaction, it is in the organization’s best interest to create positive experiences for hotel and casino employees that lead to increased job satisfaction and heightened job performance (Gil et al., 2008).

It has been determined that increasing employee job satisfaction among hospitality workers greatly has an effect on the potential profitability of an organization (Kim & Jogaratnam, 2010). One factor of success or failure of organizations can be linked to the organization’s ability to control the rate of turnover. Employee turnover can cost U.S. organizations 6 to 9 months’ salary on average per employee (Kantor, 2017). Some of the factors that have been linked to employee turnover were poor supervision, low wages, lack of self-development, lack of job security, and overall job dissatisfaction. Inspirationally motivating employees, increasing wages and benefits, and communicating appropriately could potentially reduce employee’s dissatisfaction levels; and could have

associative benefits of improved performance and increased organizational productivity (Kim & Jogaratnam, 2010).

Hotel and casino employees are the organization's backbone and can prove to be a differentiating component to how an organization operates (Kazi, Shah, & Khan, 2013). Hotel and casino employees who report low job-satisfaction levels commonly display an unpleasant emotional state when working for their organizations. Because of these reports, it is imperative that managers of organizations eagerly adopt strategies that motivate hotel and casino employees and treat those individuals as highly valued assets.

### **Leadership Behavior**

Leadership behavior and how it relates to employee grievances and turnover has been studied since the early 1900's. Fleishman and Harris (1962) specifically investigated relationships between the leader behavior of industrial supervisors and the behavior of their group members. Tobak (2015) commented on the fact that different types of leadership behavior can cause followers to act or respond in a variety of ways. This study focused on transactional leadership behavior and transformational leadership behavior, as both of these leadership behaviors are prominent in the hospitality industry.

**Transactional leadership behavior.** Transactional leadership behavior is different from other leadership styles or behaviors researched in this study, as it does not focus on the needs of followers or individualize their personal development (Northouse, 2013). Bass and Riggio (2006) specified that transactional leadership behavior is based on exchanges between leaders and followers. Leaders explain to the followers what needs to be accomplished, and the followers are given something in return for achieving the specified goal. Significant transactional leadership behaviors are: contingent reward,

management-by-exception, and Laissez-Faire (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Contingent reward involves exchanges between the leader and the follower, where the follower is rewarded for their efforts to accomplish certain tasks. Management-by-exception occurs when leaders look for performance violations and then take corrective actions to address issues; or it can be identified as passive when leaders wait until there is a performance violation before they intervene (Yukl, 2006). Laissez-Faire leadership behavior is when the individual who has the leadership position does nothing, lets others do the work, and avoids their leadership responsibilities.

Northouse (2013) expressed that the negative component of transactional leadership is that the followers are motivated to accomplish tasks by being rewarded or by being punished. While the transactional leadership style may produce the expected results, it is unlikely that the same level of effort will be consistently displayed without some form of incentive being continually offered. Yukl (2006) stated that transactional leadership involves an interaction between the leader and the follower that may result in follower compliance with what was requested by the leader, but the follower's effort is not likely to generate enthusiasm and commitment towards task objectives (p. 262).

**Transformational leadership behavior.** Transformational leadership behavior is comprised of actions or efforts that work towards improving the performance of followers and strives to develop those followers to achieve their fullest potential (Avolio, 2010; Bass 1999). Leaders who exhibit transformational leadership behavior are effective in inspirationally motivating followers to act in ways that support the organization rather than their own self-interest (Kuhnert, 1994).

Northouse (2013) identified five strengths that are presented by transformational leadership behavior. First, transformational leadership behavior has been widely studied from many perspectives, using both quantitative and qualitative research methods. It has also been the focal point of a large volume of research since its inception. For example, Lowe and Gardner (2001) analyzed content within all of the articles published in *Leadership Quarterly* from 1990–2000, and their analysis showed that 34% of the articles were about transformational leadership. Second, transformational leadership behavior has natural appeal. Northouse (2013) claimed that transformational leadership is more attractive to followers because it provides them with a vision for the future. Third, transformational leadership behavior treats leadership as an interactive process that occurs between followers and leaders. This dyadic relationship between the leader and the follower calls for an action and a response from both parties. This interaction allows followers to gain a more prominent position in the leadership process, which causes them to be more satisfied because their level of involvement is instrumental in the evolving transformational process. Fourth, the approach of transformational leadership behavior provides a comprehensive view of leadership that enriches other leadership models. Most leadership styles focus primarily on how leaders exchange rewards for followers achieving certain goals. However, transformational leadership behavior comprises not only the exchange of rewards, but the leader's attention to the needs, growth, and development of the follower (Avolio, 2010; Bass, 1985). Lastly, transformational leadership behavior places a strong emphasis on the followers' needs, values, and morals. Burns (1978) advocated that transformational leadership behavior allows leaders to elevate people to higher standards.

Since transformational leadership behavior uses a less coercive approach, it is a more generally accepted style of leadership by followers (Avolio, 2010). Yukl (2006) found that there is substantial evidence that supports the fact that transformational leadership is an effective form of leadership. Yukl (2006) also noted that transformational leadership behavior was proven to be effective in a variety of different situations.

In the hospitality industry, inspirational motivation using transformational leadership behavior has been demonstrated to enhance job satisfaction levels of organizational employees (Gill et al., 2010). Transformational leadership behavior provides clear missions, visions, goals, and objectives for organizational employees, which causes a reduction in work-related stress and an increase in job satisfaction. In addition, transformational leadership behavior increases the attitudes of organizational employees, and their intentions to stay with the organization increases as well (Gill et al., 2010).

Transformational leadership behavior benefits both the organization as well as the employees because as transformational initiatives are implemented, the leaders, as well as the followers, transform when they interact with each other over a period of time (Northouse, 2013). Transformational leadership behavior is most helpful in the workplace because it involves processes that change and transform individuals that are involved in the process (Northouse, 2013). This influence allows followers to achieve new heights in their professional development, which is beneficial for both the individual and the leader (Northouse, 2013). Inspirational motivation using transformational



leadership behaviors enhance the beliefs and attitudes of employees and inspire excitement that motivates employees to perform at their best (Bass & Avolio, 1993).

The relationship between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction has been studied by many researchers over the years. For example, in a 2014 study by Tavakkol & Janani, transformational leadership behavior had a positive and significant correlation with job satisfaction. However, few studies exist that have specifically examined the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and employee job satisfaction in the hospitality and gaming industry as it relates to California card room casinos. This study is designed to address this gap in the literature and to provide organizational leaders of California card room casinos with additional tools to increase employee job satisfaction and reduce employee turnover.

### **Statement of the Research Problem**

In the hospitality and gaming industry, service-centered organizations that use transformational leadership behaviors have the ability to improve employees' commitment levels and their desire to stay with an organization (Liaw, Chi, & Chuang, 2010). When employees believe that they belong to a more efficient company compared to others in regards to the relationship between employees and the company, such acknowledgements will improve employee self-esteem and spark positive effects on the employee's attitude toward the company (Smith, Wokutch, Harrington, & Dennis, 2001). The results from this study will aid organizational leaders who are developing transformational organizations. Service organizations with transformational leadership behavior can stimulate employees' confidence to successfully achieve knowledge-

intensive business services and increase the quality of customer services to hotel and casino guests (Wang, Tsai, & Tsai, 2014).

Leadership styles that utilize transformational leadership behaviors influence the success of organizations (Boga & Ensari, 2009). Organizations managed by individuals that use these leadership styles are extremely likely to create superior success when implementing organizational changes. Organizational initiatives that are generated and supported by top management or the executive leadership team increase the chances for organizational success (Boga & Ensari, 2009).

### **External Environment**

External changes to other organizations in the hospitality industry can be a threat to an organization's stability; thus, organizational leaders face many challenges. Some challenges include competitive pressures that force organizations to continually evaluate their business models and increase organizational learning, which leads to improving productivity and effectiveness (Rose, Kumar, & Pak, 2009). Leadership styles that utilize transformational leadership behaviors to increase job satisfaction promote organizational transformation, and improve organizational learning, which helps mitigate the effects of environmental changes (Mirkamali, Thani, & Alami, 2011). Leaders can create the type of vision that unites the interpretations of hotel and casino employees, fulfills their personal needs, and helps them achieve their goals (Mirkamali et al., 2011).

Organizations must be adaptable and responsive, addressing unanticipated changes in the existing business environment (Boga & Ensari, 2009). Organizational situations provide many platforms for transformational leadership to be explored, but without certain individual characteristics, leadership, or guidance, the opportunity can

often be passed over. The 21st century needs leaders who indoctrinate transformational leadership behaviors more than any other time (Lewis, Boston, & Peterson, 2017). Rapid change is swiftly altering the lives of individuals in ways that were never imagined. Vision, inspired by courageous leaders, can offer the ability to transport people to a new and unknown future infused with technology and filled with hopeful citizens of the world. Results from this study will provide guidance to leaders who wish to create strong social-change benefits within their organizations. Because of the pressures prompted by changes in the business environment, transformational leadership strategies can promote organizational changes that increase employee job satisfaction, improve organizational productivity, and positively change the culture of the entire organization.

### **Employee Motivation and Job Satisfaction**

The motivation to work effectively through physical and emotional exhaustion plays an important part in employee productivity and job satisfaction, and it is a main problem for management when unmotivated employees are servicing customers and guest with a poor attitude and a low performance level of work (Yuanlaie, 2011). There are continual research disagreements addressing the motivation of employees. Some researchers suggest employee motivation and job satisfaction is improved by increasing the use of intrinsic rewards; however, other researchers suggest that extrinsic rewards and supportive leadership styles have a greater effect on increasing employee motivation and job satisfaction (Prior, 2015; Chang & Teng, 2017; Putra, Cho, & Liu, 2017).

Individuals often have certain personal criteria that allow them to identify positively or negatively with a particular organization (Becker & Gerhart, 1996). This identification can potentially be the result of certain individuals in leadership capacities,

or other factors that evolve due to the organizational culture (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). In any case, individuals have a variety of reasons why they are involved in a particular organization, and why they feel that that organization is a “good” organization to affiliate with (Meyer et al., 1993). Transformational leadership behavior links leaders to followers in a way that can often facilitate a positive union between a leader and their followers (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). A growing body of research on motivation suggests that while some individuals are self-interested and motivated by material concerns, many people are motivated by experiences and identities that are related to other factors (Paarlberg & Lavigna, 2010).

The capabilities of effective transformational leadership behavior and how it permeates throughout the organization is of great importance to those organizations investing in transformational leadership practices. Additionally, followers of transformational leaders report higher organizational identification than followers of non-transformational leaders (Chukwuba, 2015). Research exploring the correlation between transformational leadership behavior and employee job satisfaction can provide helpful insight to organizations that are utilizing transformational leadership tools to foster their organizational culture (McDonald, 2016).

There has been research exploring the correlation between transformational leadership and employee job satisfaction in the hospitality industry, but there is a gap in the research pertaining to the gaming industry; specifically, card room casinos (Gill et al., 2010; Rothfelder, Ottenbacher, & Harrington, 2012). This study will prove to be useful by filling the literature gap that currently exists. The results from this study will extend knowledge in this area.

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this quantitative, non-experimental study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees.

The second purpose of this study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire leadership styles exhibited by the leadership team as defined by Bass and Avolio (1995) and identified by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) designed by Spector (1985).

## **Research Questions**

1. What is the relationship between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?
2. What is the relationship between transactional leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?
3. What is the relationship between laissez-faire leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

## **Significance of the Problem**

Finding and retaining qualified as well as talented employees in the hospitality and gaming industry is a constant challenge, and those efforts can consume quite a considerable amount of organizational resources (Deery & Jago, 2015). Organizational resources utilized to either hire or replace employees have high opportunity costs. Time and money spent on recruiting, interviewing, and onboarding employees takes away from

time being spent on operational efforts; and in the quick-paced environment of the hospitality and gaming industry, that could be quite impactful to the business. Additionally, other existing organizational costs that become a factor when losing an employee and are more difficult to quantify are those associated with the relationships that the employee had with certain customers and the level of perceived customer satisfaction and comfort that is attributed to the employee and customer's relationship (Kim, 2012); not to mention, the amount of industry knowledge that the employee takes with them. Traditionally, casino organizational leaders did not consider turnover a major problem because employees were easy to replace due to the requirement of a basic skill set (Stedham & Mitchell, 1996). The current environment and increasing level of technology being used in the gaming industry has caused a shift in the labor pool and the skill set required by casino employees. Now more than ever, especially in the current economic climate, casino organizational leaders are looking for ways to retain their qualified and experienced employees (Li, Kim, & Zhao, 2017). This study examined the relationship between leadership styles as measured by the MLQ and job satisfaction as measured by the JSS in the hospitality and gaming industry. Further, this study built on existing research which examined relationships between leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment/turnover intentions in the hospitality industry (Dawson and Abbott, 2011; Han, Bonn & Cho, 2016; Walsh & Bartikowski, 2013).

The significance of this non-experimental, quantitative, correlational study was its ability to fill a gap in the research and literature, providing a potential correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees. Determining if there is a correlation between transformational

leadership behavior and job satisfaction has professional and social change applications. The result of analyzing the data collected for this research will indicate if there is a significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction. It may be possible for organizations in the hospitality and gaming industry to establish programs that focus on employee retention strategies; and thus, improve job satisfaction, and reduce the considerable costs of employee turnover. Therefore, results from this study may contribute to the wider community by optimizing business practices utilized in the hospitality and gaming industry.

### **Definitions**

**Management.** The interlocking functions of creating corporate policy and organizing, planning, controlling, and directing an organization's resources in order to achieve the objectives of that policy (Wacker, 1998).

**Leadership.** The ability to make sound decisions and inspire others to perform well (Northouse, 2013).

**Transactional leadership.** Focusing on results, conforming to the existing structure of an organization and measuring success according to that organization's system of rewards and penalties (Flynn, 2009).

**Transformational leadership.** A leadership approach that causes change in individuals and social systems (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

**Inspirational motivation.** Behavior to motivate and inspire followers by providing a shared meaning and a challenge to those followers (McCleskey, 2014).

**Job satisfaction.** The extent to which a person's hopes, desires, and expectations about the employment he or she is engaged in are fulfilled (Collins, 2017).

**Hospitality industry.** Part of the larger service-providing industry that is divided into two sectors, food and accommodation services, and arts and entertainment (Hazra, Ghosh, & Sengupta, 2015).

**Gaming or gambling.** Any betting or wagering, for self or for others, whether for money or not, no matter how slight or insignificant, where the outcome is uncertain or depends upon chance or skill (Gainsbury, Hing, Delfabbro, & King, 2014).

**Gaming industry.** The industry that consist of casinos.

**Casino.** An establishment that facilitates certain types of gambling activities (Jo, 2016).

**Card room.** A gaming establishment that exclusively offers card games for play by the public (American Gaming Association, n.d.).

**Dealer.** A dealer is an employee at a casino or card room who facilitates games of chance and controls the flow of the game being played (Shi & Liu, 2014).

**Pit boss.** A middle management position whose primary role is to assign and rotate dealers on tables, and to determine the optimal number of dealers to have on the gaming floor (Wan, 2013).



## **Delimitations**

The study was limited to a Southern California card room casino. The sample of employees used in the study was taken from a California card room casino located in the Los Angeles County area. The study utilized two Likert type surveys as research tools. Each selected employee in the sample received a survey or request for communication through email. All employees that were not part of the executive leadership team, regardless of their department or job title, were asked to complete the surveys.

## **Organization of the Study**

The study is comprised of five chapters and includes references used in the development of the study. Chapter I contains the following: introduction, background, research statement, purpose statement, research questions, significance of the problem, definitions, and delimitations. Chapter II contains the following: current literature and any pertinent literature related to the research questions. Chapter III contains the following: the methodology used for gathering the data, the target population and sample used in the data, instrumentation, limitations, and data analysis. Chapter IV contains the results and analysis of the gathered data. Finally, Chapter V contains the following: a summary and a discussion of the key findings, conclusions, implications, final remarks, and ends with references and appendices.

## CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the relevant literature in the fields of employee job satisfaction, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership in order to build a theoretical basis for this study. A detailed overview of each leadership style and how they relate to employee job satisfaction is provided. The literature review illustrates the individual concepts that form the basis of job satisfaction being pay, the work itself, coworkers, opportunity for promotion, and supervision. The literature review also highlights the historical viewpoints and scholarly developments regarding employee job satisfaction, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership.

### **Employee Turnover**

There is strong relationship between an employee's job satisfaction level and their organizational commitment, which will impact that employee's turnover intention (Tai & Chuang, 2014). Past research has determined that job satisfaction is the best predictor of employee turnover intentions (Thompson & Lane, 2014). Employee turnover is of explicit concern to organizational leaders in the hospitality and gaming industry because organizations operating in these sectors will spend an average of 45% of operating expenses on salaries and benefits which equates to 33% of revenue (Dusek et al., 2014). Walsh and Bartikowski (2013) identified some of the elements that influence an employee's decision to quit an organization: workload, organizational commitment, locus of control, and overall levels of job satisfaction.

High levels of stress which are commonly reported by employees in the hospitality and gaming industry have been linked to higher levels of turnover (Pahi, Hamid, & Khalid, 2016). Employees that have a sense of solid job security tend to have

higher commitment levels and demonstrate to their peers a desirable organizational behavior (Mahmoud & Reisel, 2014). Researchers recommended that one way to reduce turnover is to identify the essential characteristics that an individual must possess in order to perform the duties of the job effectively, and to communicate those requirements clearly to an applicant prior to extending and offer for the job (Lai & Chen, 2012).

Al-Zoubi (2012) studied the relationship between job satisfaction and an employee's intent to quit an organization, and used data collected from surveys completed by 4,076 individuals working in 24 public and private organizations in Jordan. The respondents were grouped according to their organizational position and the researcher determined that management level employees demonstrated the highest levels of job satisfaction, as measured by the Job Satisfaction Scale developed by the Sheffield Institute of Work Psychology. The respondents who exhibited the lowest levels of job satisfaction were the frontline employees in the craft industry.

Al-Zoubi (2012) found that the employees in the private sector generally experienced higher levels of job satisfaction than those employees in the public sector. When the respondent's age was taken into consideration, the age groups of 17-29 and 40-49 scored the highest. When tenure was examined, the author found that increased tenure resulted in decreased job satisfaction. The author's finding that employee demographics influence their satisfaction level was supported with more validity because the author used a very large sample size and the industries studied were diverse. This study did not categorize the respondents according to their organizational department. Associatively, the issue of long tenure is not as critical in the hospitality and gaming industry as a result of the significantly high levels of turnover (Tews, Michel, & Allen, 2014).

Dawson and Abbott (2011) studied the relationship between human resource practices in the hospitality industry and organizational performance. They suggested that the reduction of employee turnover can assist the organization in obtaining a sustainable competitive advantage (Self & Dewald, 2011). The researchers proposed a conceptual framework that stressed the importance of employee selection and emphasized an employee's organizational fit. The hypothesis was that organizations which are more familiar with their particular culture and who are able to choose employees who share the organization's core values and beliefs, will reap financial benefits in the form of improved employee retention. The authors researched existing literature, which described the characteristics of the hospitality culture and climate. The researchers' proposition to the article's intended audience was to attempt to link the human resource efforts of recruitment and the selection process to the unique culture and climate of the organization. In addition, hospitality organizations must nurture an organizational climate where a strong supportive culture is sustained, and the employees have access to sufficient training which promotes a customer centric approach to doing business. The findings of this study are very relevant when conducting research in the gaming industry.

### **Costs Associated with Employee Turnover**

Finding, obtaining, and retaining a qualified and talented employee in the hospitality and gaming industry is an ongoing challenge; and doing so can consume a considerable amount of organizational resources (Deery & Jago, 2015). Research by Guilding, Lamminmaki, and McManus (2014) identified significant costs associated with employee turnover as the recruitment of a new individual, training of that individual, and costs due to lower productivity levels during their adjustment period. Other costs to

organizations operating in the hospitality and gaming sectors which are difficult to measure are those associated with lower levels of customer satisfaction in situations where a close relationship between employee and customer is critical (Kim, 2012).

Guiding et al. (2014) also identified the problematic issue of organizations not assigning financial accountability to specific departments. In a search of the literature by the authors, it was estimated that the costs associated with replacing a lower level frontline employee in the US hospitality industry was in the \$5,000 to \$6,000 range and can begin at around \$11,000 for a supervisory position. US hospitality industry employee turnover rates have been estimated in excess of 60% (Han, Bonn & Cho, 2016; Khalilzadeh, Giacomo, Jafari, & Hamid, 2013; Tews, Stafford, & Michel, 2014). Researchers have estimated that the US hospitality sector's turnover rate is almost double the average rate observed in all of the other job sectors (Dusek et al., 2014).

Long term meaningful relationships between patrons and front-line employees are an essential component to success in the gaming industry and having high rates of employee turnover can have a direct negative impact to the guest experience (Lai & Chen, 2012; Walsh & Bartikowski, 2013). When these figures are taken in the context of the card room casino, the collection site for the data used in this writer's research, the annual costs associated with turnover is estimated at 1.8 million dollars annually. Certain factors that have contributed to high turnover rates in the hospitality and gaming industry have been identified by researchers and have included the following: low pay, long working hours, working shifts during hours outside of the societal norm, and having limited opportunities for career advancement (Brown, Thomas, & Bosselman, 2015).

Another factor that contributes to the high levels of turnover experienced in the hospitality and gaming industry is the high levels of stress reported by frontline employees who have to interact with uncivil customers (Han et al., 2016). Researchers suggest that turnover levels in the hospitality and gaming industry may be reduced by increasing the level of employee job satisfaction and establishing programs that increase frontline employees' levels of organizational commitment (Robinson, Krajl, Solnet, Goh, & Callan, 2014). The significance of employee job satisfaction as a key predictor of employee turnover intentions is further supported in academic research (Kundu & Gahlawat, 2015).

### **Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction has been significantly researched since the early 21st century by researchers studying organizational behavior. Job satisfaction is a significant concern for any employer because satisfied employees are more likely to come to work, have higher levels of active performance, and stay with the organization for longer periods of time (Long & Thean, 2011). Job satisfaction is a dynamic factor that has a direct and positive impact on organizational performance (Akehurst, Comeche, & Galindo, 2009).

Social support from peers, links to higher job satisfaction among employees and greatly relates to employee's intentions to leave or quit jobs (Mahdi, Mohd Zin, Mohd Nor, Sakat, & Abang Naim, 2012). High levels of employee job satisfaction is important to leaders who believe that organizations have a responsibility to provide employees with jobs that are stimulating and intrinsically rewarding (Najafi, Noruzy, Azar, Nazar-Shirkouhi, & Dalvand, 2011). Job satisfaction is one of the most significant necessities that keep individuals productive and successful in the workplace (Tsai et al., 2010).

