

## THE IMPACT OF LEADER ON JOB SATISFACTION: AN EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Shalini Verma<sup>1</sup> & Sneh Anand<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor, Jaipuria Institute of Management, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India

<sup>2</sup>Officer, Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., Panipat, Haryana, India

### ABSTRACT

A huge change has been witnessed in the expectations of 21st century workforce consisting of millennials and Gen X. The current study unravels the relationship between the aspects of job satisfaction and the kind of leadership (bureaucratic, consultative and laissez faire), one is working under. The sample consisted of 90 young millennials (less than 30 years of age) who were assessed on the type of leader they were working under along with the job satisfaction level that they experienced. The results of the study were analyzed using the descriptive and inferential statistics. For this study, statistical analytical tools like one-way ANOVA were used. This research indicates that there is a strong relationship between job satisfaction levels that the participants experienced while working under bureaucratic, consultative and laissez faire styles of leadership. It was observed that the Indian millennial who work under a consultative leader are most satisfied. And those working under a bureaucratic leader are least satisfied. The results of the study can be further used by academicians for building upon new models for understanding and theories on the effect of leadership on the experience of job satisfaction better. It is an attempt to include and study the aspects of bureaucratic, consultative and laissez faire styles of leadership, relating it with the job satisfaction among millennials, specifically in the Indian context.

**KEYWORDS:** Bureaucratic, Consultative, Indian Millennial, Job Satisfaction, Laissez Faire, Leadership Style

---

### Article History

**Received: 16 Apr 2020 | Revised: 18 Apr 2020 | Accepted: 05 May 2020**

---

### INTRODUCTION

The change in trend in the business filed as a result of the ever expanding global village which intends to include the global at the local level is of great importance and relevance in 21st century. With booming business, diverse workforce and cut-throat competition, each business entity is striving to mark its space in the corporate world. This cannot be achieved with world class machinery alone, it requires skilled and motivated workforce to achieve what corporate are aiming at today. The emphasis, no doubt, is on a happy and satisfied workforce since excellence demands a little more than just paying salaries to the employees. This has brought about a paradigm shift towards employee/people centric management wherein human dynamics is the key to excel in business.

Job satisfaction is one such variable which has rightly been given due importance because of its dependence on both-person related variables like attitude, performance and expectations as well as work related variables like organizational support, engagement and leadership.

The 21st century modern workforce is not only affected by “what” in terms of salary, recognition, a challenging work or personal growth; but also on the “how” factor—constructive feedback, recognition and able guidance that he is looking up to and the leader he is working with.

### **Job Satisfaction**

It is the attitude related construct that indicates how employees overall perceive their jobs and various aspects of them. Job or work satisfaction of an employee can be studied by applying two approaches. The first one is the global or the holistic approach which treats job satisfaction as a unified, overall feeling towards one’s job. However, the alternative approach is the facet approach that stresses on the various jobs related facets such as co-workers, reward/award system, job circumstances, and the nature and quality of work itself. This proposition gives a more exhaustive depiction of job satisfaction that shows various levels of satisfaction with different facets in an employee.

Value Discrepancy theory proposed by Locke suggested that satisfaction is often obtained by attainment of one’s desires or wants than from the fulfillment of one’s deprived needs. This means that, what an employee considers important or worthy has better effects on his or her satisfaction (Berry & Houston, 1993). The theory also asserts that job satisfaction depends on the significance of value attached to a particular facet and on the extent of discrepancy between the amount that is desired of it and the extent to which it is received. Whereas, the lesser the importance of the job facet, the lesser would the discrepancy matter than when the facet means a lot to someone. Discrepancy resulting from getting disproportionate, i.e., less or more than what is desired, leads to dissatisfaction. Smaller discrepancy is associated with greater satisfaction.

Unlike Locke’s theory, in which the effect of the direction of the discrepancy depends on the job factor, in Lawler’s Facet Theory, the same psychological process operates in all job facets. Importance of the job facet is thought to be reflected in the measure of satisfaction with facet, because those facets that are most important will appear as the most or the least satisfactory. Lawler and Porter (1967) gave a complete perspective on job satisfaction, according to which, job satisfaction resulted not only from the rewards that one obtained but also on the perception of these rewards as fair or unfair. This was probably because performance was seen as an aberrant source of satisfaction. According to Lawler and Porter, job satisfaction depended of several aspect or facets of the job. The satisfaction level with a job facet was concluded by distinguishing between the expectations from a job facet and discernments of what is received in reality. According to this theory, satisfaction comes when the amount received and the amount expected is same. Whereas, in a situation wherein an individual perceives his/ her inputs as higher than the rewards or when the job is perceived to be more demanding, it results in dissatisfaction. Other than these factors, an employee tends to be dissatisfied at work if he/she perceives his/her efforts to be higher than his/her colleagues yet receiving lower level of outcome. Lawler proposed that when one perceives positive discrepancies between one’s expectations and reality and the outcome is more than deserved or expected, discomfort and guilt result instead of dissatisfaction.

