

IMPACTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES, SUCH AS AUTOCRATIC, LAISSEZ-FAIRE,
ABUSIVE SUPERVISION, ON JOB SATISFACTION AND TURNOVER INTENTION

Sumaya Sanam

Submitted to the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Masters in Interdisciplinary Studies
Indiana University Southeast
May 2023

Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Masters in Interdisciplinary Studies

Thesis Committee

Todd M Manson Ph.D.

Alexandra N. Sousa Ph.D.

Valérie Bruchon Scott Ph.D.

Date of Oral Defense
April, 24th, 2023

© 2023

Sumaya Sanam

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Todd Manson, my mentor, for helping and guiding me through this paper and I look forward to working with him on similar topics in the future. I would also like to thank Dr. Alexandra Sousa for all the feedback, comments, and insight on the topic of leadership styles which encouraged and intrigued me to choose this path. I also appreciate and thank Dr. Valérie Bruchon Scott for providing and sharing her knowledge to complete this project. I would also like to mention my mother who supported my journey and allowed me to be the first woman in my family to achieve a graduate degree. I want to thank my fiancé, David Swoyer, for aiding me during the whole process. Finally, I want to mention my sweet birds and cats for keeping me company though this whole ordeal.

Sumaya Sanam

Impacts of Leadership, such as Autocratic, Laissez-faire, and Abusive Supervision, on Job

Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

At its core, the basic aspect of leadership is to guide team members and followers towards a specific goal. Some leaders can guide and manage better than others due to their leadership styles. These leadership styles can also have a varying impact depending on job setting such as work-from-home, in-person, or home-hybrid. This paper studies the impacts of ineffective/destructive leadership styles of immediate supervisors/managers on employees' job satisfaction and turnover intention. Data was collected using Qualtrics survey via online platforms and generated 103 responses. Of the responses, only 95 were useable which generated results supporting five of the seven hypotheses while rejecting the other two.

Table of Contents

Acceptance page.....	i
Copyright page.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Table of contents.....	v
List of Tables, Appendixes, and Questionnaires.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
Effective and Ineffectiveness of leadership styles.....	2
Job Setting.....	4
Destructive/negative leadership styles.....	6
Laissez-faire Leaders.....	6
Autocratic Leaders.....	8
Abusive/Toxic Supervision.....	10
Job Satisfaction.....	12
Turnover Intention.....	13
Hypothesis.....	14
Method.....	19
Participants.....	19
Materials.....	20
Procedure.....	22
Results.....	22
Discussion.....	27

Limitation.....	31
Future Research.....	32
Reference.....	34
Appendix.....	40
Curriculum Vitae	

List of Tables, Appendixes, and Questionnaires

Table 1.....	23
Table 2.....	24
Table 3.....	26
Survey Questionnaires.....	41

Impacts of Leadership, such as Autocratic, Laissez-faire, and Abusive Supervision, on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

Since the pandemic, there have been various changes to the work environment throughout the world. Primarily, these changes are to adapt to new social distancing norms and a safekeeping of worker's health. Although the threat has largely subsided, people are continuing to work remotely (work-from-home) or in a hybrid setting (mix of both face-to-face and work-from-home about 50-50 or less for in-person office attendance) in many organizations. However, some sectors, such as healthcare or labor jobs, still operate in a face-to-face environment out of necessity. Each of these work settings require a different style of management, organizations need to train their leaders to adapt their styles to better manage their teammates, followers, and subordinates. In this study, the leadership of an immediate supervisor/manager is being reviewed as directly responsible for the care and management of the specific employee as well as their work settings. Additionally, three specific types of leadership styles (abusive/toxic supervision, autocratic, and laissez-faire) will be assessed along with the three work settings to study their impacts on employee job satisfaction and intent to quit.

The definition of leadership can vary depending on the culture. Some define leadership as an 'act of giving direction' (Alharbi, 2021) or influencing others to achieve a set of objectives (Broyles, 2022) or getting a desired outcome (Alharbi, 2021). Regardless of the definition, it can be said that a leader should have the ability to guide their followers. There are various ways to do so, which may be effective (positive/constructive) or ineffective (negative/destructive). This study aims to examine three types of leadership, specifically autocratic, laissez-faire, and toxic/abusive supervision. Although various research has already been conducted on these leadership styles individually, the results of these studies have been mixed for laissez-faire and

autocratic. In addition, none of these studies compare these leadership styles to one another in relation to work setting to find which have stronger negative correlations on job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Effective and Ineffectiveness of leadership styles

Effective leadership can be defined as constructive or, as Itzkovich et al. (2020) states, as a positive leadership style. A person with this style sincerely cares for the organization and people, and therefore supports and enhances the tasks, goals, and strategies for optimal use of organizational resources. They actively enhance employee well-being, motivation, and job satisfaction (Aasland et al. 2010; Brandebo et al., 2016; Chénard-Poirie et al. 2022; Einarsen et al., 2007; Fors Brandebo et al., 2019; Skogstad et al.2014); an example of this style would be transformational leadership. The behaviors of leaders of this style include idealized influence, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation (Aasland et al. 2010; Brandebo et al., 2016; Chénard-Poirie et al. 2022; Fors Brandebo et al., 2019). Such leaders can build trust, loyalty, respect, and admiration which results in motivated performance (Brandebo et al., 2016). Leaders may also present constructive and destructive behaviors simultaneously (Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Einarsen et al., 2007; Chénard-Poirie et al. 2022). Although rare, sometimes the interest in serving the organization may overshadow the desire for employees' well-being, resulting in a destructive leadership style (Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Einarsen et al., 2007).