Job satisfaction embodies an individual's attitude toward the various aspects of their job as well as how they feel about the work in general (Gill et al., 2011). Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as the pleasurable or positive emotional state that results from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences. Job satisfaction or dissatisfaction creates positive or negative feelings, which is represented by the employee's emotional response. Phillips and Gully (2012) stated that job satisfaction is an employee's emotional response to their work environment, based on the evaluation of actual events against the employee's expectations. Overall, there is a general consensus that identifies job satisfaction as a person's attitude towards their job and the organization.

Job satisfaction is significant because it can serve as a predictor to how an employee will perform (Saari & Judge, 2004). Phillips and Gully (2012) claimed that job satisfaction variables must be managed effectively in order to have positive results with performance levels. Job satisfaction can be significantly linked to leadership behavior (Ismail, Mohamed, Hamid, Sulaiman, & Girardi, 2011) as high quality leader-follower relationships are positively related to levels of both intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction (Stringer, Didham, & Theivananthampillai, 2006). How satisfied some individuals feel internally will predict their response to an external influence. Negussie and Demissie (2013) stated that the intrinsic components of job satisfaction are dependent on that individual's personal perception and emotional state regarding their current work environment, and includes factors such as recognition, advancement, and responsibility. The extrinsic components of job satisfaction are comprised of external job-related variables that include salary, supervision, social interactions, and working conditions.

Rondeau, Francescutti, and Zanardelli (2005) found that when employees are presented with severe resource constraints, their overall job satisfaction decreases. This diminished level of job satisfaction cannot be disregarded because it can affect the employee's organizational performance (Lawler, 2006). When employees are not satisfied with their jobs, they become disengaged, and don't see positive results associated with the time, energy, and effort they put into their work or the company. Hence, they have the tendency to decrease their efforts, which directly impacts organizational outcomes.

Job satisfaction also influences turnover rates because if employees are not satisfied with their current situation in the organization, they will typically start looking elsewhere for employment and ultimately leave the organization when presented with a better opportunity. Lawler (2006) proclaimed that if a dissatisfied employee's status does not change for the better, or they do not leave the organization; they become disgruntled employees who seek to change their current situation by organizing unions, filing lawsuits, or engaging in other undesirable behaviors. When employees are satisfied, their truancy rate decreases and the organization experiences less turnover. Lawler (2006) expressed that this should be a great motivator for employers to ensure that their employees have a high level of job satisfaction because it can be very expensive to replace qualified individuals. Further, employee satisfaction is often connected to customer satisfaction and quality of service. Customers would rather interact with satisfied employees and not deal with employees who are constantly complaining about how they are treated by the organization (Lawler, 2006). Additionally, the organization



runs the risk of losing customers if an employee is dissatisfied and leaves the organization and has established positive relationships with certain customers.

Job satisfaction is variable to the extent that each employee has a different level of satisfaction based on their pay, job security, supervisor interaction, organization's policies, and advancement opportunities (Hartline & Ferrell, 1996). Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) identified five variables of job satisfaction that are continually used as the foundation for defining and measuring job satisfaction: pay, the work itself, coworkers, opportunity for promotion, and supervision.

### **Pay**

Pay in this context, is in reference to the employee's attitude toward their wages. Gregory (2011) described how an employee's perception of what they should be paid can affect their satisfaction levels. This is apparent when job satisfaction levels decrease due to differences between the employee's perception of what they expect to be paid and their actual pay rate (Fitcher & Cipolla, 2010). Additionally, the employee's perception of the organization will be poor if they feel that the company is more concerned about revenues rather than the well-being of their employees.

### **The Work Itself**

The work itself is one of the most unnoticed but most important components of job satisfaction (Judge & Church, 2000; Jurgenson, 1978). This aspect of job satisfaction includes opportunities for creativity and task variety, which allows an individual to increase their knowledge, amount of work, autonomy, job complexity, and accept more responsibility (Smith et al., 1969). Reportedly, employees have ranked the work they do at a higher level than the actual money paid for the work (Kovach, 1995).

## **Coworkers**

Coworkers are the individuals that work with the employee on the present job. The interaction between an employee's peers can also determine the employee's satisfaction level (Smith et al., 1969). Positive interactions with coworkers will most likely result in higher satisfaction levels; whereas, negative interactions with coworkers will most likely result in lower satisfaction levels.

## **Opportunity for Promotion**

The opportunity for promotion relates to the employee's satisfaction level of the organization's job promotion policy (Fitcher & Cipolla, 2010). Employees can become frustrated with their organization when they are not provided with growth or advancement opportunities. Reasons for these promotional barriers may include favoritism or company restraints (Branham, 2005).

## **Supervision**

This is identified as the employee's level of satisfaction with their supervisor's supervisory practices. Employees are more susceptible to have greater levels of satisfaction when their supervisor is considerate and supportive to their needs. Levels of dissatisfaction are greater when supervisors ignore their employee's needs (Fitcher & Cipolla, 2010).

## **Management versus Leadership**

Over 10 years ago it was acknowledged that autocratic, top-down driven directives to influence change were ineffective, and to truly establish sustainable change, a transformational style of leadership is required (Moen & Core, 2013). "As its name implies, transformational leadership is a process that changes and transforms people; it is

concerned with emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals” (Northouse, 2013, p. 185). Transformational leadership benefits both the organization as well as individuals as transformational initiatives are implemented because the leaders, as well as the followers, transform when they interact with each other over a period of time.

The transformational style of leadership is most helpful in the workplace because it involves processes that change and transform individuals that are involved in the process. Utilization of transformational leadership behavior influence followers to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them (Northouse, 2013). This influence allows followers to achieve new heights in their professional development, which is beneficial for both the individual and the leader. Additionally, the right kind of leader can influence followers to a level of potential that far exceeds the level that they would have potentially reached on their own; and the improved level of performance greatly increases the level of success that the individual is able to achieve. When ordinary people work together to create extraordinary results in an organization it fosters an environment of inspiration (Atkins, 2010).

## **Management**

Management involves planning and budgeting; organization and allocation of resources; controlling and solving problems. Leadership involves direction; alignment and influence; motivation and inspiration. Management and leadership have similarities as well as differences. Management and leadership are two distinguishable and corresponding systems of action (Kotter, 1990). The real challenge is to combine leadership and management and use each to balance the other (Kotter, 1990). To effectively implement change and create a motivational movement within an

organization, managerial leadership that is associated with the transactional components of the day-to-day functions of an organization should be separated from transformational leadership styles, which are more aligned with how leaders are able to get their followers to gravitate towards change.

Similarities of management and leadership can be identified in the following traits and qualities: resource management, empowerment, communication, influence, and motivation towards achievement (Young & Dulewicz, 2008). Management and leadership both utilize these tools to accomplish the overall goals of the organization. Management is about dealing with the daily complexity of the organization (Kotter, 1990). As the day-to-day processes encounter issues and concerns, management involves dealing with these concerns. Management also ensures that the daily processes run smoothly and proactively. Management deals with complex issues by planning and budgeting for those issues. These plans are usually for an immediate time frame. Leadership, by contrast, is about understanding that change happens, and how to cope with that change (Kotter, 1990). Leadership handles complex issues by leading the organization towards a constructive change. Management forecasts the issue and tries to effectively deal with the situation, and leadership provides foresight and direction to produce a better outcome.

## **Leadership**

Leadership can be defined in many different ways. Bass and Stogdill (1990) defined leadership as successful influence of activities or behaviors of others that result in the attainment of goals. Kouzes and Posner (2010) defined leadership as an observable set of skills and abilities that inspires, models, empowers, and questions an established

authority. Yukl (2012) defined leadership as influencing and facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives. Similar to Yukl (2012), Northouse (2013) defined leadership as a process where leaders influence followers to accomplish collective goals. More recently, Slimane (2015) described leadership as “a process of social influence in which one person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task” (p. 218).

According to Haynes (2007), there is a significant difference between management and leadership. Leadership uses tools and characteristics to guide the behavior of others toward meeting and achieving an organization’s goals (Haynes, 2007). Haynes (2007) further states, that focused leadership behavior exhibits positive reinforcement towards such factors as policies, procedures, job specifications, organizational goals, and organizational culture.

Leaders are individuals who take on the responsibility of guiding their organizations by performing leadership activities (Domnica, 2012). In order to achieve organizational objectives, a leader must be innovative, inspirational, encouraging, and have the ability to focus on guiding people towards achieving organizational objectives. Additionally, leaders can be seen as change agents because their actions produce results within the organization that have lasting effects of change (Domnica, 2012). Successful leadership is a key success factor for organizations; especially when their employees are motivated by that leadership to achieve organizational goals (Tsai, Cheng, & Chang, 2010).

The essential goal of a leader is to influence and facilitate employee efforts to accomplish the organization’s goals and objectives. A primary focus in leadership

research has been to identify aspects of behavior that explain leader influence on the performance of a team, work unit, or organization (Yukl, 2012). In the hospitality and gaming industry, leadership style dictates a lot of how an employee relates to the executive leadership team of the organization (Bernsen, Segers, & Tillema, 2009). Some examples of what leaders accomplish through different styles of leadership are: provide vision and direction, inspire employees to work towards a common goal, and motivate teams to accomplish tasks that are seemingly impossible.

### **Leadership Styles**

Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) were early researchers who researched leadership styles. Lewin et al. (1939) are well-known for their contributions to leadership style theory. Lewin et al. (1939) recognized that one of the factors that determine a leader's choice of leadership style is the leader's decision making style. Their research identified that there were three specific styles of leadership. The first type, authoritarian leadership, evaluates the actions of subordinates and oversees the outcome while remaining uninvolved in any of the actions. The second type, democratic leadership, works in collaboration with staff to arrive at decisions. The third type, laissez-faire leadership, assumes no clear leadership role, offering advice and input only when asked.

Throughout the years, researchers (Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1948; Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969) have researched and attempted to define leadership, and they have provided assistance to organizations in understanding the importance of leadership and how it affects the organization's overall performance. From their research, several theories have been developed based on several aspects of leadership: leadership characteristics (Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1948), leadership behaviors (Fiedler, 1967), or

situational variables (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). In more recent years, leadership practices have been grouped into these particular areas of leadership: laissez-fair leadership, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership. Currently, data is being collected from a broad array of community organizations to examine the connections between leadership, organizational culture, and performance (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Based on prior research, it is expected that more transformational cultures will provide the context for more effective organizational and individual performance levels (Bass & Avolio, 1993).

Leadership styles play a very significant part in the management of organizations. Leaders that have exceptional leadership skills and characteristics tend to be highly sought after because service organizations are comprised of many diverse services and have a wide array of labor needs. Proper leadership skills and characteristics have the ability to influence the behavior of employees, which can lead to positive attitudes, and improved work performance (Flaherty, Mowen, Brown, & Marshall, 2009).

Three significant styles of leadership are present in the hospitality and gaming industry: laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational. Of the three, the two most effective leadership styles in the hospitality and gaming industry are transactional and transformational leadership (Scott-Halsell, Shumate, & Blum, 2008). Table 1 shows the behaviors and characteristics of transformational leaders, transactional leaders, and laissez-faire leaders. The table provides the components of each type of leadership style defined by (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003). The discussion following the table offers some distinctions between the three particular leadership styles.

Table 1

*Definitions of Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*

MLQ-5X scales with subscales	Description of leadership style
<b>Transformational</b>	
Idealized Influence (attribute)	Demonstrates qualities that motivate respect and pride from association with him or her
Idealized Influence (behavior)	Communicates values, purpose, and importance of organization's mission
Inspirational Motivation	Exhibits optimism and excitement about goals and future states
Intellectual Stimulation	Examines new perspectives for solving problems and completing tasks
Individualized Consideration	Focuses on development and mentoring of followers and attends to their individual needs
<b>Transactional</b>	
Contingent Reward	Provides rewards for satisfactory performance by followers
Management-by-Exception (active)	Attends to followers' mistakes and failures to meet standards
Management-by-Exception (passive)	Waits until problems become severe before attending to them and intervening
<b>Laissez-Faire</b>	Exhibits frequent absence and lack of involvement during critical junctures

**Laissez-Faire Leadership**

Laissez-faire is a French phrase that means “leave it be”, or “it will work out”, and describes the leadership style where leaders allow their followers to work without supervision (Crawford, Gould, & Scott, 2003). The laissez-faire leadership style is deemed a passive style because leaders give their subordinates the ability to make decisions or to complete their tasks as they see fit (Long & Thean, 2011). Long and Thean (2011) believed that the laissez-faire leadership style does not represent either transactional or transformational leadership. When this leadership style was applied to working situations, leaders were ineffective or not involved in the decision making



process. These leaders would not exercise any authority and ignore their leadership responsibilities, thus causing delays in prompt decisions and actions that needed to be taken.

In contrast to transactional and transformational leaders, laissez-faire leaders allow their subordinates to work and make work related decisions completely autonomously. This leadership style has the ability to create an environment of low job satisfaction and poor customer service. Although the laissez-faire leadership style is a passive form of leadership behavior, some leaders feel that it allows for the employees to gain self-empowerment (Harper, 2012). When leaders utilize the laissez-faire leadership style, they stimulate situations where subordinates have to make important decisions, and thus manage themselves. The laissez-faire leadership style works as an effective leadership style when organizational employees are highly skilled, motivated, and fully capable of working without the presence of a leader. However, this situation has the strong possibility of generating outcomes that result in chaotic work environments, poor customer service, and high overhead costs because laissez-faire leaders do not showcase their leadership abilities in a manner that exudes strong organizational directives (Harper, 2012). Subsequently, since laissez-faire leaders do not demonstrate leadership behavior that reflects a high level of interest in the organization's goals, their followers take that behavior as a negative influence and do their work with little to no effort. This cause and effect situation between the laissez-faire leader and their followers inversely impacts the organization's level of productivity and jeopardizes their competitive advantage (Ghamrawi, 2013).

Transactional leadership style is discussed in the next section. Performance measurement, objectives, and goals are the primary drivers with the transactional leadership style. These components are clearly defined by transactional leaders to guide the employee's tasks and job functions.

### **Transactional Leadership**

Burns (1978) originally presented transactional leadership as a leadership style that involved an interactive exchange between the leader and follower. His thoughts were that followers received certain remunerations, such as wages or notification, when they performed duties in accordance to their leader's requests. Building on the transactional leadership concept which was inspired by Burns (1978), Bass (1985) stated that leadership in general had been theorized as a transactional or cost-benefit practice. Burns (1978) regarded transformational leadership and transactional leadership as being entirely different, whereas Bass (1985) viewed both leadership styles as separate styles that existed on the same dimensional plane. Bass (1985) claimed that a leader can utilize both transactional and transformational leadership styles. Additionally, Bass (1985) stated that the transformational leadership style builds upon the transactional leadership style, but it is impossible for the transactional leadership style to build upon the transformational leadership style.

Bass (1985) supported the notion that transformational leadership accounts for a distinctive variance in ratings of performance beyond that attributed to transactional leadership. In addition, a transactional leader will attempt to identify what the follower wants to get from his/her efforts, and will try to see if the intended performance is worth providing what he/she wants. A transactional leader will offer enticing rewards to

individuals for their efforts to obtain results (Bass, 1985). According to research by Zaccaro (2001), transactional leadership utilizes certain levels of influence to reward desired behaviors. Additionally, Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) state that “Transactional leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of something valued” (p. 648).

Dissimilar to transactional leadership behavior, Bass (1985) stated that individuals that utilize transformational leadership behavior motivate people to do more than they had originally expected of themselves. Tucker & Russell (2004) made several distinctions between transactional and transformational leadership behavior. They indicated that transactional leaders use their position, power, and authority within the organization to get things done whereas transformational leaders will motivate people to work for the greater good of the organization.

Northouse (2013) also identified differences between transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Northouse (2013) believed that transactional leadership does not take into consideration the needs of the leader’s subordinates, or stress the importance of their personal development. Additionally, transactional leadership uses a form of exchange between the leader and the follower to complete organizational tasks and functions (Kuhnert, 1994). Furthermore, transactional leaders influence their followers towards action, not because they are inspired to do so for the sake of doing so, but because there is a beneficial reward for doing so (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987).

As the theory of transactional leadership was formally defined, two types of transactional behaviors were recognized: contingent reward and (active or passive) management-by-exception (Yukl, 2006). Discussed first is contingent reward, which is

concerned with helping employees achieve higher levels of organizational effectiveness. Discussed second is management-by-exception where leaders prefer to avoid risk, and focus on efficiency.

**Contingent reward.** Contingent reward behavior encompasses situations where individuals reward others to incentivize them for meeting certain identified goals. This behavior is used to provide motivation for the employee, and an added sense of positive reinforcement for accomplishing a task or function. Northouse (2013) described that transactional leadership tries to obtain follower support for work needed to be done by offering rewards to the individuals for doing the work. The transactional leader and the employee come to an understanding of what the goals and objectives are to be: the leader rewards the achievements of the employee, or the leader punishes the employee for the lack of achievement (Camps & Torres, 2011). For example, when a leader asks an employee to complete a task, and that leader offers some type of reward in exchange for the employee's efforts. When employees receive something from the leader in exchange for achieving a goal or accomplishing a specified task, that employee's leader is effectively practicing contingent reward behavior. Contingent reward behavior involves leaders providing tangible and intangible rewards such as financial compensation, or verbal recognition (Negussie & Demissie, 2013). Verbal praises for work, pay for performance increases, and promotion recommendations for surpassing expectations are effective examples of contingent-reward behaviors (Hockmeyer, 2015).

Goals of leaders who use contingent reward behavior are to encourage employee efforts towards working on tasks, and to foster relationships that encourage interactions between leaders and followers within the organization (Camps & Torres, 2011). The

leader explains to the follower what is required of them and what they need to do. The leader offers rewards to the employee in exchange for the employee's performance and effort to complete the task (Camps & Torres, 2011). Contingent reward is the most active and engaging form of the transactional leadership style, and is less used by transformational leaders because they are able to utilize a form of contingent reward without ever being closely involved with the employee (Sadeghi & Pihie, 2012). Transactional leaders try to enhance their employees' creativity, encourage innovative ideas, and boost cooperation amongst the team members by using contingent rewards (Camps & Torres, 2011).

**Management-by-exception (active).** Active management-by-exception is when a leader makes corrective actions to an employee's work, or uses negative reinforcement (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Leader's using this type of behavior monitor employees closely so they can point out errors that need to be corrected. Leaders who use active management-by-exception behavior continually look at each subordinate's performance and makes changes to their work if they deviate from the standard process or procedures (Odumeru & Ogbonna, 2013). The aim of active management-by-exception is to give authority to leaders so they can enforce rules, avoid mistakes, and prevent procedural irregularities (Hetland, Hetland, Andreassen, Pallesen, & Notelaers, 2011).

**Management-by-exception (passive).** Passive management-by-exception concerns the leadership behavior of individuals who intervene after their followers have committed significant mistakes and have violated the rules and standards of the workplace (Rowold & Schlotz, 2009). Passive management-by-exception includes the use of conditional punishments and other corrective action in response to deviations from

acceptable performance standards (Yukl, 2006). An example of passive management-by-exception is demonstrated in leadership when a supervisor gives an employee a poor performance evaluation without talking to the employee in advance about their work performance.

Northouse (2013) presented that both active as well as passive management-by-exception behavior involved corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement. Both the active and passive management-by-exception leadership behaviors use more negative reinforcement patterns than positive reinforcement patterns. When management-by-exception behavior is utilized by leaders, the work environment tends to be negative with a resultant effect on job satisfaction (Malloy & Penprase, 2010). (Negussie & Demissie, 2013) found that individuals who use management-by-exception leadership behavior discouraged their followers from investing time and mental effort in their work, which lead to the follower's failure to fulfill their original expectations for increased organizational performance and overall career success.

Eliophotou (2014) performed a study to identify the link between transformational and transactional leadership behaviors on teacher's job satisfaction. A sample of 438 secondary school teachers in Cyprus was studied. The study's findings specified that transactional leadership was less likely to have a positive effect on job satisfaction except for when contingent rewards were applied; additionally, many of the teachers that did receive contingent rewards identified those rewards with transformational leadership. Yammarino, Sprangler, and Bass (1993) explained that the contingent rewards and other benefits offered at lower hierarchy levels of leadership can often be limited. Eliophotou (2014) agreed with this point and suggested that in similar manner, the school teacher's

position in the Cyprus educational systems may not have been perceived to have a significant level of control over the contingent rewards offered, causing the rewards offered to be associated with a leadership style other than transactional leadership. Nonetheless, the results of this study signified that when transactional leadership is utilized without the contingent reward aspect, it is less likely to produce positive results for job satisfaction.

Burns (1978) suggested that the transactional leadership style is based on organizational authority and positional power within the organization. Individuals who utilize transactional leadership focus on work standards, assignments, and task-oriented goals. Burns (1978) believed that transactional leaders tend to focus on the completion of tasks and employee compliance. Transactional leaders rely on the use of organizational rewards and punishment to influence employees to perform at the desired level. Al-Mailam (2004) identified transactional leaders as goal setters and agents of change. However, the changes that these individuals make are done with minimal concern for motivating their followers, and they do not focus on appealing to employee's higher ideals and moral values. Emery and Barker (2007) found that for these reasons, transformational leadership behavior had a higher correlation with job satisfaction than did transactional leadership behavior. The study suggested that employees that have been subject to transactional leadership behavior might find fault or dissatisfaction with the value of their reward systems. Further, transactional leaders who use management by exception are perceived as individuals that are actively searching for deviations in employee's work. In this type of work environment, employees are often tense and on

edge because their perception is that one error would outweigh any amount of successful efforts portrayed earlier.

Hollander (1978) believed that transactional leadership behavior fosters an environment of managers bargaining with their employees to produce results. Individuals who use transactional leadership tend to analyze which needs are important to their employees and determine their goals accordingly; instead of identifying needs and associating them to personal goals as observed with transformational leaders.

Transactional leaders primarily focus on maintaining the organizational status quo by satisfying the employee's basic wants and needs. Bass (1986) claimed that transactional leadership is an acceptable form of leadership behavior but fundamentally a plan for organizational mediocrity because it limits the employee's efforts towards goals, effectiveness toward contributing to organizational goals, and job satisfaction. Deluga (1988) surveyed 117 employees in a manufacturing firm and found that transactional leadership behavior had less of an effect on employee upward influencing behavior than did transformational leadership. Further, transactional leadership was less closely related to employee job satisfaction and leader effectiveness than transformational leadership.

Schiena, Letens, VanAken, and Farris (2013) performed a study which provided findings related to the association between the characteristics of learning organizations and leadership styles. The characteristics also included the following organizational outcomes: displayed extra effort, organizational effectiveness, and job satisfaction. The leadership styles studied were transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant. The results of the study indicated that transformational leadership dimensions such as



idealized influence and individualized consideration were highly related to positive organizational outcomes, including job satisfaction.

Further, transactional leadership behavior, only when based on the use of contingent rewards, has a significant correlation with learning organizations and organizational outcomes. Eliophotou (2014) indicated that transactional leadership behavior, in the circumstance of contingent award only, can have a positive impact on employee job satisfaction. However, when considering the comprehensive definition of transactional leadership as stated by Bass (1985), existing research and literature does not support a blanket assertion that transactional leadership behavior has a positive impact on employee job satisfaction, but rather the opposite.