To understand job satisfaction better, one should give due importance to another important theory of job satisfaction, called the Social Influence Hypothesis. Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) in their Social Influence Hypothesis suggested that social influence is also an important determinant for one’s job satisfaction. One’s perception of job influences his / her own attitudes; i.e., when significant others appear to like the job that an individual into, the individual himself tends to like his job as well. Satisfaction attained from various aspects of work is affected by the extent to which an individual is attached to a highly cohesive work group. Laboratory research has supported this view on job satisfaction significantly.

But this is not all that one can speak about job satisfaction because factors other than the ones mentioned above also play a compelling role in ascertaining one's satisfaction from his/ her work. A dominant role in the determination on job satisfaction level of an employee is played by the individual differences. The focus on individual differences asserts that inconsistency in job satisfaction happens because of an individual's leaning towards enjoying what he/she does across situations. Thus, some employees generally tend to be more motivated and satisfied irrespective of the quality or nature of job they are performing.

Several studies suggest that job satisfaction, regardless of being fairly steady across jobs, may also be determined genetically. Studies with identical twins, separated from each other suggested that almost 30 per cent of job satisfaction can be understood by considering the genetic predispositions. However, such conclusions definitely would not imply on the existence of a *job satisfaction gene*. What it does mean is that some personality traits are inherited and are related to one's inclination to get satisfaction or dissatisfaction from his/ her job. These findings may sound controversial. Hence, are greatly criticized. This calls for more research before firm conclusions are drawn.

It has also been postulated that there are a few types of personalities who have a leaning towards satisfaction or dissatisfaction at their jobs. As per the hypothesis by Judge, Locke, and Durham (1997), four variables of personality namely self-esteem, emotional stability, self-efficacy and external locus of control are associated with one's susceptibility towards satisfaction or dissatisfaction in their life and work. Those who are likely to be satisfied with their lives in general and their jobs in particular are often seemed to be high on self-esteem and self-efficacy. Such people are emotionally stable and have self-belief that they have full control over their lives.

Interestingly, workers of different nationalities living in across nations and cultures experience job satisfaction at different levels. Data collected from a survey done in twenty-one countries, by the International Social Survey Program, indicate that the people working in Denmark were most satisfied with their jobs. While, the employees in Hungary were least satisfied (Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000), the reason for the same has not yet been identified yet.

Other than these factors, intelligence is regarded as another important aspect of one's personality affecting one's job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Ganzach (1998) suggested that slightly lower levels of job satisfaction were experienced among highly intelligent people when compared to people with less intelligence, especially in the jobs that are not of a complex nature. However, in case of complex jobs, the relationship between the degree of intelligence and one's satisfaction from his/her job was found to be negligible.

It can now be easily comprehended that one's job satisfaction is nothing but his/her emotional response to job situation that he / she works in. It also can be inferred from the employees' behavior that determines whether they are satisfied or dissatisfied.

## **Leadership**

Every theorist, social worker, scientist, entrepreneur, employee or educator defines leadership in his own unique way but the common string between all is the importance given to the concept in theory as well as what practiced by each. Leadership, as per definition is "the relationship in which one person, or the leader, influences others to work together willingly on related tasks to attain that which the leader desires" by Terry (Raju & Parthasarathy, 2000). This definition has a tint of the exploitative nature of the leader to drive the workers (employees) towards a particular direction for his personal interests. Leadership, according to many scholars, is one of the most critical aspects in one's work motivation and

job satisfaction hence leadership can also be defined as one's ability to shape other person's attitudes and behaviour both in formal or informal situations (Dessler, 2004).

Haimann (1966) on the other hand, gives another angle to leadership by defining it as the "process by which an executive or a manager imaginatively directs, guides and influences the work of others in choosing and attaining specified goals by mediating between the individual and the organization in such a manner that both will obtain the maximum satisfaction." All the definitions given above indicate that they are similar and the commonality in essence, running through most of these definitions is that one's leadership is a process, by virtue of which he/ she exerts influence over others, through different types of leadership (Dessler, 2004).