A negative or destructive leadership style can be defined by behaviors that violate, disrupt, or undermine organizational goals, resources, and motivations, as well as impacts to organizational well-being and employees' job satisfaction (Aasland et al., 2010; Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Brandebo et al., 2016; Einarsen et al., 2007; Itzkovich et al., 2020). Destructive

leadership behavior is not only due to the absence of effective leadership (Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Einarsen et al., 2007; Ferris et al., 2007) but also due to incompetency, thoughtlessness, insensitivity, and the undermining of followers and organizational goals (Aasland et al. 2010; Einarsen et al., 2007; Ferris et al., 2007). It can also be destructive if the leader repetitively presents counterproductive behaviors, preferential treatment, or hostile/obstructive behaviors (Aasland et al., 2010; Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Brandebo et al., 2016; Ferris et al., 2007). Some use an actively destructive form of behavior which can be abusive or aggressive (Skogstad et al., 2014). These behaviors include yelling, name-calling, intimidation, ridiculing, and bullying, which can impact the follower's morale and performance (Aasland et al. 2010; Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Einarsen et al., 2007; Ferris et al., 2007; Skogstad et al. 2014). Such behaviors and the constant source of added stress for the employees can lead to job dissatisfaction, decreased motivation, and increased turnover. (Aasland et al. 2010; Brandebo et al., 2016; Einarsen et al., 2007; Ferris et al., 2007; Fors Brandebo et al., 2019; Schaubroeck et al., 2007; Skogstad et al., 2014). As the workers are dissatisfied, they would quit and as the turnover rate goes up, the company is more likely to suffer from added expense and also loss of highly skilled employees. The organization also has to hire more employees to replace the lost employees which would require time and money to retrain, thus increasing in business expense. Combined, these outcomes show why it is important to study the relationship and impacts of destructive leadership.

Job Setting

Although Ergovan et al. (2021) mentioned that the term “telework,” proposed in 1957, was a concept of remote jobs existing, it did not gain attention until the 1970s, which has now become more prevalent in some job sectors. Over the last decade as technology and globalization gained popularity, there has been an increase in research to study the effects of remote work (Efimov et al., 2022; Raabe et al., 2020, Schall, 2019). Schall (2019) mentioned in her article that 80-90% of U.S. workers would prefer to work remotely at least on a part time basis to allow more flexibility and increase job satisfaction. On the flip side, there have also been debates indicating that the work-from-home environment is a distraction and hinderance (Tromp & Blomme, 2014). As Schall (2019) quoted in her paper, some people believe that “in-person” is the best option, commenting that:

“to become the absolute best place to work, communication and collaboration will be important, so we need to be working side-by-side” (Pepitone, 2013, p. 1).

However, according to a Gallup report on the State American Workplace,

“people who work remotely are more engaged, enthusiastic, and committed to their work — only if they work outside the office 20% of the time or less”

(Gallup, 2017, p. 29).”

This is because some people feel lonely due to the lack of communication and support when working remotely (Ergovan et al., 2021; Schall, 2019). Therefore, having a hybrid environment can help people balance between the two as well as a work-life balance in other aspects of their lives.

Having a proper work-life balance can impact one’s motivation and result in higher satisfaction at work, which means people are less likely to want to quit. Raabe et al. (2020)

conducted a quasi-experimental study that surveyed people ($N=13,316$) in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland to study the impacts of a work-from-home environment on their life satisfaction. They found that people presented slightly higher levels of average general life satisfaction in categories such as health, work, work-life balance, and leisure. They stated that the transition of remote work led to a reduced speed of life, which allowed more flexibility in incorporating family and leisure into the workday (Raabe et al., 2020). However, leadership styles are also an important factor to consider in such situations. When people come across more positive and effective leaders in an in-person setting, it is more likely that the workers are satisfied with their jobs and life while ineffective leaders have the opposite effects. It is difficult to isolate the impacts of leadership styles in a hybrid or remote setting, either due to the lack of research or lacking sample size. However, from the available studies, regardless of work setting, effective leaders tend to show higher significance for on-the-job satisfaction and intent to quit.

A recent article by Ipsen et al. (2022) studied the impacts of remote work for managers during the transition for Covid-19. They collected data from 1,016 line, middle and top managers in Danish workplaces. They found similarities for managers and employees in terms of their job satisfactions and preferences. Their study presented that most remote working managers found their jobs to be more demanding as they were lacking administrative support. However, they found great support from their employees and peer managers (Ipsen et al., 2022).