Overall, the transactional leadership style is not considered an ideal leadership style based on the perception of the follower (Ivey & Theresa, 2010). Transactional leadership behavior may generate desired results, but it disregards the needs or goals of the follower; and only focuses on immediate outcomes and organizational goals. Therefore, organizational needs may be satisfied, but the employee's needs are left unattended and often unfulfilled.

### **Transformational Leadership**

Burns (1978) strongly influenced the foundation for transformational leadership theory. What makes transformational leadership engaging is that it appeals to the moral values of followers in an attempt to raise the consciousness about them as an individual and thus mobilize their energy and resources to achieve organizational goals (Yukl, 2006). Northouse (2013) identified the fact that since the early 1980s, transformational leadership has been the focus of considerable research. According to Lowe and

Gardner's (2001) content analysis, one-third of the articles published in *Leadership Quarterly* were focused on transformational leadership between the years of 1990-1995. During this 6-year period, over 100 theses and dissertations investigated the concept and behaviors of transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The number of research papers and referenced citations in the field of transformational leadership has grown at an increasing rate based on current observations (Antonakis, 2012). This is not only the case in the overall field of leadership but in other specific disciplines such as business, education, and the hospitality industry. Transformational leadership, which has been extensively researched by many researchers in recent years, has been deemed as one of the most popular forms of leadership, and that research occupies a significant place in the overall field of leadership (Northouse, 2013).

Transformational leadership as a leadership style tends to appeal to the higher ideals of the employee, and offers them a more meaningful work atmosphere (Hamidifar, 2010). The transformational leadership style has been shown to increase employee job satisfaction levels, as well as improve the culture of the organization overall (Braun, Wesche, Frey, Weiswiler, & Peus, 2012). Transformational leadership is heavily concerned with encouraging and assisting in laying the foundation for organizational and social change (Diaz, 2017).

Transformational leadership displays a notable difference from other leadership styles due to the fact that its foundation is rooted in personal values and beliefs of the leader (Ross-Grant, 2016). The personal value system of the leader is deeply engrained in the utilization of transformational leadership (Humphreys & Einstein, 2003). Burns (1978) referred to the personal value system of a transformational leader as "end values"

(p. 20). End values cannot be transferred or exchanged between the leader and the follower, but when the leader portrays his or her end values to the follower, the leader can potentially shape the follower's goals and beliefs to be compatible with the leader's end values. The interaction between a leader and a follower is not competitive but cooperative, sharing in efforts and support towards a common purpose. The leader and follower engage in such a way that allows each of them to obtain higher levels of motivation and morale. Humphreys and Einstein (2003) debated that the reason transformational leadership centers strongly on values and beliefs is because transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human behavior and the ethical aspiration of both the leader and the follower.

Bass (1985) proposed four behaviors or factors that have shaped transformational leadership theory: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Yukl (2006) illuminated that idealized influence is leadership behavior that stimulates strong follower emotions and results in leaders being role models for their followers. Inspirational motivation includes communicating an appealing vision, using key factors to concentrate subordinate efforts, and leaders modeling appropriate behaviors (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Intellectual stimulation is leadership behavior that helps to increase the follower's awareness of problems, and encourages followers to view problems from different perspectives. Lastly, individualized consideration entails leaders attending to each follower's needs by providing support, encouragement, and mentoring or coaching. Overall, the collective goal of the four behavioral components of transformational leadership is to assist in

elevating the motives, values, and goals of the follower (Hopton, Barling, & Turner, 2013).

Transformational leadership involves characteristics of an individual that encompasses qualities that provide vision and a forward progression of advancement for followers. According to Bass & Riggio (2006), a transformational leader is someone that motivates and inspires followers to both achieve extraordinary outcomes and in the process, develop their own leadership capacity; they motivate others to do more than they originally intended and often even more than they thought possible. Transformational leadership is something that takes shape over time and often is developed from encounters, learning, and experience.

Transformational leadership is a style of leadership that inspires individuals to have a higher sense of organizational commitment. It also promotes an organizational atmosphere that is attractive to individuals that have a variety of skill sets, thereby generating an inflow of human resources. Managers that utilize transformational leadership styles are able to effectively connect followers' aspirations to the organization's operational goals (Daft, 2010). Transformational leaders stimulate others to perform more effectively by encouraging them to grow through organizational learning and innovative ideas (Garcia-Morales, Jimenez-Barrionuevo, & Gutierrez-Gutierrez, 2011). Additionally, they focus on achieving higher organizational performance levels while appealing to their followers' needs of self-esteem and self-actualization (Scott-Halsell et al., 2008).

Kara (2012) had comparable views of Garcia-Morales et al. (2011) and Scott-Halsell et al. (2008). Kara (2012) identified that transformational managers have a

positive effect on individuals who work in the hospitality industry. The study encompassed a sample (N = 443) of employees in five-star hotels in Turkey. The study used correlation analysis and multiple-linear-regression analysis to analyze the relationship between the employees' organizational commitment and the managers' transformational leadership style. The results of the study revealed that employees' organizational commitment and managers' transformational leadership styles were statistically significant. Long and Thean (2011) argued that leaders who use a transformational leadership style are energetic, enthusiastic, passionate, and have the ability to motivate hospitality employees through empowerment, inspiration, and charisma. Additionally, leaders who use a transformational leadership style are involved in the management process and their focus is to help every member of the group achieve their goals (Long & Thean, 2011).

Transformational leaders in the hospitality industry must expand and promote the interest levels of the employees that work in that industry (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). Transformational leaders must communicate a clear organizational purpose and mission to everyone within the organization to raise employee awareness and understanding. Additionally, the role of a transformational leader is to motivate followers to move beyond their self-interest for the collective benefit of the entire group (Den Hartog et al., 1997). When leaders utilize transformational leadership behaviors, they genuinely appeal to the higher ideals of the employees, and provide a meaningful work atmosphere that leads to increased levels of job satisfaction for those individuals (Long & Thean, 2011). Additionally, when transformational leaders use inspirational

motivation as a behavioral stimulus, they gain the trust and confidence of those individuals they seek to inspire (Long & Thean, 2011).

Transformational leadership can be linked to a variety of positive individual and organizational results, such as when a positive organizational change effort takes place as a result of executive leaders sharing a unified vision and purpose for the organization (Blayney & Blotnick, 2010). Additional positive results include: increased employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational culture; and a decrease in employee turnover intentions (Hamidifar, 2010). According to Scott-Halsell et al. (2008), transformational leadership, which has been proven to be effective throughout various management levels and work environments, is comprised of five dimensions:

- Idealized influence (attributed to leaders by the followers);
- Idealized influence (behavior of leaders as observed by followers);
- Inspirational motivation (provided by leaders);
- Intellectual stimulation (provided by leaders and organizations);
- Individualized consideration.

Transformational leaders do more with their associates and followers than set up simple exchanges or agreements. They behave in ways to achieve superior results by employing one or more of the above core components of transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006). These varying behaviors have been noted within the study of transformational leadership, and brief overviews of each are broken down in the sections below. The researcher perceived that each area may offer insight into the motivational influences of transformational leaders and thus, be of significance to this study.

**Idealized influence (attributed to leaders by the followers).** Attributed idealized influence in transformational leadership concerns the leader's behavior and how their influence impacts the organization (Harper, 2012). When transformational leaders present themselves as engaging role models for followers, they establish the attributed component of idealized influence, such as when they gain the trust and confidence of their followers, and inspire and nurture those followers' contributions to the overall success of the organization (Harper, 2012). Transformational leaders create attributed idealized influence when they lead by example, share risks with employees, and display a high level of ethical and moral behavior (Riaz & Haider, 2010). Additionally, when transformational leaders emulate the vision and values of the organization, they become role models for the employees of the organization (Goussak & Webber, 2011). In like manner, employees can share in the achievement of organizational goals when they commit to following the guidance of a transformational leader.

Attributed idealized influence is seen when employees share experiences and best practices with the leader, and when they follow examples that their leader has displayed (Goussak & Webber, 2011); such as when followers trust their leaders, emulate their leader's behavior, assume their leader's values, and commit to achieving organizational goals. Leaders with perceived levels of high idealized influence behave in ways that allow them to serve as role models due to their followers' admiration, respect, and trust. When attributed idealized influence is present, followers often attribute extraordinary skills and abilities to the leader (Goussak & Webber, 2011).

Transformational leaders show the authenticity of their leadership when they treat their employees with dignity and respect (Rowold & Schlotz, 2009). When employees

see that their leader showcases authentic leadership, they develop a sense of trust towards that leader, which increases their job satisfaction. Rowold and Schlotz (2009) found that individuals who encourage open-communication amongst departments of the organization enhance the level of feedback they receive. Research shows that receiving and providing feedback to employees is a key component for organizational change and success (Petrou, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2016). Research has also indicated that mentoring is an essential element in providing employee support in a challenging environment (Rowold & Schlotz, 2009). Demonstrating influence using a transformational leadership style can promote an organizational environment where employees openly communicate with their leaders; and the employees in turn, experience relatively high levels of job satisfaction. The other component of idealized influence relates to the leader's behavior. Transformational leadership behavior stimulates actions that lead to outcomes; such as employee satisfaction with their leaders, organizational commitment, and overall employee job satisfaction.

**Idealized influence (behavior of leaders as observed by followers).** Behavioral idealized influence refers to the actions of leaders that demonstrate values, beliefs, and a sense of organizational mission (Negussie & Demissie, 2013). Transformational leaders provide behavioral idealized influence when offering encouragement and support to each individual employee (Harper, 2012). For instance, leaders show thoughtfulness when they request for a project to be completed on time, and continually offer support until the project is completed. This type of behavior is necessary to develop collaborative relationships between the leader and the employee, and it also assists in keeping open lines of communication with the employees of the organization. The behavior of leaders



must present employees with the opportunity to share their ideas with their leaders. When employees share their ideas, their leaders can offer direct recognition of the contribution of each employee (Rowold & Schlotz, 2009).

Additionally, by using behavioral idealized influence, leaders can serve as role models for other employees (Harper, 2012). For example, when a leader takes the time to explain an idea or important task to an employee, their behavior can help strengthen the employees' comfort level and performance, which can lead to higher levels of productivity. Attributed and behavioral idealized influence suggests different constructs. Attributed idealized influence relates to charisma showcased by the leader, whereas behavioral idealized influence emphasizes a collective sense of mission and values, as well as action on these values (Rowold & Schlotz, 2009).

Next, transformational leadership behavior that inspires employee motivation will be discussed. Industry leaders continually express the need for all employees to perform well in their duties. Through inspirational motivation, industry leaders strive to encourage employees to achieve their own goals, as well as organizational goals.

**Inspirational motivation.** Transformational leaders institute inspirational motivation when they convey a message and vision to employees in such a way that emotionally captures and inspires those employees; such as when organizational leaders inspire and motivate employees to incite commitment towards a shared vision (Negussie & Demissie, 2013). Leaders that showcase inspirational motivation, do so by challenging employees to achieve higher standards, by communicating clear directives for their employees, and by presenting employees with obtainable organizational goals (Athalye, 2010). For instance, when leaders motivate employees inspirationally, those employees'

sense of purpose tends to be increased (Athalye, 2010). A leader that institutes transformational leadership is thus trying to have the knowledge, skill, and ability to motivate employees in setting, developing, and achieving specific goals in the interest of the employees' ultimate satisfaction. Transformational leaders engage employees in envisioning attractive possible outcomes, and promote communicated expectations that the employees feel that they can meet.

Sookaneknun and Ussahawanitchakit (2012) examined the relationships between transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration), organizational innovation, and firm performance. The researchers utilized resource-based views and contingency theory. The population consisted of cosmetic businesses in Thailand, and the sample was composed of (N = 128) cosmetic businesses. The study showed that when transformational leaders used inspirational motivation, the cosmetic business achieved its goals. Organizational leaders saw growth in profit, improved market share, and an increased competitive advantage over their competitors (Sookaneknun & Ussahawanitchakit, 2012). For inspirational motivation to be effective, "leaders must create vibrant ideas, images in the minds of the professionals that provide meaningful focus" (Sadeghi & Pihie, 2012, p. 189).

Research by Shin, Kim, Lee, and Bian (2012) reinforces the Sadeghi and Pihie (2012) statement and concludes that when organizational leaders provide inspirational motivation, those leaders effectively strengthen the employees' ability to create significant ideas that can prove to be beneficial to the organization. Shin et al. (2012) revealed in their study that a heightened level of inspirational motivation could encourage

employees to pursue different ideas. To motivate employees to continually achieve high standards in the interest of good customer service, industry leaders must communicate organizational goals effectively and provide encouragement and support to their followers. Additionally, industry leaders can incite inspirational motivation into their organization by letting the employees know that the leadership team is trustworthy and dependable (Harper, 2012).

Inspirational motivation is an important component of transformational leadership because leaders use this concept to increase the motivational levels of employees so that their overall performance reflects positively for the good of the team and organization. Intellectual stimulation and its connection to relationship and self-management are addressed in the next discussion. For example, when leaders stimulate the employees' understanding of a problem or situation, and when they ascertain their own beliefs and standards.

**Intellectual stimulation.** Industry leaders demonstrate intellectual stimulation when they encourage creativity among the employees, leading to new ways to service the guests and new opportunities to increase organizational profitability (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2010). The transformational leadership style centers on encouraging employees to be innovative and creative (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2010). In some capacities, transformational leaders can stimulate employees to be critical thinkers and problem solvers through proper training and education. Indeed, problem solving and critical thinking may play a significant role in increasing the overall productivity and profitability of the organization (Brown & Arendt, 2012). Scott-Halsell et al. (2008) found that employee empowerment is a major component of intellectual stimulation.

There are four dimensions of intellectual stimulation: rationality, existentialism, empiricism, and ideology (Scott-Halsell et al., 2008). According to Scott-Halsell et al. (2008), researchers described rational leaders as leaders who believe in employees applying their own perspective abilities and independence to their work, and encouraging those employees to be rational and logical in their thinking process. For example, effective leadership is improved when leaders offer employees decision making opportunities and the ability to participate in the process by having the chance to communicate their thoughts and opinions. Empirical leaders manage employees by expecting them to use the raw data available for informed decisions, whereas ideological leaders expect employees to use their intuition to make quick decisions that will help them achieve organizational goals (Scott-Halsell et al., 2008). For instance, intellectual stimulation provides a pathway for employees to discover new and better ideas by urging them to explore and experiment with a variety of new approaches (Shin et al., 2012). Individual consideration is the final discussion on the aspect of transformational leadership that relates to self-management; specifically, developing, coaching, and mentoring employees.

**Individualized consideration.** Individualized consideration constitutes one of the behavioral components of transformational leadership. Industry leaders exhibit individual consideration when they assess and integrate the needs of individual employees through supportive relationships, such as when a leader attends to the needs of an individual employee (Shin et al., 2012). The aim of individualized consideration is to ensure that the needs of the employee are met and to help that employee enhance their potential (Hetland et al., 2011). Transformational leaders use individualized-

consideration behavior to identify, assess, and address employees' individual needs (Brown & Arendt, 2012). In effect, leader behavior shows individual consideration when leaders address individual differences through advising and coaching (Shin et al., 2012). Industry leaders can often assist employees to become fully actualized by serving as advisors and coaches (Scott-Halsell et al., 2008). For example, industry leaders can delegate tasks to employees to assist in their professional growth through personal challenges that can often lead to the employee reaching higher levels of attainment and commitment.

Shurbagi (2014) suggested that transformational leaders are leaders who not only motivate followers through inspiration, but also engage followers via challenges and ultimately support the followers' personality development. With this engagement, there is a greater level of attentiveness towards the intangible qualities; for example, shared ideas, shared vision, and shared values. Shurbagi (2014) studied the relationship between transformational leadership style, job satisfaction, and the effect of organizational commitment in the Libyan petroleum sector. The study used the stratified sampling method, and out of 280 distributed questionnaires, 227 questionnaires were usable which yielded a response rate of 81%. The study found that there was a positive relationship between transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

When compared to other traditional styles of leadership, transformational leaders are more involved with their subordinates and colleagues (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991). Rothfelder et al. (2012) found that leadership behavior strongly affected employee job satisfaction among German hotel employees. The behaviors that encompass transformational leadership are behaviors that produce greater satisfaction

levels than transactional and non-leadership behaviors. After surveying 101 hotel employees and completing three major steps in analyzing the data (correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis, and multivariate analysis of variance), Rothfelder et al. (2012) claimed that the most applicable behavior for generating a positive influence on employee job satisfaction is transformational leadership. The study's hypotheses were supported after the findings identified that all components of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation) were positively related to employee job satisfaction. The study results were not surprising, but supported previous results from other contexts (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bryman, 1992; Howell & Frost, 1989; Keller, 1992; Seltzer & Bass, 1990). This suggests that in the case of German hotel employees, they were more satisfied when their supervisors articulated a clear vision, set personal examples, motivated and inspired them, provided meaning the employee's work, acted in ways that made their followers want to trust them, showed understanding and support, and treated their subordinates as individuals; understanding that each one has different needs, abilities, and aspirations (Rothfelder et al., 2012).

Tichy and Ulrich (1984) stressed the significance of transformational leadership, as transformational leadership behavior counteracts stagnation and regression in the world economy. They stated that transformational leadership is necessary because it drives organizations in the direction of success and sustainability; transformational leaders are able to move the organization from a stagnant state of being to one of organizational change. Transformational leaders are "movers and shakers"; they have vision and foresight, they use creative strategies to overcome challenges, and they are not

afraid to take risks in order to accomplish their goals (Mujikic, Sehic, Rahimic, & Jusic, 2014). Mujikic et al. (2014) conducted empirical research on whether transformational leadership, in comparison to other contemporary leadership styles, contributed to higher employee satisfaction levels. A total of 399 respondents took part in the study and were from private companies in Bosnia, Herzegovina, and western Germany. It was shown that there was a significant statistical difference in employee job satisfaction when the transformational leadership style was utilized as opposed to transactional and charismatic leadership styles.

These studies along with others support the notion that transformational leadership behavior tends to create working environments that stimulate positive employee job satisfaction (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Burns, 1978; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Chen, Beck, & Amos, 2005; Fuller, Patterson, Hester, & Stringer, 1996; Marshall, 2011). Literature from the past to the present illustrates through high levels of statistical significance that transformational leadership behavior is a proven and effective leadership style. Overall, transformational leadership styles promote positive changes within the organization and with its members (Garcia-Morales et al., 2011).

Effective leadership behavior has the ability to increase employee job satisfaction and enrich the performance levels of the employees (Cohen, Stuenkel, & Nguyen, 2009). Organizations that endure poor levels of employee satisfaction tend to experience high levels of turnover. When managers of the organization are faced with reduced human resources, their ability to complete organizational tasks becomes burdensome (Long & Thean, 2011). Effective leadership and increased employee job satisfaction allows organizations to achieve their organizational goals and maintain their competitive

advantage; but it is important to note that in order to sustain proactive momentum, the executive leadership team has to support the efforts of the organization's managers (Long & Thean, 2011). Managers inspire employees by providing them with the tools and direction to accomplish their work performance goals, and meet organizational tasks. Additionally, employees that have a sense of accomplishment are generally more satisfied with their work environment, and have a greater level of organizational commitment (Long & Thean, 2011). Hotel and casino organizations that have strong levels of organizational commitment from their employees are less susceptible to employee turnover, and are able to retain their human capital and be more competitive in the industry (Harper, 2012).

Most card room casinos are not as large of a scaled enterprise as a Vegas hotel and casino, but depending on the organizational structure, different leadership styles can prove to be more effective than others. Obiwuru, Okwu, Akpa, and Nwankwere (2011) studied the effects of leadership styles on organizational performance in selected small scale enterprises. The study's methodology followed a survey design and utilized the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1985) in its data generation. Obiwuru et al. (2011) initially selected three small scale enterprises to evaluate through a stratified random sampling technique. A code manual was developed and used to convert the respondents of the study's responses to quantitative data. The dependent variable constituted responses on leadership style performance outcome, and the independent variable constituted responses on various leadership behaviors. Results of the study revealed that individuals that utilized a transformational leadership style in small scale enterprises had an insignificant impact on organizational performance, and



individuals that utilized a transactional leadership style in small scale enterprises had a significant impact on organizational performance. The study did not have a sample that contained a laissez-faire leadership style. The study concluded that utilization of a transactional leadership style was more appropriate in prompting a change in organizational performance in a small scale enterprise than the utilization of a transformational leadership style (Obiwuru et al., 2011). The study did recommend that small scale enterprises utilize transactional leadership styles to induce organizational performance, but work towards implementing transformational leadership styles as the enterprise develops and grows (Obiwuru et al., 2011).

### **Summary**

As confirmed in the literature review, it is certain that different leadership styles have an associated impact and a correlation with employee job satisfaction. Existing literature demonstrates that transformational leadership behavior has had a positive relationship with employee job satisfaction. While certain components of transactional leadership, specifically contingent rewards, were demonstrated to have a positive impact on employee job satisfaction, it cannot be exclusively determined that transactional leadership has a positive impact on employee job satisfaction. Rather, transactional leadership has an inverse effect on employee job satisfaction when all components are considered. The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership has been studied in many capacities. However, this study is significant because it seeks to determine which of the two display higher levels of employee job satisfaction among California card room employees. The population that is considered in this study is also unique, as this researcher found very minimal studies that measured how these two

leadership styles correlate with employee job satisfaction in the California card room atmosphere.

The gaming industry has been increasingly expanding, both nationally, as well as internationally. For organizations to maintain their competitive advantage in the highly competitive gaming industry, they have to monitor their costs and consistently provide a quality service to their guests. One cost that needs focused attention is the cost associated with labor and employee turnover. Identifying individuals who are qualified to provide optimal service, and who are dedicated to the organization, should be of particular concern to the leadership team of the organization. There is a considerable body of work which supports the theory that transformational leadership behavior is correlated to job satisfaction, which can be directly tied to intentions to leave the organization. This study's primary focus was to examine the correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction among California card room employees.

### **Synthesis Matrix**

A synthesis matrix (Appendix A) was used in order to organize and synthesize the study variables presented in the content of the literature review. The synthesis matrix was organized to allow the researcher to identify and group the major themes and variables included in the various references. The synthesis matrix was arranged in an excel document with the major variables and literature topics listed horizontally in a row across the top of the table, and the source citations listed vertically in a column down the left of the table. This matrix assisted the researcher to draw conclusions about the nonobvious relationships that existed between the various references on the table.

## **CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY**

This chapter will commence with a restatement of the purpose of the study and the research questions, and will be followed by a description of the quantitative correlational research method that was used and the design of the research. The problem of employee turnover in the gaming industry was researched in this study. This researcher used Bass's (1985) transformational leadership theory and how that theory effects job satisfaction as the theoretical framework that supports the research. The data was collected using surveys administered to California card room casino employees.