### **Types of Leadership**

The leaders can be classified into various groups depending on their style of leadership i.e., the way a leader exercises his/ her influence his / her patrons. The leadership styles of different leaders depend on types of checks and control they enforce over group and their deportment and demeanor towards the group members. Three common leadership styles are – bureaucratic, consultative, laissez faire leadership styles (Dessler, 2004).

**Bureaucratic Leadership Style:** This leadership style has bureaucratic approach to managerial authority. A bureaucratic leader strictly adheres to the rules, regulations and procedures to a high degree (Garg, 2009). The rules are meant to frame the protocols of the patrons and subordinates, and then instruct them to do distinct things in definite ways. In this kind of leadership, there is no participation or initiative taken by the leaders. Here, the rules serve as an enumeration of the bare minimum level of performance that could be accepted, on part of the employees. The drawback of this type of leadership is it's over indulgence and dependence on rules, which makes it possible for the employees to engage in the assigned task without any kind of active participation in it. The employee may rather mechanically force themselves to work without any emotional involvement in the work.

**Consultative Leadership Style:** This leadership style has decentralized approach to managerial authority. Decision-making in this case, is done, only after consulting the entire team. All the team members are involved in the decision-making process. According to Garg (2009), a consultative leader believes in the cooperation of the team members in the accomplishment of the organizational goals. Consultative leaders empower their team members to exercise high degrees of participation, both in terms of liberty and responsibility. By investing their trust, such leaders harness decision-making capabilities in their subordinates and embolden them to escalate their abilities of exerting self-control and influence them to assume higher accountability for steering their own endeavors. However, the flip side of this kind of leadership style is that it consumes a lot of time, which may result in people shirking their responsibilities and passing on the buck to others.

**Laissez-Faire Leadership Style:** There is a non-appearance of direct leadership in this style of leadership. The principle on which a laissez-faire leadership style is dependent on delegation of the decision-making power to the subordinates rather fully. The team that assigned the task frames its own targets and goals and then works out its own procedures for the attainment of those targets and goals, that too within the given scheme of the organizational policies (Singh, 2003). It is expected of the subordinates to take the ownership, motivation, supervision and direction.

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

The interest of scholars in attempting to institute the linkage between leadership styles and job satisfaction is not new. There have been various studies assessing and comparing one's job satisfaction and leadership styles. Stander and

Rothmann (2009) investigated the relationship between organizational commitments, job satisfaction and leader empowerment behavior of employees in selected South African organizations. The relationship between organizational commitments, job satisfaction and leader empowerment behavior was found to be statistically significant. Structural equation modelling points out that job satisfaction was predicted by leader empowerment behavior and was also a determining factor of organizational commitment.

Saleem (2015) investigated the impact various leadership styles have on job satisfaction to understand whether or not the perceived organizational politics had any sort of mediating role. Her research findings revealed that job satisfaction was affected positively by transformational leadership and negatively by transactional leadership. Further, the findings suggested that, the relationship between both types of leadership styles and job satisfaction is only partially mediated by organizational politics.

Mosadeghrad & Ferdosi (2013), as per their study in the healthcare sector where participative management was a dominant leadership style, maintained that leadership played a decisive role in determining employee's job satisfaction and his/ her job commitment. According to their study, close relationship was established among leadership, satisfaction in job and commitment. All these factors were profoundly interlinked where 28 per cent of the variations in job satisfaction were explained by leadership behavior. Not only jobs satisfaction, leadership behavior also explained 20 per cent of the variations in organizational commitment. They maintained that participative management process is not always an effective style of leadership and one needs to single out the best style of leadership that suits one's needs and is in sync with the organizational culture and employees' organizational maturity.

The relationship between leadership and the levels of job satisfaction that the employees experience was reviewed critically by Belias & Koustelios (2014). It was observed that job satisfaction is associated not only with employees' interpersonal relations with his/ her other colleagues but also with their performances and perceptions of the organizational culture. As per this study, an employee's preference of certain kind of leadership style is influenced by several factors, which includes demographic characteristics as well. The study concluded that in order to ensure the maximum experience of job satisfaction, a thorough analysis of employees' demographic and individual characteristics along with a detailed examination of the organization's leadership style was important.