Another interesting article by Overbey (2012) studied the relationship between telecommuter employee's perception of leadership (transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire) and their intention to leave. Using a quantitative non-experimental design and conducting an online survey to examine their current manager, she found a significant relationship between perceived transformational leaders and telecommuter intent to quit. This implies that the more a

leader demonstrates a transformational leadership style, the more likely the employee desired to leave. However, perceived laissez-faire leadership styles indicated a significantly negative relationship which suggested the leaders who presented more a laissez-faire leadership style, the less likely a telecommuter wanted to quit. But there was no relationship between perceived transactional (also known as autocratic) leadership style and their intent to quit (Overbey, 2012). Although it was noteworthy to consider how the autocratic leadership, in this particular instance, did not impact the intent to quit but the transformational leadership style did, it is safe to assume that it was due to the preference and perception of the employees or work setting.

Destructive/Negative types of Leaders

In the past decade, there has been an increasing interest in the study of destructive leadership styles which suggests a negative cost or impact related to this type of leadership on organization success and profit (Aasland et al. 2010; Brandebo et al., 2016). Some of those costs are related to increased absenteeism, turnover rate, deviant behavior, decreased motivation, job dissatisfaction, loss of effective workflow and performance, and other negative outcomes (Aasland et al. 2010; Agrawal & Gautam, 2020; Alharbi, 2021; Ashforth, 1994; Brandebo et al., 2016; Fors Brandebo et al., 2019; De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2009; Gabler et al, 2014; Harvey et al, 2007; Pcy et al., 2019; Qian et al, 2017; Skogstad et al., 2014). These negative outcomes are due to the way leaders treat their employees, fulfill their duties, and manage their team.

Laissez-faire Leaders

This type of leader falls in the center of the spectrum of all the leadership models. These leaders rely overly on their employees' work. They do not micromanage or provide much guidance, instead they allow the employees to use their own resources, experience, and creativity to achieve and meet the expected goals (Aasland et al., 2010; Batiste-Brazile, 2022; Hinkin &

Schriesheim, 2008; Overbey, 2012; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Yang, 2015). However, some researchers state that this is a passive and ineffective leadership type because they do not interfere or interact with their followers and thus avoid their leadership responsibilities altogether (Aasland et al., 2010; Breevaart & Zacher, 2019; Broyles, 2022; Einarsen, 2007; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Overbey, 2012; Itzkovich et al., 2020; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). It is ineffective due to the lack of feedback and support, which can add to stress and create conflict or job dissatisfaction (Batiste-Brazile, 2022; Breevaart & Zacher, 2019; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Skogstad et al., 2014). Since this type of leadership sits in the center of the spectrum, the negative effects are weaker on the follower's trust and well-being, but the effects depend on behavior and context of the work environment (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Overbey, 2012; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Yang, 2015).

According to some researchers, the avoidance, inactiveness, and/or passiveness of laissez-faire leadership has been associated with non-influence or non-leadership (Aasland et al., 2010; Broyles, 2022; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Overbey, 2012; Skogstad et al., 2007; Skogstad et al., 2014). Aasland et al. (2010) stated that this type of leadership may occur due to incompetency and lack of knowledge which also is against the interest of organizational well-being. Since no actively destructive behavior is involved, it can be challenging for senior managers to detect and intervene (Aasland et al., 2010; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). And so, these leaders can continue to 'work' in the organization before any severe consequences take place. A positive aspect of laissez-faire is that it can boost morale by promoting leadership among team members based on their expertise and skills (Batiste-Brazile, 2022; Breevaart & Zacher, 2019; Broyles, 2022; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Overbey, 2012). However, issues arise when employees are not getting the direction and instructions they need

(Aasland et al., 2010; Broyles, 2022; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Itzkovich et al., 2020; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Overbey, 2012; Skogstad et al., 2007; 2014). One of the meta-analyses by Judge and Piccolo (2004) found laissez-faire leadership behavior to be negatively associated with employee's job satisfaction. They documented a moderately significant correlation of .28 and a regression analysis yielding a regression coefficient of .13. Skogstad et al. (2014), on the other hand, did not find a correlation between laissez-faire leadership with job satisfaction. However, there were little to no studies measuring the impacts on turnover intention. Therefore, there is value to add by studying this specific leadership type and its impacts on these performance metrics.

Autocratic Leaders

When it comes to needing directives, instructions, organization, and definitive answers, autocratic leaders are a great option. Especially for new hires with little experience, autocratic leaders have full control over the decision-making process and leave little room for independence (Alharbi, 2021; Batiste-Brazile, 2022; De Cremer, 2006; De Cremer, 2007; De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2009; Hams et al., 2018; Rast et al., 2013; Tromp & Blomme, 2014). This type of leadership helps to make quick decisions in stressful environments as they appear to be strong and direct (Alharbi, 2021). Some researchers group authoritarian and autocratic leaders together due to their similarities. Both types expect full obedience from their teams when making decisions (Batiste-Brazile, 2022) and this mindset is similar to that of a dictator. However, all dictators can be classified as autocratic leaders but not all autocratic leaders can be classified as dictators (Rast et al., 2013). Tromp and Blomme (2014) mentions that autocratic leadership is concerned with behaviors that aim to broaden and enhance a manager's position of power which can lead to micromanagement. Some may be nitpicky and micromanage their employees with

little to no social support while completing required tasks. This disregard for support generally leads to added stress for the employees (De Cremer, 2006; De Cremer, 2007; De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2009; Rast et al., 2013; Tromp & Blomme, 2014). These types of leaders can create feelings of disempowerment, leading to reduced self-efficacy and performance (De Cremer, 2006; De Cremer, 2007; De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2009; Tromp & Blomme, 2014).