This chapter discusses the independent and dependent variables studied, and describes the population from which the sample was selected; as well as the sample size and demographic information about the participants. The survey instruments that were used to collect the data will also be discussed. Additionally, a discussion of the rationale for selecting a quantitative research design instead of using a qualitative or mixed methods structure will be included. This chapter will conclude with a discussion of the limitations of the research, and an overall summary of the chapter.

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this quantitative, non-experimental study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees.

The second purpose of this study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire leadership styles exhibited by the leadership team as defined by Bass and Avolio (1995) and identified by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) designed by Spector (1985).

## **Research Questions**

1. What is the relationship between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?
2. What is the relationship between transactional leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?
3. What is the relationship between laissez-faire leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

## **Research Design**

The study approached the research questions from a quantitative non-experimental correlational research design perspective. The research was conducted using surveys to collect data on the correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction for California card room casino employees. This methodology and design was selected because transformational leadership behavior affords opportunities to describe the relationships between quantitative variables. In a study by Bailey, Sabbagh, Loiselle, Boileau, and McVey (2010), a descriptive correlational design was very useful in relating relationships among the studied variables.

The descriptive research approach is a basic research method that examines the situation, as it exists in its current state. Descriptive research involves identification of attributes of a particular phenomenon based on an observational basis, or the exploration of correlation between two or more phenomena (Williams, 2011, p. 66).

For this study, the variables involved were transformational leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, and job satisfaction. The aim of quantitative research is to investigate, count or classify, and construct statistical models and figures to explain the observation. A correlational research study not only describes what exists between variables, but systematically investigates relationships between two or more variables of interest (Porter & Carter, 2000).

A quantitative research method was found to be the most appropriate method for this study versus a qualitative research approach or a mixed methods approach. The qualitative research approach requires the researcher to interpret data, and does not allow the researcher to compare variables or group participants statistically (Russell & Russell, 2012). Additionally, qualitative data draws from numerous sources, other than purely numerical sources (Bansal & Corley, 2011). The researcher understood that data collected from a qualitative design could give a deeper understanding of the feelings and desires of the employees. However, qualitative results would be uniquely applicable for this one organization and making generalizations or inferences to similar organizations in the broader card room casino industry would not be feasible or credible.

Mixed-methods research combines quantitative and qualitative research approaches. In mixed-methods research, one methodology's results assist in developing or informing the results of the other methodology, such as when the researcher utilizes sampling and implementation, as well as measurement decisions (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989). The mixed-methods research approach has the ability to obtain more data than a quantitative research method, but the additional costs and time involved in the research can sometimes outweigh the benefits of obtaining the additional data.

Additionally, any issues related to the subjective nature of the qualitative research's method of inquiry and succeeding interpretation of the results by the researcher are circumvented (Simpson & Lord, 2015).

Quantitative research methods are generally better suited for larger sample groups, as was the case in this study where the sample size was 200 day shift employees out of an overall population of about 700 employees (Mačutek & Wimmer, 2013). Additionally, quantitative research methods produce numerical data that is understandable and can be easily communicated to the intended audience with very minimal added explanations required (Shabani Varaki, Floden, & Javidi Kalatehjafarabadi, 2015). The results of this study were generated objectively. Results that are generated objectively are essential because when the results are presented in this fashion they allow future research to be reproduced with similar outcomes in other situations (Slater & Gleason, 2012). The main goal of the study was to understand the correlation between transformational leadership and job satisfaction for California card room casino employees. Therefore, a quantitative methodology using survey design was selected as the most appropriate research design for the study.

### **Population**

A population is a group of individuals that conforms to specific criteria and common characteristics (Creswell, 2009; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). This study's population was comprised of 101 licensed card room casinos in the State of California. Card room casinos are distinguished separately from Indian gaming casinos. Card room casinos are very different than Indian gaming casinos in the fact that card room casinos cannot bank their own games, and are prevented from having slot machines that can be

typically found in Indian gaming casinos. Card room casino operations directly supported over 17,300 jobs in California, while the indirect and induced impacts of those operations supported over 5,400 jobs (Beacon Economics, 2013). The number of employees working for a particular card room in the State of California can range from under 250 employees to over 2,500 employees per establishment.

### **Target Population**

A target population for a study is the entire set of individuals chosen from the overall population for which the study data are to be used to make inferences. The target population defines the population to which the findings of a survey are meant to be generalized. It is important that target populations are clearly identified for the purposes of research study (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). It is typically not feasible, be it time or cost constraints, to study large groups; therefore the target population was narrowed to the seven card rooms in the Los Angeles County area.

### **Sample**

McMillan & Schumacher (2010) defined a sample as “the group of subjects or participants from whom the data are collected” (p. 129). The intention of sampling is to select individuals who are a good representation of a larger population so that researched study outcomes can be generalizable to that population (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The sample selected for this study was derived from a Southern California card room casino that has been in operation for a significant number of years, and was representative of the other card room casinos in the Los Angeles County area.

The current sample consisted of full-time day shift employees that had a valid police issued employee work permit, that allowed them to work for the organization, who

were not currently members of the executive leadership team, who could read and understand English, and must have been employed with the organization for at least one full year. All employees must be at least 21 years of age to legally work for a California card room casino. There were approximately 700 employees that worked for the card room casino at the time of the study. Of the 700 employees, 650 were not members of the executive leadership team, and there were approximately 200 employees who met the other sample requirements and were invited to participate in the study. This equated to approximately 31% of the total casino population that was not part of the executive leadership team. The sample was significant in size as related to the population being studied and provided uniformity to the study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). This helped to reduce sampling errors and allowed inferences to be made about the population.

### **Instrumentation**

The survey instruments were comprised of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass & Avolio, 1995) (Appendix H) and the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1985) (Appendix J). An e-mail letter of introduction was sent to potential participants via bcc to invite them to participate in the surveys. A brief instruction was included in the memo, which gave participants instructions on how to complete the survey. Participants were advised that the survey would approximately take 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

#### **Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)**

The MLQ is a survey comprised of 45 items that measures the full range of transformational-leadership styles (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The survey includes measurements of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire styles of leadership.



The MLQ measures transformational leadership through five components: (a) attributed idealized influence, (b) behavioral idealized influence, (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual consideration, and (e) individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1995).

The MLQ measures transactional leadership through two components: (a) contingent reward, and (b) active management-by-exception (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The MLQ measures laissez-faire leadership through passive management-by-exception (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The 45 items contained in the MLQ asked casino employees to rate the frequency of an action and transformational-leadership behavior on a 5-point Likert scale from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always).

Each item on the MLQ survey started with the phrase, “The person I am rating...”

Sample items follow:

- Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts
- Talks about their most important values and beliefs
- Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems
- Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished
- Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying (Bass & Avolio, 1995, p. 133).

According to Bass and Avolio (1995), the MLQ measures leadership-effectiveness behavior when that behavior is linked to individual and organizational achievement. It contains nine leadership components. The MLQ score is derived from adding all of the responses and dividing the total by the number of items that were contained in the scale. All of the leadership style scales have four items per scale, extra effort has three items, effectiveness has four items, and satisfaction has two items (Bass & Avolio, 1995).

## **Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)**

The job satisfaction survey (JSS) was designed by Spector (1985). The survey examines nine areas of job satisfaction which are the work itself, level of pay, fringe benefits, performance based rewards, promotion and advancement opportunities, supervisory support, organizational policies and procedures, communication effectiveness, and intrapersonal relations with coworkers (Spector, 1985). Each area of job satisfaction has four questions, and includes an ordinal scale. The JSS consists of a Likert-type scale that has six answer options ranging from disagree very much to agree very much. This instrument has been tested to certify it withstands psychometric properties. The reliability and validity coefficient alpha (the measurement of the internal consistency reliability) of the JSS is .91 (Spector 1985, 1997). The internal consistency and reliability can also be verified by using Cronbach's alpha coefficient of reliability, and must have a rating of .7 or higher to be considered reliable (AlZalabani & Modi, 2014; Cronbach, 1951).

## **Pilot Study**

In order to increase the validity and reliability of the instruments selected to be used in this study, the researcher conducted a pilot study utilizing the MLQ and JSS instruments with a group of 35 individuals in various departments from the neighboring card room property located one mile away, which represented a cross sample of the target population. The departments that were involved in the pilot study consisted of the following: cage, security, housekeeping and maintenance, gaming floor, food and beverage, and the administrative department. The 35 individuals that participated in the pilot study made up 10 percent of the casino's workforce.

The pilot test given to the sample of employees at a neighboring card room casino determined if the employees in the sample were capable of completing the surveys and answering all of the questions. The participants were selected from a separate location in order to ensure that they would not be included in the sample group of participants. After completion of the surveys, participants were given the opportunity to provide feedback based on the following questions:

1. Is the survey too long?
2. Are the directions and wording clear and explicit?
3. Is the format conducive to ease of response?
4. Do some of the items need to be rephrased or dropped?

The surveys were also checked for validity. “Researchers say that a measure is valid to the extent that it measures what it is designed to measure and accurately performs the function(s) it is purported to perform” (Patten, 2012, p. 61). To establish validity, a group of gaming industry professionals reviewed the surveys. The group included a representative from three different Los Angeles County casinos. The members of the group were encouraged to offer suggestions regarding the surveys.

## **Validity and Reliability**

### **Validity**

Validity is the extent to which a measure or set of measures accurately represents the concept of the study. Further, the validity of a research instrument is the accuracy and dependability of instruments, data, and findings. Bernard (2013) claimed that the threat to validity is initiated from internal and external sources. If the selected instrument is not specific enough, the researcher should work towards building a more accurate one

to achieve validity (Bernard, 2013, p. 47). The best way to test and validate an instrument for face value is to conduct similar studies using that instrument (Creswell, 2009). When similar studies are conducted, results can be compared to determine if the same or similar results occur from using that instrument. An instrument can be validated using the following evidence: face validity, content validity, construct validity, and criterion validity.

Hemsworth, Muterera, and Baregheh (2013) described the MLQ as a standard survey instrument that has been widely used to collect data about three different leadership styles: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership. The overall reliability of the MLQ items was calculated at  $\alpha = .94$ , which indicated that there was a high internal consistency, and when all subscales were calculated, the reliability values were .70 and above (Hemsworth et al., 2013), which was above the recommended minimum of .60 for exploratory studies (Churchill, 1979). Each of the standardized loadings were significant, yielding  $p < .05$  and indicating that the instrument had significant validity when considering convergent, discriminant, and concurrent validity (Hemsworth et al., 2013). Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam (2003) evaluated the psychometric properties of the MLQ and found strong support for the validity of the MLQ.

### **Reliability**

The instruments selected to be used for this study were the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 1995), and the JSS (Spector, 1985). These instruments have been tested by researchers and have been found to be reliable in previous studies. Past research confirms that the JSS is a reliable instrument. Findings from other job satisfaction scales were consistent

with the correlation of JSS scores (Spector, 1985). Past research has also verified the reliability of the MLQ through factor analyses which resulted in a six-factor model for the MLQ (Avolio et al., 1999). Additionally, a large variety of scholars have used the MLQ in research, experiencing reliability of the instrument.

### **Data Collection**

Prior to beginning the data collection from the participants, the researcher was approved to conduct the research from the Brandman University Institutional Review Board (BUIRB) (Appendix B). In order to protect the rights of the participants and their confidentiality, data collection did not begin until the researcher received approval from BUIRB.

The survey instruments included the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 1995) and the JSS (Spector, 1985). The researcher obtained permission to use both the MLQ (Appendix G) and the JSS (Appendix I) instruments from the authors prior to conducting the research. The instruments were combined into one continuous online document and were available for participants to access on either an on-site work computer, or on their own personal device. The surveys were anonymous, and all members of the organization were asked to participate.

Per approval from the General Manager (Appendix D), the Human Resources department manager of the casino sent out a companywide blind carbon copy email inviting all employees that met the sample requirements to participate in completing the survey which was hosted on [www.esurveycreator.com](http://www.esurveycreator.com). Brief instructions were included in the memo describing to participants how to take the survey. It was expected that participants would complete the survey in approximately 15 to 20 minutes. Questions or

concerns were directed to the researchers' school email address. There were posters advertising the survey placed in the employee break room, the Human Resource office, and attached as a memo to all employees' paychecks.

The researcher anticipated that the total time frame for data collection would be one week, whereas a sufficient level of data was collected from participants within six days. In addition to receiving an Informed Consent Form (Appendix F) and the Research Participant's Bill of Rights (See Appendix C), each participant was informed through online notification that their individual responses would not be publicized, and that the data would be reported as a combination of all responses. Additionally, the participants were informed that their survey and survey information would only be retained for one year.

### **Data Analysis**

The researcher conducted the quantitative data analysis at the conclusion of the survey process. A total of 133 California card room casino employees responded to the online survey, but only 127 met the sample requirements. The survey results were downloaded from eSurveyCreator to an Excel spreadsheet. The data was then loaded into a Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) for a more detailed level of analysis.

Paired scores were correlated in order to obtain a correlation coefficient, using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient.

When researchers want to examine the relationship between two quantitative sets of scores (at the interval or ratio levels), they compute a correlation coefficient.

The most widely used coefficient is the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, whose symbol is  $r$  (usually called the Pearson  $r$ ). (Patten, 2012, p. 123)

A separate correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between the variable pairs of transformational leadership/job satisfaction, transactional leadership/job satisfaction, and passive avoidant leadership/job satisfaction. Tables were generated based on the applicable data and the relationships among the variables were analyzed. After assessing the results and relationships among the variables, implications for the results related to transformational leadership and job satisfaction were addressed.

### **Limitations**

There were several limitations present in this research study. The first limitation was that the research was carried out in just one facility, and the absence of a control group may limit the applicability of the findings to California card room casinos operating in different locations. Thus, the internal validity of the research could be threatened (Khorsan & Crawford, 2014). The second limitation was the inability to definitively state if there was a correlation between the variables being studied; that one ultimately caused the other to occur. Any correlation could be coincidental or another factor's result not articulated in the research (Leedy & Ormrod, 2012). The third limitation was that the survey questions could have been confusing to some of the respondents, particularly those who do not use English as their primary language. The researcher attempted to minimize the limitation of confusion by using existing survey instruments which have strong constructs to validity, and which have been used by many researchers prior to this study. The fourth limitation was that this was a quantitative, non-experimental study and it was not possible to control the population being studied to determine cause and effect.

## Summary

Chapter 3 contains an explanation of the research procedures for the study of the effect of transformational leadership behavior on job satisfaction among California card room casino employees. The study utilized a quantitative, survey-design approach. Although the researcher considered the use of other research methodologies, the selected option for this study was the use of a quantitative survey-design approach. The researcher restated the purpose statement and research questions, explained the research design, identified the instrumentation used, and explained the validity and reliability of the surveys, followed by an outline of the data collection and data analysis procedures. Additionally, the researcher provided the sample size and the method for calculating the sample size. The researcher further discussed the statistical operations used to understand the relationship, patterns, and influences of transformational leadership behavior on job satisfaction for California card room casino employees. Finally, the researcher engaged a closed-ended survey to administer data collection through the [esurveycreator](#) website. Chapter 4 contains a detailed report of the findings from this research study, followed by Chapter 5, which contains a summary of the key findings, implications for action, and recommendations for further research.



## CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND FINDINGS

This chapter will present the findings of data collected using the methodology presented in the previous chapter. The chapter begins with an overview that includes the major categories of the chapter, the purpose, research questions, methodology, data collection procedures, and a population and sample summary. Lastly, the data findings as they relate to the research questions will be presented.

### **Overview**

This study sought to address potential links between transformational leadership behavior, employee job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Past research has shown that transformational leadership behavior has proven to be beneficial towards increasing employee job satisfaction and overall organizational commitment. The reason that the results of this research are important to members of the leadership team in the gaming industry is because if it is determined that there is a significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and employee job satisfaction, it may be possible for organizations in the gaming industry to reduce their turnover levels by modifying their leadership methods.

The participants in this study were members of a California card room casino located in the Los Angeles County area. At the time of the study, the casino had approximately 700 employees. Surveys were administered and completed by a variety of casino employees that worked in various departments. The sample size consisted of 200 day shift casino employees. Of the 133 participants who completed the survey, 127 were used for findings; 6 of the respondents had only been employed with the company for less than a year and therefore, did not meet the requirements for sample selection.

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this quantitative, non-experimental study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees.

The second purpose of this study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire leadership styles exhibited by the leadership team as defined by Bass and Avolio (1995) and identified by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) designed by Spector (1985).

## **Research Questions**

1. What is the relationship between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?
2. What is the relationship between transactional leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?
3. What is the relationship between laissez-faire leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

## **Research Methods and Data Collection Procedures**

The study approached the research questions from a quantitative non-experimental correlational research design perspective. The research was conducted using surveys to collect data on the correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction for California card room casino employees. For this study, the variables involved were transformational leadership (independent variable),

transactional leadership (independent variable), laissez-faire leadership (independent variable), and job satisfaction (dependent variable). The main goal of the study was to determine the statistical correlation between transformational leadership exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees.

The survey instruments utilized for data collection included the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 1995) and the JSS (Spector, 1985). Responses for the JSS use a 6-item Likert-type scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = moderately disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = slightly agree, 5 = agree moderately, 6 = strongly agree. The JSS is comprised of 36 questions which are divided into nine subscales. The nine subscales are (a) pay, (b) promotion, (c) supervision, (d) fringe benefits, (e) contingent rewards, (f) operating conditions, (g) coworkers, (h) nature of work, and (i) communication. Each of the nine subscales had a distribution of four questions and was comprised of both positive and negative sentiments. When the results for each subscale were calculated, the negative sentiments were assigned with reverse scoring. The two instruments were combined into one continuous online document and were available for participants to access via the internet which was hosted on [www.esurveycreator.com](http://www.esurveycreator.com).

### **Population**

This study's population was comprised of 101 licensed card room casinos in the State of California. Card room casinos are distinguished separately from Indian gaming casinos. Card room casinos are very different than Indian gaming casinos in the fact that card room casinos cannot bank their own games, and are prevented from having slot machines that can be typically found in Indian gaming casinos. The target population for this study was narrowed to the seven card rooms in the Los Angeles County area.

## **Sample**

The sample selected for this study was derived from a Southern California card room casino that has been in operation for a significant number of years, and was representative of the other card room casinos in the Los Angeles County area.

The sample consisted of full-time day shift employees that had a valid police issued employee work permit, that allowed them to work for the organization, who were not currently members of the executive leadership team, who could read and understand English, and must have been employed with the organization for at least one full year. There were approximately 700 employees that worked for the card room casino at the time of the study. Of the 700 employees, 650 were not members of the executive leadership team, and there were approximately 200 employees who met the other sample requirements and were invited to participate in the study. This equated to approximately 31% of the total casino population that was not part of the executive leadership team.

## **Demographic Data**

Once the data had been collected online via [www.esurveycreator.com](http://www.esurveycreator.com), the data was then downloaded into a Microsoft Excel file; and was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software in order to determine the frequency, percentage distributions, and the corresponding correlations between the independent and dependent variables using descriptive statistics. Data was collected from one hundred and thirty three participants. However, six participants were removed because they did not meet the sample requirement of being employed with the organization for at least one full year. Data analysis was conducted on the remaining one hundred and twenty seven participants ( $n = 127$ ).

Table 2 shows the distribution of the participant's answers to demographic questions. Of the sample of 127, 67 were male, and 60 were female, which was a corresponding percentage distribution of 52.8% and 47.2% respectively. The age range of participants that had the highest level of participation was 40 to 49 (36, 28.3%). Of the sample of 127, 33 were Hispanic, 32 were Asian, 28 were African American, and the remainder fell into other ethnic categories, which was a corresponding percentage distribution of 26.0%, 25.2%, 22.0%, and 26.8% respectively. The job position of the participating casino employee that had the highest level of participation was categorized as other (79, 62.2%), which meant that they elected to respond to the demographic question, did not work as a dealer, did not work as a non-dealer casino floor person (i.e. gaming department). Of the sample of 127, 62 were employed with the organization between 1-5 years, which was a corresponding percentage distribution of 48.8%.

Table 2

*Participant Demographics*

	<i>f</i>	%
Gender		
Male	67	52.8
Female	60	47.2
Age Range		
21 to 29	17	13.4
30 to 39	30	23.6
40 to 49	36	28.3
50 to 59	28	22.0
60 or older	16	12.6
Ethnicity		
Asian	32	25.2
African American	28	22.0
Caucasian	15	11.8
Hispanic	33	26.0
Native Hawaiian/American	7	5.5
Two to More Races	10	7.9
Prefer not to State	2	1.6

	<i>f</i>	%
Job Position		
Casino Floor, Non-Dealer	24	18.9
Dealer	18	14.2
Other	79	62.2
Decline to State	6	4.7
Years with the Organization		
1-5	62	48.8
6-10	33	26.0
11-15	20	15.7
16+	12	9.4

*n* = 127

### Descriptive Statistics

As seen in Table 3, the average of casino employee respondents perceived that their organizational leaders exhibited transformational leadership behaviors ( $M = 2.57$ ) more often than they exhibited other leadership behaviors. This was closely followed by transactional leadership behaviors ( $M = 2.47$ ). The average of casino employee respondents perceived that their organizational leaders exhibited passive-avoidant leadership behaviors ( $M = .83$ ) the least.

Table 3

#### *MLQ Leadership Styles – Mean Scores*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Transformational Leadership	2.57	.92
Transactional Leadership	2.47	.74
Passive-Avoidant Leadership	.83	.90

*n* = 127

**Transformational leadership subscales.** The data from the MLQ were further disaggregated in Table 4 by the individual subscales of transformational leadership. Within the transformational leadership subscales, casino organizational leaders scored as most often engaging in behaviors associated with idealized attributes ( $M = 2.91$ ),

followed by behaviors associated with inspirational motivation ( $M = 2.63$ ). Casino employee respondents perceived that their organizational leaders were less often engaging in behaviors associated with idealized behaviors ( $M = 2.44$ ), behaviors associated with intellectual stimulation ( $M = 2.43$ ), and behaviors associated with individual consideration ( $M = 2.42$ ).

Table 4

*MLQ Leadership Styles – Transformational Subscales*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Idealized Attributes	2.91	1.03
Idealized Behaviors	2.44	1.08
Inspirational Motivation	2.63	1.00
Intellectual Stimulation	2.43	.94
Individual Consideration	2.42	1.00

$n = 127$

**Transactional and passive-avoidant subscales.** The data from the MLQ were further disaggregated in Table 5 by the individual subscales of transactional and passive-avoidant leadership. Within the transactional leadership subscales, casino organizational leaders scored as most often engaging in behaviors associated with contingent rewards ( $M = 2.67$ ), followed by behaviors associated with the active management-by-exception leadership style ( $M = 1.96$ ). Within the passive-avoidant leadership subscales, casino employee respondents perceived that their organizational leaders were less often engaging in behaviors associated with the passive management-by-exception leadership style ( $M = .93$ ), and behaviors associated with the laissez-faire leadership style ( $M = .81$ ).