Çakmak (et al.) assessed the impact of leadership on job satisfaction in a total of 602 research studies, out of which 318 were subsumed in the meta-analysis. These 318 research studies were further compiled to reach a sample size of 148,501 participants. It was established by random effect model that leadership has a medium-level positive impact on job satisfaction.

Brooke (2006) in her study on child care workers in New York concluded that leadership structure and satisfaction with supervision were mildly, yet significantly correlated. The study established that the participant's experience of job satisfaction was influenced by their perception of their supervisor's leadership style. The results indicate a desire in child care workers to have a better structured leadership style, in order to be satisfied with their work in general and with the kind of supervision they receive in particular.

Choi and Lee (2011) identified that job satisfaction and leadership styles impact employees' turnover intention. They discovered that a negative relationship exists between job satisfaction and intension of employee's turnover in different fields and industries. Additionally, they also found that there exists a substantial degree of co-relationship between job satisfaction and leadership styles.

## Rationale

After a detailed analysis of the available body of literature on the subject, one could find multiple studies on the impact of leadership, especially of transformational and transactional leadership style on job satisfaction. The relationship between leadership and organizational commitment has also been highlighted in several research works. Additionally, other variables like organizational culture, organizational politics, inter personal relationships with colleagues have also been established to be impacting job satisfaction along with employee turnover intention.

Researches relating other facets of work like organizational culture and supervision which to some extent include leadership style are studied to see their impact on job satisfaction. However, not much work is found on exploring the how the three types of leadership, namely democratic leadership style, consultative leadership style and laissez faire leadership style impact the experience of job satisfaction, especially among Indian millennials across sectors and profiles.

The idea whether the kind of leader one is working under influences one's job satisfaction among millennials needs further exploration especially in Indian context. The current study unravels the impact of leadership style an Indian millennial one is working under on the experience of his/ her job satisfaction.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Aim

To assess the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction among Indian millennial working in India.

### OBJECTIVES

- To assess the leadership style under which the Indian millennials are working.
- To assess the job satisfaction level among Indian millennial.
- To find out the relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction among Indian millennial.

### HYPOTHESIS

There is no difference in the level of job satisfaction among employees working under different kinds of leaders.

### SAMPLING

**Sample Size:** The sample included a total of 90 participants (30 participants working under each of the three leadership styles, namely–bureaucratic, consultative, laissez faire leadership styles).

A strict inclusion and exclusion criteria were maintained in order to screen the participants for including them in the study.

### Inclusion Criterion

- An upper age limit of 30 years was maintained to select participants for the study.
- Graduation was the minimum qualifying criteria for participants with respect to education.
- The definition of working professional included only those Indian millennials who were in a job in the organized sector.
- A minimum of one year of work experience was mandatory to participate in the study.

### **Exclusion Criterion**

- Self-employed Indian millennials were excluded from the study.
- Foreign nationals working in India were excluded from the study.
- Indian nationals working abroad were excluded from the study.
- If a professional was prosecuted for any criminal charges, he/she was excluded from the research.

**Sampling Technique:** Accidental sampling technique, A type of non-probability sampling technique where in the researcher selects the sample as per his/her convenience was used for the selection of sample in this study.

### **Tools Used**

**Socio-Demographic Data Sheet:** It was used for collecting various information regarding the participant's socio-demographic details such as sex, religion, profession, age, monthly income, etc. In addition to the ones mentioned above, it took into consideration the variables like educational and occupational details, type of industry one is working in, standard of living etc. It also assessed the number of years for which the participant has been working for.

**Job Satisfaction Scale:** The job satisfaction scale that Amar Singh and T.R. Sharma (1999) developed has been used to assess the level of job satisfaction among the participants. It is exhaustive, synoptic and extensively accumulative in nature. The main reason of using this scale was that it is succinct, valid and reliable and can be administered to any type of employees. The validity of this scale is 0.743 with the test-retest reliability as 0.978 while the coefficient of correlation is 0.81.

**Questionnaire Identifying the Leadership Style One is Working Under:** A self-devised questionnaire was used to assess the leadership style under which the participant is working. The scale was upheld by five experts in the industry.

### **ENROLMENT OF PARTICIPANTS**

The inclusion and exclusion criteria were considered while selecting the sample. The participants were then grouped into three groups of 30 each depending upon the kind of leadership style they were working under namely – bureaucratic, consultative, laissez faire leadership styles. Group I consisted of participants who were working under a bureaucratic leader, Group II under a consultative leader, Group III under a leader who practiced free or laissez faire style of leadership.