Although autocratic leaders are often seen negatively, uncertainty can impact one's evaluation to support and follow such leaders due to their clear and directive nature (Rast et al., 2013). Inclusivity is often a virtue; however, many find comfort in an autocratic leader's decisiveness. Research has shown that autocratic leaders can convey a reliable, clear image for the group to identify with. One study by Rast et al.'s (2013) found that under low levels of uncertainty, leadership styles that exhibit non-autocratic behaviors gained greater support ($b = 70.33$, $t = 74.50$, $p = .001$). However, under highly uncertain circumstances, greater support was shown for leaders with autocratic traits ($b = 0.20$, $t = 2.29$, $p = .023$). These levels of uncertainty also show correlation with trust. Under low levels of uncertainty, less autocratic leaders gained more trust from their teams ($b = 70.49$, $t = 75.70$, $p = .001$). This suggests that autocratic leadership appeals to those who value clear direction (Rast et al., 2013). Issues arise when these leaders misuse this opportunity to force decisions in their favor while disregarding other team members' opinions (Tromp & Blomme, 2014). The limited voice to influence decisions may make employees feel that their leaders are pushy and disrespectful. This creates an issue of procedural injustice disrupting organizational unity and employees' well-being and motivation. Thus, it produces negative feelings such as lack of motivation and loyalty, distrust, dissatisfaction, etc. (Tromp & Blomme, 2014). These negative feelings lead to job dissatisfaction and high turnover intentions.

Abusive/Toxic Supervision

Abusive/Toxic supervision is simple to describe as it is exactly what the name suggests. These leaders abuse their employees and do not hesitate to publicly abuse or mistreat their staff or remind them of past failures (Gabler et al., 2014; Harris et al., 2007; Harvey et al., 2007; Pyc et al., 2017; Ronen & Donia, 2020). These abusive actions are non-physical hostility that tend to repeat regularly until the victims decides to leave (Gabler et al., 2014; Pyc et al., 2017).

Although abuse can be defined as intimidation, public humiliation, antagonistic behaviors, threatening to fire, and playing favorites among the employees, the silent treatment is also a form of abuse (Gabler et al., 2014; Harris et al., 2007; Harvey et al., 2007; Pyc et al., 2017; Ronen & Donia, 2020; Tepper, 2000). Some researchers associate petty tyrant/tyrannical leadership with this type as they hold the same traits. Tyrannical leaders systematically humiliate, belittle, and manipulate their followers to complete the agenda at the expense of overall well-being (Aasland et al., 2010; Ashforth, 1994; Harvey et al., 2007; Skogstad et al., 2014; Tepper, 2000). These leaders often misuse their powers to oppress their employees while socially undermining attitudes that impair the follower's ability to succeed at work (Harvey et al., 2007; Tepper, 2000).

This toxic or abusive supervision can impact the individual's well-being. Studies have shown various negative psychological outcomes such as helplessness, decreased self-efficacy, psychological distress, anger, high levels of emotional exhaustion, higher levels of added stress and anxiety, perceived work-family conflict, turnover intentions, and job dissatisfaction (Ashforth, 1994; Harris et al., 2007; Harvey et al., 2007; Pyc et al., 2017; Tepper, 2000). This psychological stress can also lead to burnout and other health problems (Harey et al., 2007; Tepper, 2000). It suggests that employees feel unwanted and mistreated at work, with can impact

their self-worth and ability to perform well. This can also affect the organization negatively because it influences the employee's organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Gabler et al., 2014; Pyc et al., 2017; Ronen & Donia, 2020; Tepper, 2000). Ronen & Donia (2020) indicated that the abusive supervision was negatively correlated with job satisfaction ($r = -.45$, $p < .001$) and positively correlated with turnover intentions ($r = .33$, $p < .01$). However, Gabler et al. (2014) mentioned that organizations often overlook abusive leadership's dysfunctional behavior because of the staff's perception of their managers. Often, even if one views their supervisor/manager's behavior as abusive, a different employee may not see those behaviors through the same lens (Gabler et al., 2014; Tepper, 2000). Hence, the organization may overlook such situations despite the damage caused to the organization.

Impacts of Destructive Leaders

Research has shown that destructive leadership can impair the organization's overall well-being. Partially due to the employee's negative emotions such as burnout. Burnout is the psychological response to chronic stress (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2009; Tepper, 2000); It is combined with emotional exhaustion, such as pressure for better performance, loss of control and power, and lack of social support (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2009; Tepper, 2000). These adverse imbalances in work-life conditions and emotions lead to reduced productivity, commitment, job satisfaction, and increased turnover (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2009; Tepper, 2000). Hence, the next two sections will talk about the impacts of these types of leadership styles on job satisfaction and employee turnover intention.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction can be defined as a positive emotional state within employees due to their judgment and experiences at work which can also impact their attitude and behaviors (Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Brandebo et al., 2016; Fors Brandebo et al., 2019; Gabler et al 2014; McCallaghan et al., 2019; Podsakoff et al., 2007). Three psychological states influence one's job satisfaction: experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work, and knowledge of the actual results of the work activities (Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Brandebo et al., 2016; Fors Brandebo et al., 2019; McCallaghan et al., 2019). Research has presented a positive correlation between job satisfaction and psychological well-being (Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Brandebo et al., 2016; Fors Brandebo et al., 2019). Therefore, employees reporting job dissatisfaction often feel more negative emotions as well as physical and mental health problems.