Table 5

*MLQ Leadership Styles – Transactional and Passive-Avoidant Subscales*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Transactional Leadership		
Contingent Reward	2.67	.97
Active Management-by- Exception	1.96	1.05
Passive-Avoidant Leadership		
Passive Management-by- Exception	.93	1.02
Laissez-Faire	.81	.89

*n* = 127

**Job satisfaction subscales.** The data from the JSS were further disaggregated in Table 6 by the individual subscales of job satisfaction. Within the job satisfaction subscales, scores of 0–2.99 are associated with negative satisfaction levels, scores of 3–3.99 are associated with ambivalent satisfaction levels, and scores of 4–6 are associated with positive satisfaction levels. Casino employee respondents scored their positive satisfaction levels as most often being associated with the nature of the work ( $M = 5.05$ ), followed by associations with supervision ( $M = 4.75$ ), associations with coworkers ( $M = 4.69$ ), associations with communication ( $M = 4.30$ ), and associations with operating conditions ( $M = 4.12$ ). Casino employee respondents scored their ambivalent satisfaction levels as most often being associated with contingent rewards ( $M = 3.84$ ), followed by associations with fringe benefits ( $M = 3.54$ ), associations with promotional opportunities ( $M = 3.35$ ), and associations with pay ( $M = 3.23$ ). Casino employee respondents did not score any subscale categories as being associated with a negative satisfaction level.



Table 6

*Job Satisfaction Survey Scale Scores*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Pay	3.23	1.28
Promotional Opportunities	3.35	1.05
Supervision	4.75	1.36
Fringe Benefits	3.54	1.13
Contingent Rewards	3.84	1.38
Operating Conditions	4.12	.91
Coworkers	4.69	1.06
Nature of the Work	5.05	1.05
Communication	4.30	1.22

*n* = 127

### **Presentation and Analysis of Data**

The three research questions were analyzed using correlation analyses in order to determine if there is a statistically significant relationship between transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire leadership and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees. The independent variables were transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership. The dependent variable was employee job satisfaction. The presentation and analysis of data as is relates to the tables will be presented by research question.

### **Correlation of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction**

Table 8 and Table 9 display the correlations of the independent variables of leadership styles and the dependent variables of job satisfaction, which are associated with all three research questions. The overall data analysis for the transformational leadership styles showed a definite moderate to strong positive correlation with job satisfaction with a confidence interval  $p \leq 0.05$  and a strong statistical significance at the

$p \leq 0.01$  level. The overall data analysis for the transactional leadership styles showed a mixed set of correlations with some positive correlations and some negative correlations, with a confidence interval  $p \leq 0.05$  and a strong statistical significance at the  $p \leq 0.01$  level. It is interesting to note that contingent rewards had an overall positive correlation with job satisfaction, but active management-by-exception had an overall mixed set of correlations with job satisfaction; with some correlations being positive, and some correlations being negative. Finally, the overall data analysis for the passive avoidant leadership styles showed a definite moderate to strong negative correlation with job satisfaction with a confidence interval  $p \leq 0.05$  and a strong statistical significance at the  $p \leq 0.01$  level. Table 7 provides a contextual overview for interpretation of the correlation of coefficients, assessing the strength of relationships between leadership styles and job satisfaction.

Table 7

*Interpretation of Values*

From	To	Interpretation
0.00	$\pm 0.20$	A negligible degree of correlation—this relationship could have occurred by chance alone, as well as from an existing relationship
$\pm 0.20$	$\pm 0.40$	A low degree of correlation—some relationship actually exists
$\pm 0.40$	$\pm 0.70$	A strong degree of correlation— a considerable relationship exists
$\pm 0.70$	$\pm 0.90$	A high degree of correlation—a definite, marked relationship exists
$\pm 0.90$	$\pm 1.00$	A very high degree of correlation—a very considerable relationship exists

Source: Goehring, H.J. (1981). *Statistical methods in education*. Information Resources Press, Arlington, VA.

## **Research Question 1**

Research Question 1 asked: What is the relationship between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

**Idealized influence (attributed)/pay.** The relationship between idealized influence (attributed) and pay exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .34, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Idealized influence (attributed)/promotional opportunities.** The relationship between idealized influence (attributed) and promotional opportunities exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .57, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader exhibits idealized influence (attributed), the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to promotional opportunities.

**Idealized influence (attributed)/supervision.** The relationship between idealized influence (attributed) and supervision exhibited a moderately strong degree of positive correlation at .41, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Idealized influence (attributed)/fringe benefits.** The relationship between idealized influence (attributed) and fringe benefits exhibited a moderately strong degree of positive correlation at .41, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Idealized influence (attributed)/contingent rewards.** The relationship between idealized influence (attributed) and contingent rewards exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .45, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Idealized influence (attributed)/operating conditions.** The relationship between idealized influence (attributed) and operating conditions exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .50, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader exhibits idealized influence (attributed), the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to operating conditions.

**Idealized influence (attributed)/coworkers.** The relationship between idealized influence (attributed) and coworkers exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .50, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader exhibits idealized influence (attributed), the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to coworkers.

**Idealized influence (attributed)/nature of the work.** The relationship between idealized influence (attributed) and the nature of the work exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .68, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This was the highest correlation out of the transformational leadership and job satisfaction subscales. This denoted that the relationship between these two variables

would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader exhibits idealized influence (attributed), the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to the nature of the work.

**Idealized influence (attributed)/communication.** The relationship between idealized influence (attributed) and communication exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .48, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Idealized influence (behavior)/pay.** The relationship between idealized influence (behavior) and pay exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .23, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Idealized influence (behavior)/promotional opportunities.** The relationship between idealized influence (behavior) and promotional opportunities exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .53, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader exhibits idealized influence (behavior), the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to promotional opportunities.

**Idealized influence (behavior)/supervision.** The relationship between idealized influence (behavior) and supervision exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .24, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Idealized influence (behavior)/fringe benefits.** The relationship between idealized influence (behavior) and fringe benefits exhibited a low degree of positive

correlation at .30, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Idealized influence (behavior)/contingent rewards.** The relationship between idealized influence (behavior) and contingent rewards exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .21, with a confidence interval of 95% and no statistical significance.

**Idealized influence (behavior)/operating conditions.** The relationship between idealized influence (behavior) and operating conditions exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .29, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Idealized influence (behavior)/coworkers.** The relationship between idealized influence (behavior) and coworkers resulted in a negligible degree of positive correlation at .15 and no statistical significance ( $p$  was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Idealized influence (behavior)/nature of the work.** The relationship between idealized influence (behavior) and the nature of the work exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .44, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Idealized influence (behavior)/communication.** The relationship between idealized influence (behavior) and communication exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .36, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Inspirational motivation/pay.** The relationship between inspirational motivation and pay exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .37, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Inspirational motivation/promotional opportunities.** The relationship between inspirational motivation and promotional opportunities exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .62, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader exhibits inspirational motivation, the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to promotional opportunities.

**Inspirational motivation/supervision.** The relationship between inspirational motivation and supervision exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .38, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Inspirational motivation/fringe benefits.** The relationship between inspirational motivation and fringe benefits exhibited a moderately strong degree of positive correlation at .40, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Inspirational motivation/contingent rewards.** The relationship between inspirational motivation and contingent rewards exhibited a moderately strong degree of positive correlation at .40, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Inspirational motivation/operating conditions.** The relationship between inspirational motivation and operating conditions exhibited a moderately strong degree of

positive correlation at .40, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Inspirational motivation/coworkers.** The relationship between inspirational motivation and coworkers exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .32, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Inspirational motivation/nature of the work.** The relationship between inspirational motivation and the nature of the work exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .54, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader exhibits inspirational motivation, the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to the nature of the work.

**Inspirational motivation/communication.** The relationship between inspirational motivation and communication exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .50, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader exhibits inspirational motivation, the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to communication.

**Intellectual stimulation/pay.** The relationship between intellectual stimulation and pay exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .27, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .



**Intellectual stimulation/promotional opportunities.** The relationship between intellectual stimulation and promotional opportunities exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .58, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader exhibits intellectual stimulation, the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to promotional opportunities.

**Intellectual stimulation/supervision.** The relationship between intellectual stimulation and supervision exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .26, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Intellectual stimulation/fringe benefits.** The relationship between intellectual stimulation and fringe benefits exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .28, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Intellectual stimulation/contingent rewards.** The relationship between intellectual stimulation and contingent rewards exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .24, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Intellectual stimulation/operating conditions.** The relationship between intellectual stimulation and operating conditions exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .37, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Intellectual stimulation/coworkers.** The relationship between intellectual stimulation and coworkers resulted in a negligible degree of positive correlation at .12 and no statistical significance (p was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Intellectual stimulation/nature of the work.** The relationship between intellectual stimulation and the nature of the work exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .37, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Intellectual stimulation/communication.** The relationship between intellectual stimulation and communication exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .32, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Individual consideration/pay.** The relationship between individual consideration and pay exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .38, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Individual consideration/promotional opportunities.** The relationship between individual consideration and promotional opportunities exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .62, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader exhibits individual consideration, the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to promotional opportunities.

**Individual consideration/supervision.** The relationship between individual consideration and supervision exhibited a moderately strong degree of positive

correlation at .41, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Individual consideration/fringe benefits.** The relationship between individual consideration and fringe benefits exhibited a moderately strong degree of positive correlation at .42, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Individual consideration/contingent rewards.** The relationship between individual consideration and contingent rewards exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .39, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Individual consideration/operating conditions.** The relationship between individual consideration and operating conditions exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .39, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Individual consideration/coworkers.** The relationship between individual consideration and coworkers exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .34, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Individual consideration/nature of the work.** The relationship between individual consideration and the nature of the work exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .54, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader

exhibits individual consideration, the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to the nature of the work.

**Individual consideration/communication.** The relationship between individual consideration and communication exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .38, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

Table 8 below illustrates all of the correlations for transformational leadership scores and job satisfaction.

Table 8

*Correlations for Transformational Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction*

	Idealized Attributes	Idealized Behaviors	Inspirational Motivation	Intellectual Stimulation	Individual Consideration
Pay	.34**	.23**	.37**	.27**	.38**
Promotional Opportunities	.57**	.53**	.62**	.58**	.62**
Supervision	.41**	.24**	.38**	.26**	.41**
Fringe Benefits	.41**	.30**	.40**	.28**	.42**
Contingent Rewards	.45**	.21*	.40**	.24**	.39**
Operating Conditions	.50**	.29**	.40**	.37**	.39**
Coworkers	.50**	.15	.32**	.12	.34**
Nature of the Work	.68**	.44**	.54**	.37**	.54**
Communication	.48**	.36**	.50**	.32**	.38**

Note. n = 127; \*  $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p \leq 0.01$

**Research Question 2**

Research Question 2 asked: What is the relationship between transactional leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

**Contingent rewards/pay.** The relationship between contingent rewards and pay resulted in a negligible degree of positive correlation at .16 and no statistical significance ( $p$  was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Contingent rewards/promotional opportunities.** The relationship between contingent rewards and promotional opportunities exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .58, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ . This was the highest correlation out of the transactional leadership and job satisfaction subscales. This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the leader provides contingent rewards, the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it relates to promotional opportunities.

**Contingent rewards/supervision.** The relationship between contingent rewards and supervision exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .22, with a confidence interval of 95% and no statistical significance.

**Contingent rewards/fringe benefits.** The relationship between contingent rewards and fringe benefits exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .28, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Contingent rewards/contingent rewards.** The relationship between contingent rewards related to transactional leadership and contingent rewards related to job satisfaction exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .27, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Contingent rewards/operating conditions.** The relationship between contingent rewards and operating conditions exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .49, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Contingent rewards/coworkers.** The relationship between contingent rewards and coworkers exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .32, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Contingent rewards/nature of the work.** The relationship between contingent rewards and the nature of the work exhibited a strong degree of positive correlation at .46, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Contingent rewards/communication.** The relationship between contingent rewards and communication exhibited a low degree of positive correlation at .34, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Active management-by-exception/pay.** The relationship between active management-by-exception and pay resulted in a negligible degree of positive correlation at .14 and no statistical significance ( $p$  was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Active management-by-exception/promotional opportunities.** The relationship between active management-by-exception and promotional opportunities resulted in a negligible degree of positive correlation at .15 and no statistical significance ( $p$  was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Active management-by-exception/supervision.** The relationship between active management-by-exception and supervision resulted in a negligible degree of negative

correlation at -.16 and no statistical significance (p was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Active management-by-exception/fringe benefits.** The relationship between active management-by-exception and fringe benefits resulted in a negligible degree of positive correlation at .01 and no statistical significance (p was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Active management-by-exception/contingent rewards.** The relationship between active management-by-exception and contingent rewards resulted in a negligible degree of negative correlation at -.10 and no statistical significance (p was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Active management-by-exception/operating conditions.** The relationship between active management-by-exception and operating conditions resulted in a negligible degree of negative correlation at -.09 and no statistical significance (p was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Active management-by-exception/coworkers.** The relationship between active management-by-exception and coworkers exhibited a low degree of negative correlation at -.29, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Active management-by-exception/nature of the work.** The relationship between active management-by-exception and the nature of the work resulted in a negligible degree of negative correlation at -.12 and no statistical significance (p was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

**Active management-by-exception/communication.** The relationship between active management-by-exception and communication resulted in a negligible degree of

negative correlation at -.11 and no statistical significance (p was not  $\leq 0.01$  and was outside the confidence interval of  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

Table 9 below illustrates all of the correlations for transactional leadership scores, passive avoidant leadership scores, and job satisfaction.

Table 9

*Correlations for Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction*

	Contingent Reward	Active Management- by- Exception	Passive Management- by- Exception	Laissez-Faire
Pay	.16	.14	-.31**	-.33**
Promotional Opportunities	.58**	.15	-.48**	-.38**
Supervision	.22*	-.16	-.55**	-.44**
Fringe Benefits	.28**	.01	-.35**	-.27**
Contingent Rewards	.27**	-.10	-.48**	-.40**
Operating Conditions	.49**	-.09	-.49**	-.29**
Coworkers	.32**	-.29**	-.57**	-.41**
Nature of the Work	.46**	-.12	-.49**	-.44**
Communication	.34**	-.11	-.44**	-.27**

Note. n = 127; \*  $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p \leq 0.01$

**Research Question 3**

Research Question 3 asked: What is the relationship between laissez-faire leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

**Laissez-faire/pay.** The relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and pay exhibited a low degree of negative correlation at -.33, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Laissez-faire/promotional opportunities.** The relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and promotional opportunities exhibited a low degree of negative



correlation at -.38, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Laissez-faire/supervision.** The relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and supervision exhibited a moderately strong degree of negative correlation at -.44, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Laissez-faire/fringe benefits.** The relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and fringe benefits exhibited a low degree of negative correlation at -.27, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Laissez-faire/contingent rewards.** The relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and contingent rewards exhibited a moderately strong degree of negative correlation at -.40, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Laissez-faire/operating conditions.** The relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and operating conditions exhibited a low degree of negative correlation at -.29, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Laissez-faire/coworkers.** The relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and coworkers exhibited a moderately strong degree of negative correlation at -.41, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Laissez-faire/nature of the work.** The relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and the nature of the work exhibited a moderately strong degree of negative correlation at -.44, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

**Laissez-faire/communication.** The relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and communication exhibited a low degree of negative correlation at -.27, with a confidence interval of 95% and a statistical significance of  $p \leq 0.01$ .

Table 10 below illustrates all of the correlations for casino organizational leader transactional leadership scores, passive avoidant leadership scores, and casino employee job satisfaction.

Table 10

*Correlations for Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction*

	Contingent Reward	Active Management- by- Exception	Passive Management- by- Exception	Laissez-Faire
Pay	.16	.14	-.31**	-.33**
Promotional Opportunities	.58**	.15	-.48**	-.38**
Supervision	.22*	-.16	-.55**	-.44**
Fringe Benefits	.28**	.01	-.35**	-.27**
Contingent Rewards	.27**	-.10	-.48**	-.40**
Operating Conditions	.49**	-.09	-.49**	-.29**
Coworkers	.32**	-.29**	-.57**	-.41**
Nature of the Work	.46**	-.12	-.49**	-.44**
Communication	.34**	-.11	-.44**	-.27**

Note. n = 127; \*  $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p \leq 0.01$

### Summary

The findings from this research were obtained from 127 employees in a card room casino in Los Angeles County. The participants were comprised of full-time day shift employees that had a valid police issued employee work permit, that allowed them to work for the organization, who were not currently members of the executive leadership team, who could read and understand English, and must have been employed with the organization for at least one full year. The participants responded to the 45 item MLQ

survey, which broke down leadership into the following nine subscales: (a) idealized influence (attributed), (b) idealized influence (behavior), (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual stimulation, (e) individual consideration, (f) contingent rewards, (g) active management-by-exception, (h) passive management-by-exception, and (i) laissez-faire leadership. The participants also responded to the 36 item JSS survey, which broke down job satisfaction into the following nine subscales: (a) pay, (b) promotional opportunities, (c) supervision, (d) fringe benefits, (e) contingent rewards, (f) operating conditions, (g) coworkers, (h) nature of the work, and (i) communication.

This study's primary focus was to examine the correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction among California card room employees. The highest statistical relationship identified between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction existed between the transformational leadership subscale of idealized influence (attributed) and the job satisfaction subscale of the work itself at .68. The lowest statistical relationship identified between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction existed between the transformational leadership subscale of active management-by-exception and the job satisfaction subscale of fringe benefits at .01. The overall data analysis for the transformational leadership styles showed a definite moderate to strong positive correlation with job satisfaction with a confidence interval  $p \leq 0.05$  and a strong statistical significance at the  $p \leq 0.01$  level. This denoted that the relationship between these two variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing these correlations, the greater the degree to which the organizational leader provides transformational leadership behavior, the higher the casino employees' level of job satisfaction.

## CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this quantitative, non-experimental study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees.

The second purpose of this study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire leadership styles exhibited by the leadership team as defined by Bass and Avolio (1995) and identified by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) designed by Spector (1985).

### **Research Questions**

1. What is the relationship between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?
2. What is the relationship between transactional leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?
3. What is the relationship between laissez-faire leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

### **Research Methods and Data Collection Procedures**

The study approached the research questions from a quantitative non-experimental correlational research design perspective. The research was conducted using surveys to collect data on the correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction for California card room casino employees. For this study,

the variables involved were transformational leadership (independent variable), transactional leadership (independent variable), laissez-faire leadership (independent variable), and job satisfaction (dependent variable). The main goal of the study was to determine the statistical correlation between transformational leadership exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees.

The survey instruments utilized for data collection included the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 1995) and the JSS (Spector, 1985). Responses for the JSS use a 6-item Likert-type scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = moderately disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = slightly agree, 5 = agree moderately, 6 = strongly agree. The JSS is comprised of 36 questions which are divided into nine subscales. The nine subscales are (a) pay, (b) promotion, (c) supervision, (d) fringe benefits, (e) contingent rewards, (f) operating conditions, (g) coworkers, (h) nature of work, and (i) communication. Each of the nine subscales had a distribution of four questions and was comprised of both positive and negative sentiments. When the results for each subscale were calculated, the negative sentiments were assigned with reverse scoring. The two instruments were combined into one continuous online document and were available for participants to access via the internet which was hosted on [www.esurveycreator.com](http://www.esurveycreator.com).

### **Population**

This study's population was comprised of 101 licensed card room casinos in the State of California. Card room casinos are distinguished separately from Indian gaming casinos. Card room casinos are very different than Indian gaming casinos in the fact that card room casinos cannot bank their own games, and are prevented from having slot

machines that can be typically found in Indian gaming casinos. The target population for this study was narrowed to the seven card rooms in the Los Angeles County area.

### **Sample**

The sample selected for this study was derived from a Southern California card room casino that has been in operation for a significant number of years, and was representative of the other card room casinos in the Los Angeles County area.

The sample consisted of full-time day shift employees that had a valid police issued employee work permit, that allowed them to work for the organization, who were not currently members of the executive leadership team, who could read and understand English, and must have been employed with the organization for at least one full year. There were approximately 700 employees that worked for the card room casino at the time of the study. Of the 700 employees, 650 were not members of the executive leadership team, and there were approximately 200 employees who met the other sample requirements and were invited to participate in the study. This equated to approximately 31% of the total casino population that was not part of the executive leadership team.

### **Major Findings**

A total of approximately 200 day shift casino employees were invited to participate in the study. 133 participants completed the survey, but 6 of the participants did not meet the sample requirements of being employed with the organization for over one year. The remaining 127 participants equated to a response rate of 63.5%. The two surveys administered to the participants measured three independent variables of leadership, and the dependent variable of employee job satisfaction. Two out of the three independent variables of leadership had marginally close means, with the other

independent variable being significantly less. The highest mean score out of the independent variables of leadership was transformational leadership ( $M = 2.57$ ), and the second highest mean score was transactional leadership ( $M = 2.47$ ). The lowest mean score out of the independent variables of leadership was passive-avoidant leadership, or laissez-faire leadership ( $M = 0.83$ ). The mean score of the dependent variable of employee job satisfaction was ( $M = 4.10$ ).

### **Research Question 1**

Research Question 1 asked: What is the relationship between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

The overall data analysis for the transformational leadership styles showed a definite moderate to strong positive correlation with job satisfaction with a confidence interval  $p \leq 0.05$  and a strong statistical significance at the  $p \leq 0.01$  level. This denoted that the relationship between these variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this overall correlation, the greater the degree to which the card room casino employee perceived that the leader exhibited transformational leadership behavior, the greater the degree the casino employees' level of job satisfaction. Additionally, the transformational leadership subscale of idealized influence (attributed) and the job satisfaction subscale of the nature of the work were determined to be the highest correlation out of the transformational leadership and job satisfaction subscales at .68. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the card room casino employee perceived that the leader exhibited idealized influence (attributed), the greater the degree of the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it related to the nature of the work.

The findings of this research collaborate with the findings of prior research asserting that the satisfaction levels of employees greatly increase when transformational leadership behaviors are utilized by organizational leaders (Gil et al., 2008; Gill et al., 2010; Kim & Jogaratnam, 2010). The findings also reflected that attributed idealized influence was seen to have the greatest effect on job satisfaction. When transformational leaders present themselves as engaging role models for followers, they establish the attributed component of idealized influence (Harper, 2012). Demonstrating influence using the transformational leadership style promotes organizational environments where employees can openly communicate with their leaders; and the employees in turn, experience relatively high levels of job satisfaction.

Table 11 below illustrates all of the correlations that have a strong degree of correlation for transformational leadership scores and job satisfaction.