### **DATA COLLECTION**

A pilot phase was conducted before the conduction of the main phase of the research. It was administered on two participants in order to gauge whether any subsequent changes are required to be made in the questionnaire/ research methods before the administration of the main phase of research.

### **ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The identity of the participants for the purpose of this study or otherwise was kept completely confidential throughout the test and even after it. The participants were not harmed physically, mentally or psychologically even in a single way. The results were analyzed objectively in a bias-free manner without any kind of prejudice or stereotype. The participants selected for the study were well informed with respect to the nature and procedure of the test. They gave their voluntary consent by signing the informed consent form and were by no means misguided or forced to be a part of this research.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-demographic diversity details of the participants were discussed in the first part of this section followed by the analysis of results obtained from the study on the relationship between job satisfaction and leadership styles among working Indian millennials.

### Socio-Demographic Particulars of the Participants

The universe of the research was Indian millennial working in an organized sector. However, the sample for this study consisted of 90 participants (30 participants working under each of the three leadership styles, namely – bureaucratic, consultative, laissez faire leadership styles). These participants were included in the research after a thorough consideration of the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The sample selected for the purpose of the research was diverse and inclusive in nature, with respect to age, sex, religion, geographical locations, designation, annual income, experience and the number of years they have been working in their current organization.

### Analysis of Results

First, the leadership style under which each of the participants is working was assessed followed by the grouping of the participants. Group I consisted of participants who were working under a bureaucratic leader, Group II under a consultative leader while the leaders of participants in Group III practiced free or laissez faire style of leadership. The job satisfaction levels experienced by these participants were then assessed and finally the job satisfaction level of all the three groups was compared to identify whether there is any significant relationship between the job satisfaction one is experiencing and the distinct kind of leadership one is working under.

Once the three groups of participants were formed depending on the type of leadership style they were working under, their job satisfaction scores were compared.

Analyzing the job satisfaction level among the 90 participants, high job level of job satisfaction at work was observed in most of the individuals in Group II, which implies that the millennials in India who are working under a consultative leader are satisfied at their work. As per this study, the jobs satisfaction was found to be slightly lower among participants in Group III wherein the participants were working in a free or laissez faire kind of leadership. However, the job satisfaction among the participants in Group I who have been working under a bureaucratic leader was found to be the lowest.

It could be inferred from Table 4.1 that the mean of job satisfaction level experienced by the participants working under a consultative leader was 21.9 with a standard deviation of 4.67, while mean job satisfaction for participants working under laissez faire leadership style was 19.33 with a standard deviation of 4.8. However, the mean of job satisfaction among the participants who worked under bureaucratic leadership was found to be lowest, i.e., 14.267 with a standard deviation of 5.43. A high standard deviation witnessed here implies the presence of outliers in the study. This probably is because of the individual differences among the participants.

### Table 1 about Here

These scores on job satisfaction of the three individual groups (depending on the type of leadership style they were working under) were compared using One-way ANOVA test. The *F value* was 18.25445 indicating a significant difference between the job satisfaction levels experienced by the participants working under different leadership styles. The results of the test are indicated in Table 2.

**Table 2 about Here**

Hence, the null hypothesis stating that “there is no difference in the level of job satisfaction among employees working under different kinds of leaders” cannot be accepted.

This study indicates a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction experienced by employees who are working under different leadership styles. It is evident in the results of the study that the millennials are most satisfied at work when they work under a leader who practices consultative style of leadership. This implies that the millennials in India prefer working under a leader who takes their points of view and opinions seriously and considers their out of the box thinking before making tough decisions of the business. The career oriented millennials are satisfied working in a decentralized manner under a consultative leadership wherein decisions are taken after consultation with the entire team. The consultative approach to leadership gives enough freedom and responsibilities to the millennial who exercise a high degree of participation.

It makes them feel more involved in the organization thereby increasing their organizational commitment and job satisfaction. This collective decision making and responsibility sharing further boosts the confidence of the young millennials striving to prove themselves in the new age corporate.

The collectivist culture found in the very gene of Indians though is slowly moving towards individualism of the West and hasn't lost its charm yet. The achievement of common organizational goals through cooperation and consultation infuses a high degree of group cohesion and participation where the underlying factor is the trust that enables the employees to harness their decision making abilities. This very trust factor brings in not just the authority but also the accountability among the young adults which further boosts their belongingness towards the organization, increasing their job satisfaction in turn.