Some researchers have found that destructive leadership styles, such as abusive supervision, have a significantly negative impact on job satisfaction (Brandebo et al., 2016; Gabler et al., 2014; Pyc et al., 2017; Qian et al, 2017; Ronen & Donia, 2020; Schaubroeck et al., 2007; Tepper, 2000). However, more study needs to be conducted on other styles, such as laissez-faire and autocratic which have little or mixed results (Rast et al., 2013; Skogstad et al., 2014; Tromp & Blomme, 2014). One interesting find by Qian et al. (2017) is that despite job dissatisfaction being related to negative outcomes, one positive aspect of laissez-faire leadership is the promotion of employee creativity. This example of a positive outcome with respect to a negative leadership style is evidence that much is still unknown about the overall destructive impacts that still need to be explored.

Turnover Intention

Although many employees may continue to work at the same organization for long periods, psychologically, they have quit the role due to a lack of motivation, thus resulting in a drop in work performance (Agrawal & Gautam, 2020; Broyles, 2022; McCallaghan et al., 2019; Pcy et al., 2017; Tromp & Blomme, 2014). Some reasons that could cause an employee to quit are relocating, lacking work-life balance, lacking room for growth in the organization, changing careers, not getting enough pay, health problems, a toxic work environment, etc. Generally, job satisfaction, or in this case dissatisfaction, can play a big role in an employee's intention to quit. When employees pass a threshold of dissatisfaction and frustration due to demanding leaders or other stressful work environments, people start to look for other options (Agrawal & Gautam, 2020; McCallaghan et al., 2019; Podsakoff et al., 2007).

When people start a new job, they have a certain set of expectations about what their role will involve. Harvey et al. (2007) mentions an older study model that indicated an increased likelihood of turnover when employee expectations are unmet. Particularly in cases where there are abusive leaders, in which the job and the leader may create an undesirable work environment, this leads to higher links to turnover intention (Broyles, 2022; Harvey et al., 2007; McCallaghan et al., 2019, Tromp & Blomme, 2014). This study intends to measure similar interactions across the three destructive leadership types to see which has a higher correlation and influence with employee turnover intention and job satisfaction. One aspect to remember is that turnover intention is not the same as turnover itself. In some instances, although people may intend to quit their jobs, not everyone quits. In such cases, it benefits the organization because, despite the dissatisfaction, employees are still committed to their jobs. That is why the organization does not have to hire more people to work or spend money on training. However, if the workers see

through their intention and quit, then it impacts the organization directly. Since various factors are involved for both parties when quitting, it is unsuitable for this paper. Since the paper is for a master's thesis and the study is done on a smaller scale, it will only study employees' turnover intention.

Hypotheses

The primary aim of this study is to test the relationships between job satisfaction and turnover intention with the three varying types of destructive leadership. Since there have been mixed results for autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles, this paper studied the impacts of these two lesser destructive types compared to abusive/toxic supervision. The strongest impact on job satisfaction and commitment or intention to quit is the level of hindrance and stress that comes with leadership styles. The leadership styles that allow more challenges and room for improvement tend to have more satisfaction and less turnover intention than those that add stress or hinder an employee's work. A meta-analysis by Podsakoff et al. (2007) studied such impacts of job hindrance and challenge stressors on mental and physical strain, job satisfaction, turnover intention, actual turnover, organizational commitment, and withdrawal behavior. They described hindrance stressors as behaviors or events that constrain an employee's work achievement and personal development, and challenge stressors as behaviors or events that promote the opposite. The results indicated that strain was positively related with hindrance stressors ($r_c = .56$) and challenge stressors ($r_c = .40$), with both respectively at p values of $.05$. Hindrance stressors had dysfunctional relationships with job attitudes, such as job satisfaction at $r_c = .57$ and $p = .05$ and organizational commitment at $r_c = .52$ and $p = .05$. The turnover intentions present at $r_c = .49$ and $p = .05$ while the actual turnover was at $r_c = .23$, $p = .05$. Whereas the Challenge stressors had small or nonsignificant relationships such as job satisfaction ($r_c = .02$, $p = .05$), organizational

commitment ($r_c = .04$, $p = .05$), turnover intentions ($r_c = .11$, $p = .05$), and turnover ($r_c = .04$, $p = .05$). Their hypothesis was supported and aligned with the results that indicated hindrance stressors have strong, negative relationships with both job satisfaction ($\beta = -.66$, $p = .05$) and organizational commitment ($\beta = -.63$, $p = .05$). Similarly, challenge stressors had moderate, positive relationships at $\beta = .24$ for job satisfaction and $\beta = .29$ and for organizational commitment, respectively, with both p values at $.05$. The results also supported the hypothesis that hindrance stressors would have a strong, positive relationship with turnover intentions $\beta = .53$, $p = .05$, and a significant, negative relationship for challenging stressors with turnover intentions at $\beta = -.10$, $p = .05$. This provides evidence that job satisfaction was negatively associated with hindrance stressors but positively associated with challenge stressors and the opposite for turnover intention.