Table 11

*Correlations for Transformational Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction*

	Idealized Attributes	Idealized Behaviors	Inspirational Motivation	Intellectual Stimulation	Individual Consideration
Pay	.34**	.23**	.37**	.27**	.38**
Promotional Opportunities	.57**	.53**	.62**	.58**	.62**
Supervision	.41**	.24**	.38**	.26**	.41**
Fringe Benefits	.41**	.30**	.40**	.28**	.42**
Contingent Rewards	.45**	.21*	.40**	.24**	.39**
Operating Conditions	.50**	.29**	.40**	.37**	.39**
Coworkers	.50**	.15	.32**	.12	.34**
Nature of the Work	.68**	.44**	.54**	.37**	.54**
Communication	.48**	.36**	.50**	.32**	.38**

Note. n = 127; \* p ≤ 0.05; \*\* p ≤ 0.01



## **Research Question 2**

Research Question 2 asked: What is the relationship between transactional leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

The overall data analysis for the transactional leadership styles showed a mixed set of correlations with job satisfaction, with some positive correlations and some negative correlations. It is interesting to note that contingent rewards had an overall positive correlation with job satisfaction, but active management-by-exception had an overall mixed set of correlations with job satisfaction; with some correlations being positive, and some correlations being negative. All of the correlations for contingent rewards had a confidence interval  $p \leq 0.05$  and a strong statistical significance at the  $p \leq 0.01$  level, with the exception of pay and supervision, which denoted that the relationship between these variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this overall correlation, the greater the degree to which the card room casino employee perceived that the leader exhibited transactional leadership behavior by way of contingent rewards, the greater the degree the casino employees' level of job satisfaction; and the greater the degree to which the card room casino employee perceived that the leader exhibited transactional leadership behavior by way of active management-by-exception, the lesser the degree the casino employee's level of job satisfaction. Additionally, the transactional leadership subscale of contingent rewards and the job satisfaction subscale of promotional opportunities were determined to be the highest correlation out of the transactional leadership and job satisfaction subscales at .58. In assessing this correlation, the greater the degree to which the card room casino employee perceived that

the leader exhibited the use of contingent rewards, the greater the degree of the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it related promotional opportunities.

The findings of this research collaborate with the findings of prior research asserting that the satisfaction levels of employees is affected in a mixed capacity when transactional leadership behaviors are utilized by organizational leaders. When contingent rewards are used, the leader offers rewards to the employee in exchange for the employee's performance and effort to complete the task (Camps & Torres, 2011). Sadeghi and Pihie (2012) state that contingent rewards are the most active and engaging form of the transactional leadership style.

Dissimilar to contingent rewards, Northouse (2013) presented that both active as well as passive management-by-exception behavior involved corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement. Both the active and passive management-by-exception leadership behaviors use more negative reinforcement patterns than positive reinforcement patterns. When management-by-exception behavior is utilized by leaders, the work environment tends to be negative with a resultant effect on job satisfaction (Malloy & Penprase, 2010).

Table 12 below illustrates all of the correlations that have a strong degree of correlation for transactional leadership scores and job satisfaction.

Table 12

*Correlations for Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction*

	Contingent Reward	Active Management- by- Exception	Passive Management- by- Exception
Pay	.16	.14	-.31**
Promotional Opportunities	.58**	.15	-.48**
Supervision	.22*	-.16	-.55**
Fringe Benefits	.28**	.01	-.35**
Contingent Rewards	.27**	-.10	-.48**
Operating Conditions	.49**	-.09	-.49**
Coworkers	.32**	-.29**	-.57**
Nature of the Work	.46**	-.12	-.49**
Communication	.34**	-.11	-.44**

Note. n = 127; \*  $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p \leq 0.01$

**Research Question 3**

Research Question 3 asked: What is the relationship between laissez-faire leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

The data analysis for the laissez-faire leadership style showed a definite moderately low negative correlation with job satisfaction with a confidence interval  $p \leq 0.05$  and a strong statistical significance at the  $p \leq 0.01$  level. This denoted that the relationship between these variables would be true 99% of the time. In assessing this overall correlation, the greater the degree to which the card room casino employee perceived that the leader exhibited laissez-faire leadership behavior, the lesser the degree the casino employees' level of job satisfaction. Additionally, the laissez-faire leadership style and the job satisfaction subscales of supervision and the nature of the work were

determined to be the highest correlation out of the laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction subscales at -.44. In assessing these correlations, the greater the degree to which the card room casino employee perceived that the leader exhibited laissez-faire leadership behavior, the lesser the degree of the casino employees' level of job satisfaction as it related to supervision and the nature of the work.

The findings of this research support the fact that the laissez-faire leadership style has the ability to create an environment of low job satisfaction and poor customer service. Harper (2012) suggest that the laissez-faire leadership style has the strong possibility of generating outcomes that result in chaotic work environments, poor customer service, and high overhead costs; because laissez-faire leaders do not showcase their leadership abilities in a manner that exudes strong organizational directives.

Table 13 below illustrates all of the correlations that have a strong degree of correlation for laissez-faire leadership scores and job satisfaction.

Table 13

*Correlations for Leadership Scores and Job Satisfaction*

	Laissez-Faire
Pay	-.33**
Promotional Opportunities	-.38**
<b>Supervision</b>	<b>-.44**</b>
Fringe Benefits	-.27**
<b>Contingent Rewards</b>	<b>-.40**</b>
Operating Conditions	-.29**
<b>Coworkers</b>	<b>-.41**</b>
<b>Nature of the Work</b>	<b>-.44**</b>
Communication	-.27**

Note. n = 127; \* p ≤ 0.05; \*\* p ≤ 0.01

## **Conclusions**

The significance of this non-experimental, quantitative, correlational study was its ability to fill a gap in the research and literature by providing data to support the correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees. Determining the fact that there was a correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction has both professional and social change applications. The data collected for this research, and the study's findings indicate that there is a significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction. Due to the nature of these findings, it showcases the need for organizations in the hospitality and gaming industry to establish programs that focus on leadership practices and employee retention strategies; thus improving job satisfaction, and reducing the considerable costs of employee turnover.

In this dissertation's examination of the relationship between leadership behaviors exhibited by the leadership team and employee job satisfaction, the findings illustrate that transformational leadership behavior is a critical element that needs to be incorporated into the organization's work environment. The use of transactional leadership behavior is useful when utilizing contingent rewards, but the findings show that this leadership style is less effective than transformational leadership when it comes to employee job satisfaction. The challenge for most organizations will be to ascertain which leadership style is most appropriate for their work environment, and which leadership style and/or behavior will generate the most positive response towards their overall group of employee's job satisfaction.

## **Conclusion for Research Question 1**

Research Question 1 asked: What is the relationship between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

**Conclusion.** Since transformational leadership behavior uses a less coercive approach, it is a more generally accepted style of leadership by followers (Avolio, 2010). Yukl (2006) found that there is substantial evidence that supports the fact that transformational leadership is an effective form of leadership. Yukl (2006) also noted that transformational leadership behavior was proven to be effective in a variety of different situations.

California card room employees are most satisfied with transformational leadership behavior when the leadership team exhibits attributed idealized influence and inspirational motivation. Transformational leadership behavior has a strong positive correlation to employee job satisfaction, and prompts increased satisfaction levels amongst individuals within the organization. Employees with low levels of job satisfaction in the gaming industry tend to move from one organization to another (Stedham & Mitchell, 1996). Positive job satisfaction promotes environments for employees to stay with organizations, which reduces overall turnover cost. Additionally, It has been determined that increasing employee job satisfaction greatly has an effect on the potential profitability of an organization (Kim & Jogaratnam, 2010).

## **Conclusion for Research Question 2**

Research Question 2 asked: What is the relationship between transactional leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

**Conclusion.** Transactional leadership behavior impacted employee job satisfaction both positively as well as negatively. The positive effects on job satisfaction were only strong on a few subscales, but the negative effects on job satisfaction were more prominent. Transactional leadership behavior was deemed to be utilized by the leadership team as much as transformational leadership behavior, but the effects were not completely positive or favorable. This research concluded that transactional leadership can be utilized in some cases, but it is cautioned not to solely depend on this leadership style due to the potential negative effects on employee job satisfaction.

Northouse (2013) expressed that the negative component of transactional leadership is that the followers are motivated to accomplish tasks by being rewarded or by being punished. While the transactional leadership style may produce the expected results, it is unlikely that the same level of effort will be consistently displayed without some form of incentive being continually offered. Yukl (2006) stated that transactional leadership involves an interaction between the leader and the follower that may result in follower compliance with what was requested by the leader, but the follower's effort is not likely to generate enthusiasm and commitment towards task objectives (p. 262).

### **Conclusion for Research Question 3**

Research Question 3 asked: What is the relationship between laissez-faire leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees?

**Conclusion.** Three significant styles of leadership are present in the hospitality and gaming industry: laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational. Of the three, the two most effective leadership styles in the hospitality and gaming industry are transactional and transformational leadership (Scott-Halsell et al., 2008). Laissez-faire leadership behavior has an overall negative effect on employee job satisfaction, and has a strong negative correlation on four out of the nine job satisfaction subscales. This study concluded that this leadership behavior has a damaging effect to the organization as it relates to job satisfaction. Since there was no evidence of any positive relationship between this leadership style and job satisfaction, it is understandable why this particular leadership style was not identified as a widely utilized leadership style in the organization.

### **Implications for Action**

Transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction were the focus of this research study. The results from this study will be beneficial to card room casino employees, by helping their organizational leaders to ascertain the best leadership style for their organization. Additionally, the results of this study indicate a need for important implications for action from the casino executive leadership team.



### **Implication for Action 1: Improve Communication**

The casino executive leadership team needs to have a presence with the team members and communicate their values, purpose, and mission of the organization to their employees. The casino executive leadership team must also strive to nourish the interpersonal relationships within the casino by promoting a work environment that is cross-functional. Communication between functional teams builds collaboration and comradery amongst the team members, and establishes associations that can increase job satisfaction as it is related to intellectual stimulation, which statistically was one of the lower correlation scores.

Most card room casinos conduct pre-shift meetings to disseminate information to the employees, but it would prove to be a useful communication vehicle if one of the organizational leaders were to participate in the pre-shift meetings on a routine basis. When employees are able to connect or have the perception that they can connect to the leadership team, they feel that there is a more direct form of communication established within the organization. Actions like these will assist the organization in fostering a more communicative environment within the organization.

### **Implication for Action 2: Non-monetary Rewards**

The results of this study reflected that the majority of card room casino employees felt ambiguous about the following job satisfaction subscales: pay, promotion opportunities, fringe benefits, and contingent rewards; but according to Aisha and Hardjomidjojo (2013) properly utilized non-monetary rewards have the ability to have a significant influence on job satisfaction. Organizational leaders can develop ways to

reward employees through recognition, acknowledgement, or organizational praise. These types of efforts go a long way towards an employee's job satisfaction level.

### **Implication for Action 3: Optimize Retention Strategies**

This study examined the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction in the hospitality and gaming industry. As stated by Tews et al., (2014), turnover levels are exceeding the 50% mark in the hospitality and gaming industry. The purpose of the findings presented in this research is to provide organizational leaders in the gaming industry with valuable information so they can optimize their retention strategies in order to reduce employee turnover levels.

Organizational leaders can work with their functional teams to develop strategies to cross-train their employees, which will allow them developmental growth and advancement opportunities within the organization. Additionally, with the assistance of human resources, each functional team can provide a representative to serve on a focus group that would discuss organizational issues. The focus group would be a beneficial way for the organizational leaders to gain an employee perspective on company concerns.

### **Implication for Action 4: Supervisor and Manager Training**

This research indicated that the passive-avoidant leadership style of passive management-by-exception and coworker interactions, as well as supervision, have the greatest negative impact on employee job satisfaction. The casino executive leadership team must strive to ensure that their supervisors and managers have sufficient training and the tools needed to address issues as they arise, and to ensure that they have the necessary support they require when making important decisions.

### **Implication for Action 5: Transformational Leadership Training**

Results from this study revealed that when transformational leadership behavior is used in the workplace, it has a positive effect on the job satisfaction levels of casino employees. Due to this information, gaming organizations need to make it a point to develop strategies towards training and developing their employees' leadership behaviors. By providing their leadership team with adequate leadership training on how to become effective transformational leaders, the organization will be able to establish a foundation that will lead to increases in bottom line profits, a sustained workforce, and an improved quality of life for their employees.

### **Recommendations for Further Research**

The fact that this may be the first research study that specifically investigated leadership styles and job satisfaction in a California card room casino creates a wealth of opportunities for further study in this area. Further research should address the limitations of this study and build on its results. The following are several recommendations for future research and scholarly inquiry.

#### **Recommendation 1**

A replication of this study is strongly encouraged. This researcher did not find any research on California card room casinos, and a replicated study conducted after a number of years would provide substantial data on industry trends.

#### **Recommendation 2**

Future researchers should consider conducting similar research at the other California card room casinos. Further, the demographic data collected should be expanded and further analyzed to provide more information about the influence of

industry, job classification, age, sex, qualifications, seniority level, leadership styles, and outcomes.

### **Recommendation 3**

There are many different types of casinos across the nation, and it is possible that casino employees could transition to a non-card room casino. A future study could evaluate a card room casino and a non-card room casino to compare the data and see if the results are different or the same.

### **Recommendation 4**

Conduct a study on two groups of employees; satisfied versus dissatisfied.

### **Recommendation 5**

Future research should also be expanded to include and incorporate regression analysis which would investigate causality in the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction.

### **Recommendation 6**

This study utilized a quantitative method, which did not obtain any personal opinions or conduct any observations of the participants, and the results of a future study may benefit from a qualitative or mixed-methods methodology.

### **Recommendation 7**

The participants of future research should be expanded to include participants from different organizations within the hospitality and gaming industry.

## **Recommendation 8**

In addition to further research on the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction, there is a need for additional exploration into other aspects of the organization.

Additional questions to be explored are as follows:

- What is the relationship between leadership style and organizational profitability?
- What is the relationship between employee job satisfaction and employee productivity?

These are some of the questions around which further research is recommended to fill the gap that exists in the body of knowledge about leadership in the hospitality and gaming industry.

## **Concluding Remarks and Reflections**

Recent research indicates that organizations in the hospitality and gaming industry are experiencing turnover levels in excess of 50% (Tews et al., 2014), and the cost of replacing an employee can often exceed the annual salary for the vacated position (Bryant & Allen, 2013). There is a strong negative correlation between employee's intentions to leave an organization and employee job satisfaction and motivation (Al-Zoubi, 2012). This study addressed the gap in the research and provided organizational leaders of California card room casinos with additional tools to increase employee job satisfaction and reduce employee turnover.

The purpose of this quantitative, non-experimental study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees. The second purpose of this study was to determine if there is a correlation between transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire leadership styles exhibited by the leadership team as defined by Bass and Avolio (1995) and identified by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) designed by Spector (1985). The researcher investigated the relationship between transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees. The study analyzed data collected through the use of two Likert type surveys which were administered to card room casino employees. The findings of this research identified that the strongest statistical relationship identified were between the transformational leadership subscale of idealized influence (attributed) and the job satisfaction subscale of the work itself at .68, and the weakest statistical relationship identified were between the transactional leadership subscale of active management-by-exception and the job satisfaction subscale of fringe benefits at 0.01.

The hospitality and gaming industry is an essential part of the U.S. economy. Organizational leaders of card room casinos must provide the best possible leadership behavior towards their employees to warrant satisfactory employee job satisfaction. The relationship between the transformational leadership behavior exhibited by the leadership team and job satisfaction among California card room employees was identified and confirmed in this study. Addressing the needs of both internal as well as external

customers is an important aspect of leadership, and card room employees are happier and more satisfied in an environment that utilizes transformational leadership. This study revealed that the use of transformational leadership behavior has a positive effect on job satisfaction, which can lead to an increased level of organizational commitment and ultimately reduce organizational turnover. Additionally, it can generate a progressive organizational movement that perpetuates productivity and increases employee morale.

## REFERENCES

- Agrusa, J., & Lema, J. D. (2007). An examination of Mississippi gulf coast casino management styles with implications for employee turnover. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, *11*(1), 13-26.
- Aisha, A. N., & Hardjomidjojo, P. (2013). Effects of working ability, working condition, motivation and incentive on employees multi-dimensional performance. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, *4*(6), 605-609.  
doi:10.7763/IJIMT.2013.V4.470
- Akehurst, G., Comeche, J., & Galindo, M. (2009). Job satisfaction and commitment in the entrepreneurial SME. *Small Business Economics*, *32*, 277-289.  
doi:10.1007/s11187-008-9116-z
- Al-Mailam, F. (2004). Transactional versus transformational style of leadership employee perception of leadership efficacy in public and private hospitals in Kuwait. *Quality Management in Health Care*, *13*(4), 278-284.
- AlZalabani, A., & Modi, R. S. (2014). Impact of human resources management practice and perceived organizational support on job satisfaction: Evidence from Yanbu Industrial City, KSA. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*(3), 33-52.
- Al-Zoubi, M. (2012). Generating benchmarking indicators for employee job satisfaction. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *23*, 27-44.  
doi:10.1080/14783363.2011.637780
- American Gaming Association. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.americangaming.org/>



- Antonakis, J. (2012). Transformational and charismatic leadership. In D. Day, & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The Nature of Leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 35-41). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: an examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(3), 261-295.  
doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00030-4
- Athalye, R. (2010). Transformational leadership through role models: How B-schools can teach new paradigms of leadership. *SIES Journal of Management*, *6*(2), 1-10.
- Atkins, K. (2010). Strategically planning to change. *New Directions for Student Services*(132), 17-25.
- Avolio, B. (2010). *Full range leadership development* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Avolio, B., Waldman, D., & Yammarino, F. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four I's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *13*(5), 5-16.  
doi:10.1108/03090599110143366
- Bailey, J., Sabbagh, M., Loiselle, C., Boileau, J., & McVey, L. (2010). Supporting families in the ICU: A descriptive correlational study of informational support, anxiety, and satisfaction with care. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing*, *26*(2), 114-122. doi:10.1016/j.iccn.2009.12.006
- Baird, M. R. (2007). *Turnover: Replacing Casino Employees Costs Properties Thousands of Dollars for Each New Hire, Says Robinson & Associates, Inc.* Retrieved from <http://www.prweb.com/releases/2007/04/prweb516011.htm>.

- Bansal, P., & Corley, K. (2011). The coming of age for qualitative research: Embracing the diversity of Qualitative methods. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(2), 233-237.
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. (1986). *Implications of a new leadership paradigm*. New York, NY: Binghamton School of Management.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, 8(1), 9-32.  
doi:10.1080/135943299398410
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Technical report*. Redwood City: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1990). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14(5), 21-27.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public administration quarterly*, 17(1), 112-121.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1995). *MLQ: Multifactor Leadership questionnaire*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B., & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates, 2006.

- Bass, B., & Stogdill, R. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bazelon, C., Neels, K., & Seth, P. (2012). Beyond the Casino Floor: Economic Impacts of the Commercial Casino Industry. *American Gaming Association*, 2-3.
- Beacon Economics. (2013). *2013 California card club impact study*. Retrieved from [http://www.cgcc.ca.gov/documents/enabling/2013/Card\\_Room\\_Study.pdf](http://www.cgcc.ca.gov/documents/enabling/2013/Card_Room_Study.pdf)
- Becker, B., & Gerhart, B. (1996). The impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects. *Academy of management journal*, 39(4), 779-801.
- Bernard, H. (2013). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bernsen, P., Segers, M., & Tillema, H. (2009). Learning under pressure: Learning strategies, workplace climate, and leadership style in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management*, 9(4), 358-373. doi:10.1504/IJHRDM.2009.025069
- Blayney, C., & Blotnick, K. (2010). Leadership in the hotel industry: Evidence from Canada. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 3(3), 53-66.
- Boga, I., & Ensari, N. (2009). The role of transformational leadership and organizational change on perceived organizational success. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 12(4), 235. doi:10.1080/10887150903316248

- Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. (2010). Transformational leadership in the classroom: The development and validation of the Student Intellectual Stimulation Scale. *Communication Reports, 23*(2), 91-105. doi:10.1080/08934215.2010.511399
- Branham, L. (2005). *The 7 hidden reasons employees leave: How to recognize the subtle signs and act before it's too late*. New York, NY: Amacom.
- Braun, S., Wesche, J., Frey, D., Weiswiler, S., & Peus, C. (2012). Effectiveness of mission statements in organizations—A review. *Journal of Management & Organization, 18*(4), 430-444.
- Brown, E., & Arendt, S. (2012). Perceptions of transformational leadership behaviors and subordinates' performance in hotels. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 10*, 45-59. doi:10.1080/15332845.2010.500205
- Brown, E., Thomas, N., & Bosselman, R. (2015). Are they leaving or staying: A qualitative analysis of turnover issues for Generation Y hospitality employees with a hospitality education. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 46*, 130-137. doi:10.1013/j.ijhm.2015.01.011
- Bryant, P. C., & Allen, D. G. (2013). Compensation, benefits and employee turnover: HR strategies for retaining top talent. *Compensation & Benefits Review, 45*(3), 171-175. doi:10.1177/0886368713494342
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London, England: Sage.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R., & Allen, J. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 472.

- Camps, J., & Torres, F. (2011). Contingent reward leader behaviour: Where does it come from? *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 28(3), 212-230.  
doi:10.1002/sres
- Chang, J., & Teng, C. (2017). Intrinsic or extrinsic motivations for hospitality employees' creativity: The moderating role of organization-level regulatory focus. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 60, 133-141.
- Chen, H., Beck, S., & Amos, L. (2005). Leadership styles and nursing faculty job satisfaction in Taiwan. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 4(37), 378.  
doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.2005.00064.x
- Chukwuba, K. (2015). *A Quantitative Model Studying the Effects of Transformational Leadership on Job Satisfaction*. (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing*, 16(1), 64-73.
- Cohen, J., Stuenkel, D., & Nguyen, Q. (2009). Providing a healthy work environment for nurses: the influence on retention. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 24(4), 308-315. doi:10.1097/NCQ.0b013e3181a4699a
- Collins. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com>
- Crawford, C. B., Gould, L. V., & Scott, R. F. (2003). Transformational leader as champion and techie: Implications for leadership educators. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 2(1), 1-12.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cronbach, L. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297-334.
- Daft, R. (2010). *New era of management* (9th ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson Southern-Western.
- Dawson, M., & Abbott, J. (2011). Hospitality culture and climate: A proposed model for retaining employees and creating competitive advantage. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, *12*(4), 289-304.
- Deery, M., & Jago, L. (2015). Revisiting talent management, work-life balance and retention strategies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *27*(3), 453.
- Deluga, R. (1988). Relationship of transformational and transactional leadership with employee influencing strategies. *Group & Organization Studies*, *13*(4), 456.
- Den Hartog, D., Van Muijen, J., & Koopman, P. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *70*(1), 19-34. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00628.x
- Diaz, E. (2017). Relationship between gender and transformational leadership practices: A study of self reports of male and female graduate students. Doctoral dissertation, City University of Seattle.