This free-minded millennial is also somewhat comfortable and happy working in its free spirit in laissez faire leadership wherein a direct leadership is though absent, the leader delegates his authority to his team. The team sets the goals for itself and figures out its own ways to achieve those goals within the set organizational framework (Singh, 2003). This kind of leadership harnesses the creativity and risk taking attitude among the millennial.

Millennial by their very curious and risk-taking characteristics feel comfortable when they are given the autonomy to perform in the manner they choose. This probably discomforts the millennials to work in a bureaucratic leadership characterized by strict adherence to the rules, regulations and procedures to a high degree (Garg, 2012) wherein “what” and “how” to do is rather predefined. The lack of recognition, participation and initiatives at the end of the leader rather demotivates the millennial to work.

The current study suggests a linkage between the two variables, namely job satisfaction and leadership, i.e., one's experience of satisfaction or dissatisfaction at workplaces depends on the kind of leadership he is working under thereby conforming to the claims made by Stander and Rothmann (2009) who found a statistically significant relationships between leader empowering behavior, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Table 1 showing the mean and standard deviation in the job satisfaction scores among different group of participants as per the leadership styles they are working under.

**Table 1 Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation in the Job Satisfaction Scores Among Different Group of Participants as Per the Leadership Styles they are Working Under:**

**Table 1**

Participants Working Under	N	Mean Job Satisfaction	Standard Deviation
Bureaucratic Leadership Style	30	14.2667	5.4326
Consultative Leadership Style	30	21.9	4.6709
Laissez faire Leadership Style	30	19.3333	4.8018

**Table 2 Showing the Relationship between Job Satisfaction among Different Groups of Participants Depending On the Type of Leadership They Were Working Under:**

**Table 2**

	SS	DF	MS	F = 18.25445
Between-groups	905.2667	2	452.6333	
Within-groups	2157.2333	87	24.7958	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3062.5</b>	<b>89</b>		

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

After a complete examination of results of this study along with an in depth review of literature, the interaction between the levels of job satisfaction one experiences and the type of leader one is working under is undisputed. After a thorough analysis of the available literature on the subject, it can be concluded that in order to enhance the overall wellbeing of the employees along with increased efficiency of the company, it is important to understand the views and expectations of the workforce, the Indian millennials in this case. This approach would help in catering the issue of job-skill gap along with the problems of attrition in the corporate wherein the expectations of the employee and realities presented to him do not match.

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the results. Statistical analysis tools like one-way ANOVA were used for the purpose of this study. The results revealed that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction level experienced by participants and the kind of leadership they were working under. This only strengthens the link between the two variables as concluded by various studies analyzed in the literature. The kind of leader one is working under and the style of leadership he/ she is practicing definitely affect the subordinate's perception of not just his work environment but also opportunities and threats at workplace.

The results of this study indicate that the participants were most satisfied working under a consultative leader and least under a bureaucratic one. This only strengthens the concept that leadership or guidance or supervision plays a vital role in generating and keeping one's interest in the job not only focusing on the "what" factor but also on the "how" factor. The more able guidance one receives, the more comfortable one feels in the team, the higher would be his productivity. Such high productivity yields rewards which further increases one's interest in the job. This cycle continues and results in overall satisfaction at work ultimately resulting in organizational commitment.

Moreover, the low level of job satisfaction among Indian millennials who are working under a bureaucratic leader who is more or less governed by strict rules indicate that the youth of today know no boundaries. The millennials have their own opinions and ways of creative thinking, which they carry at workplace too. Their opinions do matter to them and they have a high self-worth. The idea of blindly following the rules and the boss sort of discomforts these highly enthusiastic creative minds. This idea is further strengthened by the results of this study wherein a free or laissez faire style of leadership is preferred by the millennials when compared to a bureaucratic

one. Hence a higher level of job satisfaction was witnessed among participants working under laissez faire style of leadership than under a bureaucratic one.

The results of this study can be used to understand the underlying factors which determine job satisfaction among Indian millennials, with an emphasis on the leadership style one is working under. New theories and models for a better understanding of the impact of leadership on job satisfaction can be built up on these results by the academicians.

This is probably the first study to include the dimensions of bureaucratic, consultative and laissez faire leadership styles, relating it with the job satisfaction experienced among millennials working in the organized sector, specifically in the Indian context.