Another study by Agrawal, and Gautam (2020) suggested that job satisfaction is negatively associated with leadership behavior. However, the results presented leadership behavior to be significant with job satisfaction ($\beta = .254$, $p < .05$), meaning that when leaders treat their employees poorly, they decrease their job satisfaction and vice-versa. This means that destructive leadership styles, such as toxic/abusive supervision, are more likely to negatively correlate with job satisfaction and positively correlate with turnover intention. It is tricky to pinpoint the autocratic leadership style's impact on job satisfaction and turnover intention due to mixed results from various research. Such as, in cases where strict directions are required to allow employees to complete the task and enable personal growth, autocratic leadership will have higher job satisfaction (Alharbi, 2021). However, in this case, laissez-faire leadership will have lower job satisfaction due to uncertainty and added stress (Rast et al., 2013).

As discussed previously, various studies have found destructive leadership to have a negative correlation to job satisfaction (Aasland et al., 2010; Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Brandebo et al., 2016; Einarsen et al., 2007; Ferris et al., 2007; Itzkovich et al., 2020; Pyc et al., 2019; Qian et al., 2017; Schaubroeck et al., 2007; Skogstad et al., 2014). One study by Fors Brandebo et al. (2019) found that that 28% of general job satisfaction and 36.3% of experienced meaningfulness of work is related to leadership style (constructive versus destructive leadership behaviors). Therefore, it is evident that turnover intention is also related to leadership behavior and that other factors also predict these work outcomes. Pyc et al.'s (2017) study found that abusive supervision was significantly related to job dissatisfaction (.36, .06) and intention to quit (.04, .27). Authoritarian (autocratic) leadership was also significantly related to job satisfaction (-.21, -.03,) and intent to quit at (.02, .17). The results presented abusive supervision impacting anxiety and depression mediating negative employee outcomes with job satisfaction (.36, .06) and intention to quit (.04, .27). The study by McCallaghan et al. (2019) examined the relationship between destructive leadership (autocratic) and employee attitudes. They found destructive leadership positively associated with organizational commitment ($r = 0.18$, small effect) and job satisfaction ($r = 0.45$, medium effect) and an inverse relationship with intention to quit ($r = -0.43$, medium effect). This suggests that a lack of destructive leadership could lower feelings of intention to quit and improve job satisfaction and organizational commitment to some extent. The results for their regression model with autocratic leadership and intention to quit were significant, $b = -0.50$, $t(227) = -6.57$; $p < 0.01$. This was also true for autocratic leadership and job satisfaction, $b = 0.27$, $t(227) = 6.55$; $p < 0.01$. It is safe to say that a non-autocratic leadership style can improve job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and decrease turnover intentions.

Gabler et al. (2014) studied the consequences of abusive supervision in sales management. In their study, they found abusive leadership to significantly decrease employees' job satisfaction ($p < 0.01$) as well as their organizational commitment ($p < 0.01$). This means that the employee is more likely to quit or plan on quitting under such leaders. Qian et al.'s (2017) study found similar results that state abusive supervision to be significantly and positively correlated with job dissatisfaction ($\beta = 0.21, p < 0.01$). Overall, it seems that most studies found abusive/toxic supervision to show a stronger negative correlation to job satisfaction and a positive correlation with intent to quit (Brandebo et al., 2016; Gabler et al., 2014; Pyc et al., 2017; Qian et al., 2017; Ronen & Donia, 2020; Schaubroeck et al., 2007; Tromp & Blomme, 2014). As for autocratic leadership, Alharbi (2021) studied participants' job satisfaction based on level of autocratic leadership style and found statistically significant results. He stated that the presence of an autocratic leadership style explains 29.7% of the variance in job satisfaction in the model. However, there have been unreliable or mixed results for laissez-faire in most cases. But Skogstad et al. (2014) found a weak negative impact on job satisfaction at -0.28 . Breevaart and Zacher (2019) stated that laissez-faire leadership had shown to undermine followers' satisfaction with their job and their leader and their perceptions of leader effectiveness.

Likewise, although there is little research on the turnover intention for autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles, there has been a noticeable trend. Studies have shown that higher levels of job satisfaction are negatively correlated to turnover intention. (Einarsen et al. 2007; McCallaghan et al., 2019; Overbey, 2012; Schaubroeck et al., 2007; Tromp & Blomme, 2014). This means that the more satisfied employees are at work, the less likely they want to quit. Similarly, Brandebo et al. (2016) studied the correlation of an employee's propensity to leave the organization with constructive versus destructive leaders. They found statistical significance

showing constructive leadership has stronger negative correlations than destructive leadership in regard to an employees' propensity to leave the organization. Harvey et al. (2007) noted that abusive supervision directly predicted an employee's intent to leave ($\beta=.10$, $p<.01$) and that positive affect (tendency to have an overall sense of well-being, to experience positive emotions...and to see oneself as pleasurablely engaged in terms of both interpersonal relations and achievement) had a direct negative association with turnover intent ($\beta=-.10$, $p<.01$). These results support their hypothesis showing the strongest positive relationship between abusive supervision and intent to quit. Finally, most research has found destructive leadership styles to have a positive correlation to turnover intention and it is safe to assume that both autocratic and laissez-faire follow this trend. Hence, the hypotheses for this study are as follows:

H1. Abusive/toxic leadership, autocratic, and laissez-faire will negatively correlate to job satisfaction.