- Dinh, J., Lord, R., Gardner, W., Meuser, J., Liden, R., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 36-62.
- Domnica, D. (2012). The role of leadership in identifying the premises of the future organization. *Land Forces Academy Review*, 17(2), 154-161.
- Dusek, G., Ruppel, C., Yurova, Y., & Clarke, R. (2014). The role of employee service orientation in turnover in the U.S. hotel industry. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 18(2), 87-104.
- Eagly, A., Johannesen-Schmidt, M., & Van Engen, M. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological bulletin*, 129(4), 569-591. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569
- Eliophotou, M. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership, perceived leader effectiveness and teacher's job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(4), 509-528.
- Emery, C., & Barker, K. (2007). The effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication, and Conflict*, 11(1), 77-90.
- Fiedler, F. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Fitcher, C., & Cipolla, J. (2010). Role conflict, role ambiguity, job satisfaction, and burnout among financial advisors. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, 15(2), 256-261.

- Flaherty, K., Mowen, J., Brown, T., & Marshall, G. (2009). Leadership propensity and sales performance among sales personnel and managers in a specialty retail store setting. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 29(1), 43-59.  
doi:10.2753/PSS0885-3134290103
- Fleishman, E. A., & Harris, E. F. (1962). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. *Personnel psychology*, 15(1), 43-56.
- Flynn, S. (2009). Transformational and transactional leadership. *Research Starters: Sociology*, 1(1), 1-6.
- Fuller, J., Patterson, C., Hester, K., & Stringer, D. (1996). A quantitative review of research in charismatic leadership. *Psychological Reports*, 78, 271-287.
- Gainsbury, S. M., Hing, N., Delfabbro, P. H., & King, D. L. (2014). A taxonomy of gambling and casino games via social media and online technologies. *International Gambling Studies*, 14(2), 196-213.  
doi:10.1080/14459795.2014.890634
- Garcia-Morales, V., Jimenez-Barrionuevo, M., & Gutierrez-Gutierrez, L. (2011). Transformational leadership influence on organizational performance through organizational learning and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 65, 1040-1050. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.03.005
- Germano, M. A. (2010). Leadership Style and Organizational Impact. Retrieved from <http://ala-apa.org/newsletter/2010/06/08/spotlight/>
- Ghamrawi, N. (2013). Leadership styles of school principals and their multiple intelligences profiles: Any relationship. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 2(2), 37-49. doi:10.5861/ijrse.2013.277



- Gil, I., Berenguer, G., & Cervera, A. (2008). The roles of service encounters, service value, and job satisfaction in achieving customer satisfaction in business relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37(8), 921-939.  
doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2007.06.008
- Gill, A., Flaschner, A., Shah, C., & Bhutani, I. (2010). The relations of transformational leadership and empowerment with employee job satisfaction: A study among Indian restaurant employees. *Business and Economics Journal*, 2010, 1-10.  
Retrieved from <http://astonjournals.com/bej>
- Gill, A., Mathur, N., Sharma, S. P., & Bhutani, S. (2011). The Effects of Empowerment and Transformational Leadership on Employee Intentions to Quit: A Study of Restaurant Workers in India. *International Journal of Management*, 28, 217-229.
- Goehring, H. J. (1981). *Statistical methods in education*. Arlington, VA: Information Resources Press.
- Goussak, G., & Webber, J. (2011). Employee perception of leadership styles by Las Vegas casino-gaming managers. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 4(2), 85-98.
- Greene, J., Caracelli, V., & Graham, W. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 11(3), 255-274. doi:10.3102/01623737011003255
- Gregory, K. (2011). The importance of employee satisfaction. *The Journal of the Division of Business & Information Management*, 29-37.

- Guilding, C., Lamminmaki, D., & McManus, L. (2014). Staff turnover costs: In search of accountability. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 36, 231-243.  
doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.10.001
- Hamidifar, F. (2010). A study of the relationship between leadership styles and employee job satisfaction at IAU in Tehran, Iran. *Au-GSB e-Journal*, 3(1), 45-58.
- Han, S., Bonn, M., & Cho, M. (2016). The relationship between customer incivility, restaurant frontline service employee burnout and turnover intention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 52, 97-106.  
doi:10.1016/ijhm.2015.10.002
- Harper, S. (2012). The leader coach: A model of multi-style leadership. *Journal of practical consulting*, 4(1), 22-31.
- Hartline, M., & Ferrell, O. (1996). The management of customer-contact service employees: an empirical investigation. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(4), 52-72.
- Haynes, T. (2007). Management/leadership styles. In *Encyclopedia of Business and Finance* (2 ed., Vol. 2, pp. 477-482). Gale.
- Hazra, K., Ghosh, P., & Sengupta, P. (2015). Motivation and performance linkages: A comparative study between two sectors of hospitality industry. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 7(1), 77.
- Hemsworth, D., Muterera, J., & Baregheh, A. (2013). Examining Bass's transformational leadership in public sector executives: A psychometric properties review. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 29(3), 853-862.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior; utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., & Johnson, D. E. (2000). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hetland, H., Hetland, J., Andreassen, C., Pallesen, S., & Notelaers, G. (2011). Leadership and fulfillment of the three basic psychological needs at work. *Career Development International*, *16*(4-5), 507-523. doi:10.1108/13620431111168903
- Hickey, M. T. (2010). Leadership Theories. In M. Klainberg, & K. M. Dirschel (Eds.), *Today's Nursing Leader: Managing, Succeeding, Excelling* (pp. 63-73). Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Hockmeyer, W. (2015). *The impact of participation in a leadership development program on transformational leadership behaviors*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix).
- Hollander, E. (1978). *Leadership dynamics: A practical guide to effective relationships*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Hoption, C., Barling, J., & Turner, N. (2013). "It's not you, it's me": Transformational leadership and self-deprecating humor. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *34*(1), 4-19.
- Howell, J., & Frost, P. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, *43*, 243-269. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(89)90052-6
- Humphreys, J., & Einstein, W. (2003). Nothing new under the sun: Transformational leadership from a historical perspective. *Management Decision*, *41*(1/2), 85-95.

- International Society of Hospitality Consultants. (2005). *Top Ten Global Issues and Challenges In the Hospitality Industry for 2006*. Retrieved from <http://www.hospitalitynet.org/news/4025771.html>.
- Ismail, A., Mohamed, A., Hamid, S., Sulaiman, Z., & Girardi, A. (2011). Relationship between performance based pay, interactional justice and job satisfaction: A mediating model approach. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(11), 170-180.
- Ivey, G., & Theresa, J. (2010). Transformational and active transactional leadership in the Canadian military. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(3), 246-262.
- Jo, W. (2016). Casino tourism. In *Encyclopedia of Tourism* (pp. 136-138). Springer International Publishing.
- Josiam, B. M., Clay, J. M., & Graff, S. (2011). Who will stay and who will go: Predicting club general manager turnover. *Tourismos*, 6(2), 17-31.
- Judge, T., & Church, A. (2000). Job satisfaction: Research and practice. In C. Cooper, & E. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice* (pp. 166-198). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Jurgensen, C. (1978). Job preferences (What makes a job good or bad?). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 267-276.
- Kantor, J. (2017). *High Turnover Costs Way More Than You Think*. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com>

- Kara, D. (2012). The effects of managers' transformational leadership style on employee's organizational commitment. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 2(1), 16-24.
- Kaye, B., & Jordan-Evans, S. (1999). *Love'em or lose'em*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kazi, S. S., Shah, I. M., & Khan, A. (2013). Occupational Stress, Performance and Emotional Intelligence: A Critical Review. *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(1), 185-191.
- Keller, R. (1992). Transformational leadership and the performance of research and development project groups. *Journal of Management*, 18, 489-502.
- Khalilzadeh, J., Giacomo, D., Jafari, J., & Hamid, Z. (2013). Methodological approaches to job satisfaction measurement in hospitality firms. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 25(6), 865-882.
- Khorsan, R., & Crawford, C. (2014). External validity and model validity: a conceptual approach for systematic review methodology. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*, 2014. doi:10.1155/2014/694804
- Kim, K., & Jogaratnam, G. (2010). Effects of individual and organizational factors on job satisfaction and intent to stay in the hotel and restaurant industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 9(3), 318-339.  
doi:10.1080/15332845.2010.487043
- Kim, N. (2012). Employee turnover intentions among newcomers in travel industry. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16, 56-64. doi:10.1002/jtr.1898

- Kimes, S. (2011). The future of hotel revenue management. *Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management*, 10(1), 62-72. doi:10.1057/rpm.2010.47
- Kotter, J. (1990). What leaders really do. In J. Wren (Ed.), *The leader's companion* (pp. 114-123). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2010). *The Leadership Challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kovach, K. (1995). Employee motivation: Addressing a crucial factor in your organization's performance. *Employment Relations Today*, 22, 93-107.
- Kuhnert, K. W. (1994). Transforming leadership: Developing people through delegation. In B. M. Bass, B. J. Avolio, B. J. Bass, & B. J. Avolio (Eds.), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership* (pp. 10-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kuhnert, K., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and Transformational Leadership: A Constructive/Developmental Analysis. *Academy Of Management Review*, 12(4), 648-657.
- Kundu, S., & Gahlawat, N. (2015). Socially responsible HR practices and employees' intentions to quit: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Human Resource Development International*, 18, 387-406. doi:10.1080/13678868.2015.1056500
- Lai, M., & Chen, Y. (2012). Self-efficacy, effort, job performance, job satisfaction, and turnover intention: The effect of Personal Characteristics on organization performance. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 3(4), 387. doi:10.7763/IJIMT.2012.V3.260

- Lawler, E. (2006). What makes people effective? In J. Gallos (Ed.), *Organizational development* (pp. 634-655). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Leedy, P., & Ormrod, J. (2012). *Practical research: Planning and design* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *10*(2), 269-299.
- Lewis, E., Boston, D., & Peterson, S. (2017). A Global Perspective of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Development. *Journal of Research Initiatives*, *2*(3), 1-6.
- Li, J. J., Kim, W. G., & Zhao, X. R. (2017). Multilevel model of management support and casino employee turnover intention. *Tourism Management*, *59*, 193-204. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2016.08.006
- Liaw, Y., Chi, N., & Chuang, A. (2010). Examining the mechanisms linking transformational leadership, employee customer orientation, and service performance: The mediating roles of perceived supervisor and coworker support. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *25*(3), 477-492. doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9145-x
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, *1*, 1297-1343.
- Long, C., & Thean, L. (2011). Relationship between leadership style, job satisfaction and employees' turnover intention: A literature review. *Research journal of business management*, *5*(3), 91-100. doi:10.3923/rjbm.2011.91.100

- Lowe, K. B., & Gardner, W. L. (2001). Ten years of the leadership quarterly: Contributions and challenges for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 459-514.
- Macdonald, S., & MacIntyre, P. (1997). The generic job satisfaction scale: Scale development and its correlates. *Employee Assistance Quarterly*, 13(2), 1-16.  
doi:10.1300/J022v13n02\_01
- Mačutek, J., & Wimmer, G. (2013). Evaluating goodness-of-fit of discrete distribution models in quantitative linguistics. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 20(3), 227-240. doi:10.1080/09296174.2013.799912
- Maden, C. (2014). Impact of fit, involvement, and tenure on job satisfaction and turnover intention. *The Service Industries Journal*, 34(14), 1113-1133.  
doi:10.1080/02642069.2014.939644
- Mahdi, A., Mohd Zin, O., Mohd Nor, M., Sakat, A., & Abang Naim, A. (2012). The relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 9, 1518-1526. doi:10.3844/ajassp.2012.1518.1526
- Mahmoud, B., & Reisel, W. (2014). Relating patient satisfaction to nurses' job satisfaction, job security, and obedience OCBs. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Healthcare Marketing*, 8(1), 47-61.
- Malloy, T., & Penprase, B. (2010). Nursing leadership style and psychosocial work environment. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18(6), 715-725.
- Mann, R. (1959). Review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(4), 241-270.



- Marshall, E. (2011). *Transformational leadership in nursing: From expert clinician to influential leader*. New York, NY: Springer.
- McCleskey, J. (2014). Situational, transformational, and transactional leadership and leadership development. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 5(4), 117-130.
- Mcdonald, S. (2016). *A quantitative correlational study on the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover in the gaming industry using herzberg's 2-factor theory as a framework*. (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University).
- McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Merhar, C. (2016). *Employee Retention - The Real Cost of Losing an Employee*. Retrieved from <https://www.zanebenefits.com/blog/bid/312123/employee-retention-the-real-cost-of-losing-an-employee>.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(4), 538.
- Mirkamali, S., Thani, F., & Alami, F. (2011). Examining the role of transformational leadership and job satisfaction in the organizational learning of an automotive manufacturing company. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 139-148. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.218
- Moen, C., & Core, G. (2013). Demystifying ward nurse manager's approach to managing change. *The International Journal of Clinical Leadership*, 17(4), 251-259.
- Mujikic, A., Sehic, D., Rahimic, Z., & Jusic, J. (2014). Transformational leadership and employee satisfaction. *Ekonomski Vjesnik*, 27(2), 259-270.

- Najafi, S., Noruzy, A., Azar, H., Nazar-Shirkouhi, S., & Dalvand, M. (2011). Investigating the relationship between organizational justice, psychological empowerment, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical model. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5, 5241-5248. doi:10.5897/AJBM10.1505
- Negussie, N., & Demissie, A. (2013). Relationship between leadership styles of Nurese managers and nurses' job satisfaction in Jimma University Specialized Hospital. *Ethiopian journal of health sciences*, 23(1), 50-58.
- Nging, T. K., & Yazdanifard, R. (2015). The General Review of How Different Leadership Styles Cause the Transformational Change Efforts to Be Successful. *International Journal Of Management, Accounting and Economics*, 2(9), 1130-1140.
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Obiwuru, T., Okwu, A., Akpa, V., & Nwankwere, I. (2011). Effects of leadership style on organizational performance: A survey of selected small scale enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu council development area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(7), 100-111.
- Odumeru, J., & Ogbonna, I. (2013). Transformational vs. transactional leadership theories: Evidence in literature. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2(2), 355-361.

- Paarlberg, L. E., & Lavigna, B. (2010). Transformational leadership and public service motivation: Driving individual and organizational performance. *Public administration review*, 70(5), 710-718.
- Pahi, M., Hamid, K., & Khalid, N. (2016). Save talent of banking sector of Pakistan: Mediating job satisfaction between job stress and employee turnover intention. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(3), 617-624.
- Patten, M. L. (2012). *Understanding research methods*. Glendale, CA: Pyrczak.
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2016). Crafting the change: The role of employee job crafting behaviors for successful organizational change. *Journal of Management*. doi:10.1177/0149206315624961
- Phillips, J., & Gully, S. (2012). *Organizational behavior: Tools for success*. Mason, OH: South-Western.
- Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management journal*, 49(2), 327-340.
- Pors, N. (2003). Job satisfaction among library managers: a cross-cultural study of stress, freedom, and job conditions. *New Library World*, 104(11/12), 464-473.
- Porter, S., & Carter, D. (2000). Common terms and concepts in research. In D. Cormack, *The research process in nursing* (4th ed., pp. 17-28). Oxford, England: Blackwell Science.
- Prior, Y. (2015). *Investigating Extrinsic and Intrinsic Employee Needs in Hospitality Workers*. Northcentral University.

- Putra, E., Cho, S., & Liu, J. (2017). Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on work engagement in the hospitality industry: Test of motivation crowding theory. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 17*(2), 228-241.
- Riaz, A., & Haider, M. (2010). Role of transformational and transactional leadership on job satisfaction and career satisfaction. *Business and Economic Horizons, 1*(1), 29-38. doi:10.15208/beh.2010.05
- Robinson, R., Krajl, A., Solnet, D., Goh, E., & Callan, V. (2014). Thinking job embeddedness not turnover: Towards a better understanding of frontline hotel worker retention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 101-109*. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.08.008
- Rondeau, K., Francescutti, L., & Zanardelli, J. (2005). Emergency department overcrowding: The impact of resource scarcity on physician job satisfaction. *Journal of Healthcare Management, 50*(5), 327-340.
- Rose, R., Kumar, N., & Pak, O. (2009). The effect of organizational learning on organizational commitment, job satisfaction and work performance. *Journal of Applied Business Research, 25*(6), 55-66. Retrieved from <http://journals.cluteonline.com/index.php/JABR/>
- Ross-Grant, L. S. (2016). *Exploring the relationships between leadership styles and job satisfaction among employees of nonprofit organizations*. Regent University, School of Business & Leadership. Ann Arbor: ProQuest, LLC.
- Rothfelder, K., Ottenbacher, M. C., & Harrington, R. J. (2012). The impact of transformational, transactional and non-leadership styles on employee job

- satisfaction in the German hospitality industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 12(4), 201-214. doi:10.1177/1467358413493636
- Rowold, J., & Schlotz, W. (2009). Transformational and transactional leadership and followers' chronic stress. *Leadership Review*, 9(1), 35-48.
- Russell, B., & Russell, H. (2012). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human resource management*, 43(4), 395-407. doi:10.1002/hrm.20032
- Sadeghi, A., & Pihie, Z. (2012). Transformational leadership and its predictive effects on leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7), 186-197. Retrieved from <http://www.ijbssnet.com>
- Schiena, R., Letens, G., VanAken, E., & Farris, J. (2013). Relationship between leadership and characteristics of learning organizations in deployed military units: An exploratory study. *Administrative Sciences*, 3(3), 143-165.
- Schwartz, D. G. (2013). Roll the Bones: The History of Gambling. In *Roll the Bones: The History of Gambling, Casino Edition* (pp. 1-592). Las Vegas, Nevada: Winchester Books.
- Scott-Halsell, Shumate, S., & Blum, S. (2008). Using a model of emotional intelligence domains to indicate transformational leaders in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 7(1), 99-113.  
doi:10.1300/J171v07n01\_06

- Self, J., & Dewald, B. (2011). Why do employees stay? A qualitative exploration of employee turnover. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 12*, 60-72. doi:10.1080/15256480.2011.540982
- Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. (1990). Transformational leadership: beyond initiation and structure. *Journal of Management, 16*, 693-704.
- Shabani Varaki, B., Floden, R., & Javidi Kalatehjafarabadi, T. (2015). Para-quantitative Methodology: Reclaiming experimentalism in educational research. *Open Review of Educational Research, 2*(1), 26-41. doi:10.1080/23265507.2014.986189
- Shi, W., & Liu, S. (2014). Living with casinos: the experience of young dealers in Macau. *Journal of Youth Studies, 17*(7), 930-947.  
doi:10.1080/13676261.2013.844778
- Shierholz, H. (2013). Is there really a shortage of skilled workers? In G. A. Horn, & T. I. Palley (Eds.), *Restoring shared prosperity: A policy agenda from leading keynesian economists* (pp. 143-150). Creative Commons.
- Shin, S., Kim, T., Lee, J., & Bian, L. (2012). Cognitive team diversity and individual team member creativity: A cross level interaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*, 197-212. doi:10.5465/amj.2010.0270
- Shurbagi, A. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership style job satisfaction and the effect of organizational commitment. *International Business Research, 7*(11), 126-138. doi:10.5539/ibr.v7n11p126
- Simpson, G., & Lord, B. (2015). Enhancing the reporting of quantitative research methods in Australian social work. *Australian Social Work, 68*(3), 375-383.  
doi:10.1080/0312407X.2015.1035662

- Slater, M., & Gleason, L. (2012). Contributing to theory and knowledge in quantitative communication science. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 6(4), 215-236. doi:10.1080/19312458.2012.732626
- Slimane, M. (2015). Relationship between innovation and leadership. *Procedia - Social And Behavioral Sciences*, 181, 218-227. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.883
- Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Smith, W. J., Wokutch, R. E., Harrington, K. V., & Dennis, B. S. (2001). An examination of the influence of diversity and stakeholder role on corporate social orientation. *Business & Society*, 40(3), 266-294.
- Sookaneknun, S., & Ussahawanitchakit, P. (2012). Transformational leadership, organizational innovation capability, and firm performance of cosmetic businesses in Thailand. *Journal of International Business & Economics*, 12(4), 77-91.
- Spector, P. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713. doi:10.1007/BF0092979
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences* (Vol. 3). Sage publications.
- Srivastava, P. C. (2016). LEADERSHIP STYLES IN WESTERN & EASTERN SOCIETIES AND ITS RELATION WITH ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE. *Pranjana: The Journal Of Management Awareness*, 19(1), 60-76. doi:10.5958/0974-0945.2016.00006.6

- Stedham, Y., & Mitchell, M. C. (1996). Voluntary turnover among non-supervisory casino employees. *Journal of Gambling Studies, 12*(3), 269-290.
- Stogdill, R. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology, 25*(1), 35-71.
- Stringer, C., Didham, J., & Theivananthampillai, P. (2006). Motivation, pay satisfaction, and job satisfaction of front-line employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*(1), 161-179.
- Tai, F., & Chuang, P. (2014). Job satisfaction of university staff. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning, 10*(1), 51-64.
- Tavakkol, M., & Janani, H. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Sport Studies, 4*(12), 1565-1569.
- Tews, M., Michel, J., & Allen, D. (2014). Fun and friends: The impact of workplace fun and constituent attachment on turnover in a hospitality context. *Human Relations, 67*, 923-946. doi:10.1177/0018726713508143
- Tews, M., Stafford, K., & Michel, J. (2014). Life happens and people matter: Critical events, constituent attachment, and turnover among part-time hospitality employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 38*, 99-105. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2014.01.005
- Thompson, C., & Lane, S. (2014). Intelligence and job satisfaction in the USA and china. *Journal of Technology Management in China, 9*(3), 232-244.
- Tichy, N., & Ulrich, D. (1984). The leadership challenge: A call for the transformational leader. *Sloan Management Review, 26*, 59-68.



- Tobak, S. (2015). 10 Behaviors of Real Leaders. *Entrepreneur*. Retrieved from <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/249205>
- Tsai, M., Cheng, C., & Chang, Y. (2010). Drivers of hospitality industry employees' job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job performance. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(18), 4118-4134.
- Tucker, B., & Russell, R. (2004). The influence of the transformational leader. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 103-111.
- Wacker, J. G. (1998). A definition of theory: research guidelines for different theory-building research methods in operations management. *Journal of operations management*, 16(4), 361-385.
- Walsh, G., & Bartikowski, B. (2013). Employee emotional labour and quitting intentions: Moderating effects of gender and age. *European Journal of Marketing*, 47(8), 1213-1237. doi:10.1108/03090561311324291
- Wan, P. (2013). Work Stress Among Casino Industry Supervisors in Macao Casinos. *International Journal Of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 14(2), 179-201. doi:10.1080/15256480.2013.782233
- Wang, C., Tsai, H., & Tsai, M. (2014). Linking transformational leadership and employee creativity in the hospitality industry: The influences of creative role identity, creative self-efficacy, and job complexity. *Tourism Management*, 40, 79-89.
- White, R. (2017). *Employee engagement processes and productivity among Las Vegas five-star hospitality organizations* (Vol. 78). Dissertation Abstracts International Section A.