The need of the hour is to understand the expectations and challenges of the millennial workforce, who by their very nature are risk-taking and career oriented. They look for autonomy rather than continuous monitoring. Too many rules and rigidity tend to demotivate the millennials thereby increasing the discontent and dissatisfaction among them. And the relationship between dissatisfaction and productivity is well established. Therefore, organizations today need to adopt a more consultative and laissez faire kind of approach wherein the millennial is given due importance in decision making and goal setting.

### **Implications of the Research**

The most important factor of production / work in today's era—the human factor is considered in this study. This study encompasses not just mechanical perspective of performance but also the overall well-being of the employees. This outlook encompasses not just the employee's performance but also his/ her overall satisfaction at work. This study intends to improve employee wellbeing as well as increasing the efficiency of the organization.

The research findings indicate that the millennials are most satisfied and deliver to the best of their capabilities when working under the type of leader who practices consultative leadership, thereby giving his subordinate enough autonomy and decision making authority. The responsibility one shares when being a part of decision making also increases one's job satisfaction to a great extent. Therefore, consultative leadership styles can be adopted in organizations to invite the creative ideas of the millennial.

### **Limitations of the Research**

Accidental sampling—a non-probability sampling technique is the primary limitation of this study. It does not ensure equal probability to each participant for getting selected in the research. Nevertheless, accidental sampling was used in this study only for the sake of convenience.

Also, other job and individual related factors influencing the one's response for job satisfaction as well as leadership style has not been looked into in the research. This leaves a further scope for future research.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

The area of holistic employee welfare has a tremendous scope for future research. This includes the facets like job involvement, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. A comprehensive research on a randomly selected larger sample might be used for further research findings and generalizations preferably across sectors, businesses and nations.

## REFERENCES

1. Belias D & Koustelios A. (2014). *Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction: A Review. International Review of Management and Marketing*, 4, 132–149.
2. Berry L. M & Houston J. P. (1993). *Psychology at Work*. San Francisco: WCB Brown & Benchmark.
3. Brooke S. (2006). *Leadership and Job Satisfaction. Academic Leadership: The Online Journal*, 4(1), 6.
4. Choi S. L. & Lee Y. T. (2011). *Relationship between Leadership Style, Job Satisfaction and Employees' Turnover Intention: A Literature Review. Research Journal of Business Management*, 5, 91–100.
5. Çakmak E., Öztekin B & Özge Karadağ E. (2015). *The effect of leadership on job satisfaction. In G. Karada, Leadership and organizational outcomes: Meta-analysis of empirical studies. (pp 29-56). Switzerland: Springer.*
6. Dessler G. (2004). *Human Resource Management. (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition)*. Cornell: Prentice Hall.
7. Ganzach Y (1998). *Intelligence and job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal*, 41(5), 526–539.
8. Garg, V. (2009). *Leadership Style: Scope and Application in Indian Organization. Retrieved From: http, on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2018 at 5:32pm.*
9. Haimann T. (1966). *Professional Management. New Delhi: Eurasia Publishing House. Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A. & Durham C. C. (1998). Dispositional Effects on Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Core Evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83 (1), 17–34.
10. Lawler, E. E. & Porter L. W. (1967). *The Effect of Performance on Job Satisfaction. Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 7 (1), 20–28.
11. Locke E. A. (1976). *The nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 1297–1343.
12. Mosadeghrad A M & Ferdosi M. (2013). *Leadership, job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Healthcare Sector: Proposing and Testing a Model. Matera Sociomedica*, 25(2), 121–126.
13. Raju, S., Parthasarathy, A. (2000). *Management: Text and Cases. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.*
14. Salancik G. R. & Pfeffer J. (1977). *A Social Information Processing Approach to Job Attitudes and Task Design. Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23 (2), 224–253.
15. Saleem, H. (2015). *The Impact of Leadership Styles on Job Satisfaction and Mediating Role of Perceived Organizational Politics. Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 172 (27), 563–569.
16. Singh, N. (2003). *Organizational Behaviour: Concepts, Theory and Practices. New Delhi: New Elegant Printers.*
17. Sousa-Poza & Sausa-Poza (2000). *Well-Being at Work: A Cross National Analysis of the Levels and Determinants of Job Satisfaction. The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 29 (6), 517–538.
18. Stander M.W & Rothmann S. (2009). *The Relationship between Leadership, Job Satisfaction and Commitment. SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 7 (3), 7–13.