H2. Abusive/toxic leadership will have the strongest negative correlation to job satisfaction.

H3. Laissez-faire will have the weakest correlation.

H4. Abusive/toxic leadership, autocratic, and laissez-faire will positively correlate to turnover intention.

H5. Abusive/toxic leadership will have the strongest positive correlation to turnover intention.

Since the research on work setting is relatively new and it lacks enough evidence to make predictions for study on the impacts of work setting and on leadership styles. However, as mentioned above, there has been some research suggesting a link between job satisfaction and turnover intention with respect to the work setting (Work-from-home, in-person, versus home-

hybrid). Efimov et al. (2022) stated that they had found a positive link between virtual leadership and well-being, job satisfaction, and a negative link to psychological strain, stress, and perceptions of isolation of digitally collaborating employees. This means that it is likely that remote work will have a more positive outlook on work-life balance, which indicates more job satisfaction (Efimov et al., 2022; Ergovan et al. 2021; Overbey, 2012; Raabe et al., 2020; Schall, 2019) and less intent to quit. However, given the leadership style and the stress of an in-person work setting, they are more likely to be dissatisfied and want to quit (Raabe et al., 2020). As Ipsen et al. (2022) found in their article, the majority (67%) of managers prefer to lead from the office but are willing to manage remotely if needed. They mentioned that having hybrid work with support from top management and in-house support functions can help maintain and improve job satisfaction (Ipsen et al., 2022). Hence, the remaining hypothesis for this study are:

H6: In person job setting will have a stronger correlation on job satisfaction than work-from-home setting.

H7: In person job setting will have a stronger correlation on turnover intention than work-from-home setting.

Methody

Participants

There were a total of 103 individuals who took the survey, of which 5 were unable to finish due to lack of employment. Of the 98 participants, the mean age was 38.8 years ($SD = 12.5$) with the oldest being 68 years old and youngest being 20 years old. The participants belonged to various backgrounds predominantly from elementary to high school education ($n = 27$), healthcare ($n = 24$), research ($n = 5$), human resource ($n = 5$), social services ($n = 4$), IT ($n = 4$), and other industries ($n = 25$) which included college academics ($n = 1$), engineering ($n = 1$),

retail ($n = 1$), entertainment ($n = 1$), communications ($n = 1$), and finance ($n = 1$). Their average length of position being 6.34 years ($SD = 6.2$) with a minimum of less than a year and maximum of 30 years. The population consisted of 68 females and 26 males reviewing the behaviors of their immediate supervisor/manager. There were 2 individuals who did not wish to disclose their gender and 1 non-binary individual in this population. Regarding the demographic of the managers of participants, the majority were female ($n = 56$). Most of the participants of this study work in an in-person setting ($n = 52$), some operate in a hybrid setting ($n = 26$), and 18 individuals work fully remotely.

Materials

The survey was conducted on Qualtrics, containing 24 questions. Demographics questions asked participants about their current employment, gender, area or industry of their job, length of their current position, their immediate supervisor or manager's gender, and their work setting. To keep simplicity in the questionnaire, it was set on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Participants were asked to rate the different statements regarding their immediate supervisor or manager, their job satisfaction, and turnover intention.

Four questions were picked for each type of leader from various questionnaires to measure their implementation styles. First, for autocratic leadership, the validated Dutch Charismatic Leadership in Organizations questionnaire (CLIO) by De Hoogh et al. (2004) was used with a Cronbach's alpha of .74 found in the McCallaghan et al. (2019) article. The participants were asked to make statements such as "My immediate supervisor/ manager is bossy and orders subordinates around," "My immediate supervisor/ manager does not consult others (followers/teammates) when making decisions," "My immediate supervisor/ manager believes

that, in reality, only one person can be the leader,” and “My immediate supervisor/ manager is very critical of new ideas.” To measure the abusive/toxic supervision the abusive supervision item questionnaire by Tepper (2000) was used. Pcy et al. (2017) found a reliability coefficient was .86. The participants were asked to rate four statements as follows: “My supervisor/ manager tells me I am incompetent,” “My immediate supervisor/ manager gives me silent treatment,” “My immediate supervisor/ manager puts me down in front of others” “My immediate supervisor/ manager does not give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of efforts.” Since the Multifactor Leadership questionnaire was too expensive and ineffective for this study, using the definition and some reference of self-assessment sheets, the Laissez-faire questionnaire was created. The participants were asked to rate statements like: “My immediate supervisor/ manager is unavailable when needed by the team,” “My immediate supervisor/ manager provides us complete freedom to solve problems on their own,” “My immediate supervisor/ manager provides little input in most situations,” “My immediate supervisor/ manager avoids making decisions.” Lastly, using Camman et al.’s (1979) questionnaire, participants rated the statement “All in all, I am satisfied with my job” to indicate their level of satisfaction. Pcy et al. (2017) had found the reliability coefficient to be .80. Schaubroeck et al. (2017) study questionnaire, which demonstrated reliability at $\alpha=.78$, participants were asked to rate their turnover intentions. It asked “Which of the following statements most clearly reflects your feelings about your future with this employer? ‘Definitely will not leave’ (1) to Definitely will leave’ (5).” Another question for turnover intention included an item from McCallaghan et al.’s (2019) Intention to Quit (ITO) questionnaire asking to rate the statement “If I could, I would quit today.” The higher the score, the more likely the participant plans to quit.