- Williams, C. (2011). Research methods. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (JBER)*, 5(3), 65-72. doi:10.19030/jber.v5i3.2532
- Yammarino, F., Sprangler, W., & Bass, B. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: a longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 41(1), 81-102.
- Young, M., & Dulewicz, V. (2008). Similarities and differences between leadership and management: High-performance competencies in the british royal navy. *British Journal of Management*, 19(1), 17-32. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00534.x
- Yuanlaie, S. (2011). *The emotional exhaustion, motivation and job outcomes: A study of hotel frontline employees in Phuket*. (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University).
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), 66-85.  
doi:10.5465/amp.2012.0088
- Yuzuk, P. (1961). *The assessment of employee morale: A comparison of two measures*. Ohio State University, College of Commerce and Administration.
- Zaccaro, S. (2001). *The nature of executive leadership: A conceptual and empirical analysis of success*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

# APPENDIX A

## Synthesis Matrix

File / In Text Citation	Leadership Styles	Transformational Leadership Behavior	Job Satisfaction	Performance	Organizational Commitment	Turnover
Abehurst, Comeche, & Galindo, 2009			X		X	
Alzabani, A., & Modi, R. S. (2014)	X		X		X	
Al-Zoubi (2012)						
American Gaming Association (n.d.)	X	X				
Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003)	X	X				
Athalya, 2010	X	X		X		
Athalya (2010)	X			X		
Awuy, Wu, & Holley (2015)	X				X	X
Bailey, J. J., Sabbagh, M., Loisele, C. G., Boileau, J., & McVey, L. (2010)			X			
Baird (2007)						X
Bansal & Corley, 2011						
Bass & Avolio (1993)	X	X				
Bass & Avolio (2000)	X		X	X	X	
Bass & Riggio (2006)	X	X				
Bass & Stogdill (1990)	X	X				
Bass (1985)	X	X		X		
Bass (1980)	X	X		X		
Bazelon, Neels, & Seth (2012)						
Bernard, H. R. (2013)						
Bernsen, Sagara, & Tiliema (2005)	X			X	X	
Blayney & Bhotnicki (2010)	X			X		
Boga & Enari (2000)	X	X		X		
Bolkan & Goodboy (2010)	X	X		X		
Brown, Mershis, Frey, Weiswiler, & Peus (2012)	X	X		X		
Brown & Avenit (2012)	X	X		X		
Brown, Thomas, & Bosselman, 2015						
Bryman (1992)						
Burns (1978)						
Campes & Torres (2011)	X					
Chang & Teng (2017)						
Chukwura (2015)						
Coban, Stambol, & Nguyen (2009)					X	X
Collins (2017)						
Crosswell, J. W. (2009)						
Crosswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007)						
Cumby, L. J. (1991)						
Dart (2010)						
Dawson & Abbott (2011)					X	X
Deary & Jago (2015)					X	X
Dani Hartog, Van Mulien, & Koopman (1997)	X	X				
Dias (2017)						
Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden, & Hu, (2014)						
Domitila (2014)						
Dusse, Ruppel, Yurova, & Clarke (2014)					X	X
Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003)	X	X				
El-Nahas, Eiman, & Aymon, 2013	X		X			
Fiedler (1967)	X				X	X
Fleherly, Mowson, Brown, & Marshall (2009)	X					
Flynn (2011)						
Garcia-Morales, Jimenez-Barrionuevo, & Gutierrez-Gutierrez (2013)	X	X				
Ghanrawi (2013)	X					
Gill, Berenguer, & Cervera (2008)			X			
Gill, Flacchini, Shah, & Bhatnani (2010)			X	X	X	X
Gill, Mathur, Sharma, & Bhatnani (2011)			X	X	X	X
Gossak & Webber (2011)	X					
Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989						
Guidling, Lamminmaki, & McManus (2014)						X
Hamidfar (2010)	X		X		X	X
Han, Bonn & Cho, 2016						X
Harper (2012)	X					
Haynes (2007)						
Hazra, Ghosh, & Sengupta, (2015)				X		
Hersey & Blanchard (2009)	X			X		
Hertzberg (1966)						
Holland, Nathand, Amrassan, Notoleora, & Pallesen, 2011	X					
Hill, Chênevert, & Poltras, 2013						
Hochmayer (2015)	X	X		X		
HSIC (2009)						
Jansen, Vera, & Crossan (2009)	X					
Jo (2016)						
Josiam, Clay, & Graff (2013)					X	X
Kantor (2017)						
Kara (2012)	X	X			X	X
Karatepe, 2013						X
Kazi, Shah, & Khan (2013)						
Khalilzadeh, Giacomo, Jafari, & Hamid, 2013			X	X		
Khorram, H., & Crawford, C. (2014)						
Kim & Joppeinan (2010)			X		X	X
Kim (2012)					X	X
Kines (2013)	X					
Kotter (1990)						
Kouzes & Posner (2010)						
Kuhnert & Lewis (1987)	X	X				
Kundu & Gahlawat, 2015			X		X	X
Lai & Chen (2012)						
Lahovichien, Fredendall, & Cantrell, 2009	X	X		X	X	X
Laytham, S. (2013)						
Leadly, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2012)						
Levon, Lipnitz, & Witke (1939)						
Liew, Chi, & Chuang (2010)	X			X		
Long & Thean (2013)	X					
Mr. Gainsbury, Hing, Deifabro, & King (2014)			X		X	X
Machini (2014)						
Macutek & Wimmer, 2013						
Mahdi, Mohd Zin, Mohd Nor, Sakat, & Abang Naim, 2012			X		X	X
Mahmoud & Reiss (2014)				X		
Mallory & Penprase (2010)	X					
Mann (1959)	X			X		
Martin & Loomis (2013)						
Maslow (1943)						
Maslow (1954)						
McCluskey (2014)	X	X				
McDonald (2016)	X	X				X
McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010)			X			
Merhar (2010)						X
Mirkomali, Thani, & Alami (2011)	X	X				
Moen & Core (2011)						
Muennich, N., & Armstrong, A. (2008)	X	X				
Najafi, Nooray, Aziz, Niaz, Shirkoobi, & Dalvand, 2011			X	X	X	
Naguis & Demissie (2013)	X					
Najmi & YazdaniFard (2015)	X	X		X	X	
Ni, Ys, Ke, & Wu (2015)						
Northouse (2013)						
Nyberg & Hoyhart, 2013						
Obiwuru, Okwu, Akpa, & Nwankwere (2011)	X	X		X		
Odumodu & Oigboina (2013)	X					
Pearlberg & Lavigna (2010)						
Pani, Hamid, & Khalid, 2016						
Plattner, Krippenber, Schippers, & Stam (2010)	X	X				
Porter & Carter, 2000						
Prior (2015)						
Putra, Cho, & Liu, (2017)						
Qazi, Khalid, & Shaifur, 2015						
Riaz & Haider (2010)	X	X		X		X
Robinson, Kraff, Solinas, Gob, & Callan, 2014				X	X	X
Rose, Kumar, & Pak (2013)				X		
Rossiter (2009)	X	X		X		
Russell & Russell (2009)	X	X		X		
Russell & Russell, 2012						
Ryan & Hardin, 2014				X	X	
Sandaghi & Pihus (2012)	X	X		X		
Schwartz (2013)				X		
Scott-Halsell, Shumate, & Blum (2008)	X	X				
Self & Dewald (2011)						X
Shabani Varaki, B., Floden, R. E., & Javidi Kalatehifarabadi, Y. (2015)						
Shi & Liu (2014)						
Shierholz (2013)						
Shin, Kim, Lee, & Bhan (2012)						
Simpson & Lord, 2015						
Slater & Gleason, 2012						
Slitman (2015)						
Smith, Wokutch, Harrington, & Dennis (2001)						
Sookkankom & Uraibawanchitakitt (2012)	X	X				
Spector, P. E. (1985)						
Spector, P. E. (1997)						
Srivastava (2016)	X	X		X	X	X
Stegham & Mitchell (1996)						
Stogdill (1988)	X					X
Tai & Chuang, 2014						
Tavakoli & Jannati (2014)	X	X				
Tews, Michael, & Allen, 2014						
Tews, Michael, Xu, & Brown, 2015						
Tews, Stafford, & Michel, 2014						
Thompson & Lane, 2014				X		
Tsai, Cheng, & Chuang (2010)						
Tucker & Russell (2006)	X	X				
Vandenberghie & Basak Ok (2013)						
Wacker (1998)						
Walsh and Bartkowsk (2013)						
Wan (2013)						X
Wang, Tsai, & Tsai (2014)	X				X	X
Wang, Yun, & Chan, 2016						
Welfy Peachey, Burton, & Wells, 2014	X					X
Wong & Dulawicz (2008)						
Yuan (2013)						
Yuki (2012)						
Zaccaro (2001)	X					
Taylor-Pearce (2015)	X					

## APPENDIX B

### **Brandman University Institutional Review Board Approval**

**Institutional Review Board** <my@brandman.edu>

Fri, Mar 23, 2018 at  
9:55 AM

To: hall4104@mail.brandman.edu

Cc: jbrooks@brandman.edu, buirb@brandman.edu, ddevore@brandman.edu

Dear Lydell H. Hall,

Congratulations, your IRB application to conduct research has been approved by the Brandman University Institutional Review Board. This approval grants permission for you to proceed with data collection for your research. Please keep this email for your records, as it will need to be included in your research appendix.

If any issues should arise that are pertinent to your IRB approval, please contact the IRB immediately at [BUIRB@brandman.edu](mailto:BUIRB@brandman.edu). If you need to modify your BUIRB application for any reason, please fill out the "Application Modification Form" before proceeding with your research. The Modification form can be found at the following link: <https://irb.brandman.edu/Applications/Modification.pdf>.

Best wishes for a successful completion of your study.

Thank you,

**Doug DeVore, Ed.D.**

Professor

Organizational Leadership

BUIRB Chair

[ddevore@brandman.edu](mailto:ddevore@brandman.edu)

[www.brandman.edu](http://www.brandman.edu)

## APPENDIX C

### Research Participant's Bill of Rights



#### BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

##### Research Participant's Bill of Rights

Any person who is requested to consent to participate as a subject in an experiment, or who is requested to consent on behalf of another, has the following rights:

1. To be told what the study is attempting to discover
2. To be told what will happen in the study and whether any of the procedures, drugs or devices are different from what would be used in standard practice.
3. To be told about the risks, side effects or discomforts of the things that may happen to him/her.
4. To be told if he/she can expect any benefit from participating and, if so, what the benefits might be.
5. To be told what other choices he/she has and how they may be better or worse than being in the study.
6. To be allowed to ask any questions concerning the study both before agreeing to be involved and during the course of the study.
7. To be told what sort of medical treatment is available if any complications arise.
8. To refuse to participate at all before or after the study I started without any adverse effects.
9. To receive a copy of the signed and dated consent form.
10. To be free of pressures when considering whether he/she wishes to agree to be in the study.

If at any time you have questions regarding a research study, you should ask the researchers to answer them. You also may contact the Brandman University Institutional Review Board, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. The Brandman University Institutional Review Board may be contacted either by telephoning the Office of Academic Affairs at (949) 341-9937 or by writing the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA, 92618

APPENDIX D

**Permission to Administer Survey**

**From:** Marco Jacobs <MarcoJ@casino.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 03, 2017 11:35 AM  
**To:** Dell Hall <hall4104@mail.brandman.edu>  
**Subject:** RE: Lydell's Dissertation Research

Dear Lydell Hall,

Based on our review of your research proposal, we give our permission for you to conduct your research on Transformational Leadership Behavior and Job Satisfaction among California Card Room Casino Employees. As part of this research, we authorize you to send us the survey link or email for potential participants and we will send it out to the casino staff. Employee participation will be entirely voluntary and at their own discretion.

Please accept this email correspondence as an authorization to conduct your research. We understand that the data collected will remain entirely confidential and may not be provided to anyone outside of the research team without our expressed consent.

Best,

Marco Jacobs

General Manager

## APPENDIX E

### Email to Potential Participants

To all casino employees,

My name is Lydell Hall, and I am currently pursuing my doctoral degree in Organizational Leadership at Brandman University.

The purpose of this email is to invite you to voluntarily participate in a quantitative correlational study between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees.

The goal of this study is to contribute to the field of knowledge regarding transformational leadership and job satisfaction as it pertains to card room casinos.

Past research has shown that transformational leadership behavior has proven to be beneficial towards increasing employee job satisfaction and overall organizational commitment. However, previous studies have not evaluated card room casinos. To address this gap, this study is specifically surveying card room casino employees.

If you voluntarily choose to participate in the study, you will be asked to:

- Review the Informed Consent form and Brandman University Institutional Review Board (BUIRB) Research Participant's Bill of Rights. (See Attached)
- Complete an electronic survey that will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.  
*The survey is accessible via the web and can be accessed on mobile devices as well.*
- Complete the electronic survey by **Friday, March 30, 2018.**

The survey can be accessed through the following link:

<https://www.esurveycreeator.com/s/a5422bf>

***This survey was specifically designed to be completely anonymous and voluntary. NO personal information on the participant or individual will be collected, and the response data will only be accessible to the investigator (me).***

Thank you in advance for your consideration to participate in the study. Your contribution to scholarly research is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

**Lydell H. Hall**

Doctoral Candidate at Brandman University

[Hall4104@mail.brandman.edu](mailto:Hall4104@mail.brandman.edu) (university email)

Tel: 850.778.3355

## APPENDIX F

### **Informed Consent Form**

#### **Participant Electronic Informed Consent**

**INFORMATION ABOUT:** This research will help fill a gap in the research and literature by examining the correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees. Analysis of individual employees' needs and perceptions will provide valuable insight into which leadership style proves to be most beneficial within the organization.

**RESPONSIBLE INVESTIGATOR:** Lydell H. Hall

#### **THE FOLLOWING WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE ELECTRONIC SURVEY:**

You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Lydell H. Hall, a doctoral student from the School of Education at Brandman University, part of the Chapman University System. The purpose of this quantitative study is to analyze the correlation between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction among California card room casino employees. This study seeks to address potential links between transformational leadership behavior, employee job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. In addition, you will be asked several questions related to your demographics and job type.

I understand my participation is completely voluntary, anonymous, and confidential, with no personal identifying information requested to identify the participant or individual.

No information that identifies me will be released without my separate consent, and that all identifiable information will be protected to the limits allowed by law. If the study design or use of the data is to be changed, I will be so informed and my consent re-



obtained. There are minimal risks associated with participating in this research study. I understand I may withdraw at any time without negative consequences. I understand that the research investigator will protect my confidentiality, and survey results, paper or electronic, will be stored in a secured location which will only be accessible to the investigator. I understand the survey results will be used for research purposes only, and the data will be destroyed after analyzed, or after one year, whichever comes first.

The two questionnaires will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

The first questionnaire is the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) designed by Bernard M. Bass & Bruce J. Avolio (1995).

The MLQ—also known as MLQ 5X short or the standard MLQ measures a broad range of leadership types from passive leaders, to leaders who give contingent rewards to followers, to leaders who transform their followers into becoming leaders themselves. The MLQ identifies the characteristics of a transformational leader and helps individuals discover how they measure up in their own eyes and in the eyes of those with whom they work. (<http://www.mindgarden.com/16-multifactor-leadership-questionnaire>)

The second questionnaire is the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) designed by Paul E. Spector (1985). The JSS is a questionnaire used to evaluate nine dimensions of job satisfaction related to overall satisfaction (<http://www.statisticssolutions.com/job-satisfaction-survey-jss/>).

The results of this study will be used for scholarly purposes only. If you have any questions or concerns about completing this survey, or any aspects of this research, please contact Lydell H. Hall at [hall4104@mail.brandman.edu](mailto:hall4104@mail.brandman.edu) or Dr. Jalin B. Johnson,

Dissertation Committee Chair, at [jbrooks@brandman.edu](mailto:jbrooks@brandman.edu). Please understand that if you have any questions, comments, or concerns about this study, or the informed consent process, you may write or call the office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, at 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA 92618, (949) 341-7641.

**ELECTRONIC CONSENT:** By clicking the “agree” button and continuing forward, you are acknowledging that you have read the informed consent form and the information in this document, voluntarily agreeing to participate under the terms of this study. If you do not wish to participate in this study, you may disregard and exit this survey at any time.

\_\_\_ **AGREE:** I acknowledge that I have received and read this informed consent form, along with respective materials and information, and I give my consent to voluntarily participate in the study.

*If you do not wish to participate in this electronic survey, you may decline participation by not “clicking” into the survey.*

\_\_\_ **DISAGREE:** I do not wish to participate in the study.

*If you do not wish to participate in this electronic survey, you may decline participation by not “clicking” into the survey.*

APPENDIX G

**Permission to use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)**

By Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass

For use by Lydell Hall only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on February 13, 2018



[www.mindgarden.com](http://www.mindgarden.com)

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to grant permission for the above named person to use the following copyright material for his/her research:

Instrument: *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*

Authors: *Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

Copyright: *1995 by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

Five sample items from this instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis, or dissertation.

The entire instrument may not be included or reproduced at any time in any published material.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert Most", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Robert Most  
Mind Garden, Inc.  
[www.mindgarden.com](http://www.mindgarden.com)

APPENDIX H

**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire**

For use by Lydell Hall only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on February 13, 2018

**MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire  
Rater Form (5x-Short)**

Name of Leader: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization ID #: \_\_\_\_\_ Leader ID #: \_\_\_\_\_

This questionnaire is to describe the leadership style of the above-mentioned individual as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank. Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

<p>IMPORTANT (necessary for processing): Which best describes you?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I am at a higher organizational level than the person I am rating.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The person I am rating is at my organizational level.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I am at a lower organizational level than the person I am rating.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I do not wish my organizational level to be known.</p>
--

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing. Use the following rating scale:

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

*THE PERSON I AM RATING . . .*

1.	Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts .....	0	1	2	3	4
2.	Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.....	0	1	2	3	4
3.	Fails to interfere until problems become serious.....	0	1	2	3	4
4.	Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.....	0	1	2	3	4
5.	Avoids getting involved when important issues arise.....	0	1	2	3	4
6.	Talks about their most important values and beliefs .....	0	1	2	3	4
7.	Is absent when needed.....	0	1	2	3	4
8.	Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems .....	0	1	2	3	4
9.	Talks optimistically about the future.....	0	1	2	3	4
10.	Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her.....	0	1	2	3	4
11.	Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets .....	0	1	2	3	4
12.	Waits for things to go wrong before taking action .....	0	1	2	3	4
13.	Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished .....	0	1	2	3	4
14.	Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose .....	0	1	2	3	4
15.	Spends time teaching and coaching.....	0	1	2	3	4

Continued =>

	Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
	0	1	2	3	4
16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.....	0	1	2	3	4
17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it.".....	0	1	2	3	4
18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group .....	0	1	2	3	4
19. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group.....	0	1	2	3	4
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action.....	0	1	2	3	4
21. Acts in ways that builds my respect .....	0	1	2	3	4
22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures .....	0	1	2	3	4
23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.....	0	1	2	3	4
24. Keeps track of all mistakes.....	0	1	2	3	4
25. Displays a sense of power and confidence .....	0	1	2	3	4
26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future.....	0	1	2	3	4
27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards.....	0	1	2	3	4
28. Avoids making decisions.....	0	1	2	3	4
29. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.....	0	1	2	3	4
30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles.....	0	1	2	3	4
31. Helps me to develop my strengths.....	0	1	2	3	4
32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments .....	0	1	2	3	4
33. Delays responding to urgent questions.....	0	1	2	3	4
34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.....	0	1	2	3	4
35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations .....	0	1	2	3	4
36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.....	0	1	2	3	4
37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs .....	0	1	2	3	4
38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying.....	0	1	2	3	4
39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do.....	0	1	2	3	4
40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority .....	0	1	2	3	4
41. Works with me in a satisfactory way.....	0	1	2	3	4
42. Heightens my desire to succeed .....	0	1	2	3	4
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements.....	0	1	2	3	4
44. Increases my willingness to try harder .....	0	1	2	3	4
45. Leads a group that is effective.....	0	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX I

**Permission to use the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)**

From: **Spector, Paul** <pspector@usf.edu>  
Date: Tue, Oct 31, 2017 at 6:04 PM  
Subject: RE: Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and Permission for Use  
To: Dell Hall <hall4104@mail.brandman.edu>

Dear Lydell:

You have my permission to use the JSS in your research. You can find copies of the scale in the original English and several other languages, as well as details about the scale's development and norms, in the scales section of my website. I allow free use for noncommercial research and teaching purposes in return for sharing of results. This includes student theses and dissertations, as well as other student research projects. Copies of the scale can be reproduced in a thesis or dissertation as long as the copyright notice is included, "Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved." Results can be shared by providing an e-copy of a published or unpublished research report (e.g., a dissertation). You also have permission to translate the JSS into another language under the same conditions in addition to sharing a copy of the translation with me. Be sure to include the copyright statement, as well as credit the person who did the translation with the year.

Thank you for your interest in the JSS, and good luck with your research.

Best,

Paul Spector, Distinguished Professor  
Department of Psychology  
PCD 4118  
University of South Florida  
Tampa, FL 33620  
813-974-0357  
pspector [at symbol] usf.edu  
<http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~spector>

**From:** Dell Hall <hall4104@mail.brandman.edu>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 3:56 PM  
**To:** Spector, Paul <pspector@usf.edu>  
**Subject:** Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and Permission for Use

Dear Professor Paul Spector,

My name is Lydell Hall and I am a student at Brandman University, conducting research for the completion of my doctorate degree. I am conducting "a quantitative correlational study between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Job Satisfaction among California card room casino employees".

I am writing to seek your permission to use the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) as an instrument in my research.

I appreciate your assistance in this process.

Sincerely,

**Lydell Hall, MBA**  
**Brandman University**

Cell: 850.778.3355  
Cell: 850.PST.DELL  
Hall4104@mail.brandman.edu

NOTICE: The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material of Lydell Hall which is for the exclusive use of the individual designated above as the recipient. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact immediately the sender by returning e-mail and delete the material from any computer. If you are not the specified recipient, you are hereby notified that all disclosure, reproduction, distribution or action taken on the basis of this message is prohibited.

APPENDIX J

**Job Satisfaction Survey**

<p align="center"><b>JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY</b>                      Paul E. Spector                      Department of Psychology                      University of South Florida                      Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.</p>							
<p align="center">PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT                      COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION                      ABOUT IT.</p>		Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately	
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	I like the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1	2	3	4	5	6



16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1 2 3 4 5 6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1 2 3 4 5 6
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1 2 3 4 5 6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1 2 3 4 5 6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1 2 3 4 5 6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1 2 3 4 5 6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1 2 3 4 5 6
30	I like my supervisor.	1 2 3 4 5 6
31	I have too much paperwork.	1 2 3 4 5 6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1 2 3 4 5 6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1 2 3 4 5 6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1 2 3 4 5 6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1 2 3 4 5 6