Procedure

For this research, participants were recruited via an online link shared on platforms such as LinkedIn, Facebook, and Instagram to allow a larger audience. The idea was to share it with colleagues, friends, and family, who can then share it with their coworkers and create a snowball effect. Despite the sample size being small in each category, it enabled the survey to circulate and collect a good sample size for the main analysis of paper. The participants were provided with the link to the survey on online platforms as well as the information sheet showing the IRB approval and information of the study in a general sense. They were asked if they were willing to take the survey. They were also asked about their employment and age at the beginning and if they were unemployed or under 18 years of age, it ended the survey. Only those with a full-time (or at least a part-time) position were asked to take the survey. Of those participants, only those who were 18 or older could complete the full survey. There were no incomplete responses from those who completed the survey.

Results

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for hypotheses 1 through 5. Using a correlation analysis, the relationship between the leadership style, turnover intention and job satisfaction was analyzed. Although in the possible range of 4-28 the leadership styles were on the lower ends and their standard deviations were large. In terms of job satisfaction most people seemed to be satisfied with their jobs and very few had any intention of quitting.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Hypothesis 1 through 5

Variables	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	Possible Range
Abusive Supervision	95	7.92	5.37	4-28
Autocratic	95	9.74	6.78	4-28
Laissez-faire	94	11.4	4.36	4-28
Job satisfaction	93	5.42	1.95	1-7
If I could, I would quit my job today.	93	3.20	2.26	1-7
Future intent to quit the employer	93	2.48	1.36	1-5

Table 2 shows the correlations for hypotheses 1 through 5. The autocratic leadership style had the significantly strongest negative correlation to job satisfaction and a significantly stronger positive correlation to intent to quit. Abusive supervision also had a significant negative correlation for job satisfaction and significant positive correlation for intention to quit and their future intent with the employer. Laissez-faire leadership had the weakest correlation for both job satisfaction and intention to quit. This implies that people are more likely to quit if their boss presents autocratic leadership traits compared to abusive supervision. Either of these would result in a stronger desire to quit than those working with a laissez-faire leader. Similarly, people with autocratic leaders are more dissatisfied with their jobs than those with abusive supervision, but both styles have stronger impacts on job satisfaction than laissez-faire. The correlational results support H1 which states abusive/toxic leadership, autocratic, and laissez-faire are negatively correlated to job satisfaction. However, H2 was not supported which states

“abusive/toxic leadership will have the strongest negative correlation to job satisfaction.” The data presents that autocratic leaders had the strongest negative correlation to job satisfaction instead of abusive/toxic supervision. H3 and H4 were supported as predicted, with laissez-faire having the weakest correlation among the three and all three being positively correlated with turnover intention. H5 was not supported as well, since abusive/toxic leadership did not have the strongest positive correlation to turnover intention. Like job satisfaction, autocratic leadership had the strongest positive correlation to intention to quit for both questions.

Table 2

Correlations for Hypothesis 1 through 5

Variables	N	Abusive Supervision	Autocratic	Laissez-faire
Job satisfaction	92-93	-.675**	-.758**	-.401**
If I could, I would quit my job today.	92-93	.451**	.514**	.268**
Future intent to quit the employer	92-93	.497**	.530**	.279**

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 shows the correlational statistics for both hypotheses 6 and 7. Those who worked in an in-person setting showed their results were significantly and negatively correlated to job satisfaction for abusive supervision, autocratic, and laissez-faire. While people working from home also had significantly negative correlation between abusive supervision and autocratic leadership with job satisfaction, the correlation to laissez-faire was almost non-existent. Nevertheless, this supports H6 that states “In person job setting will have a stronger correlation on job satisfaction than work-from-home setting.” Likewise, H7 stating “In person job setting will have a stronger correlation on turnover intention than work-from-home setting” was

supported. The data indicated significantly positive correlation with intent to quit for the in-person work setting for abusive supervision, autocratic and laissez-faire. In this case, people working from home did not have any significant correlation to abusive supervision or autocratic leadership. Although the data for laissez-faire had a negative correlation to intent to quit, the other question asking about their future intention to quit the employer was positively correlated. However, neither question indicated significance and the relationship between them is almost non-existent.

Hybrid work setting presented a similar trend, where job satisfaction had a significantly stronger relationship with both abusive supervision and autocratic leadership. As for intention to quit, the statement about “If I could, I would quit my job today” had a significantly positive correlation with abusive supervision and autocratic leadership. The second question asking about their future intention to quit their employer did not have a significant correlation for abusive supervision or autocratic. In the case of laissez-faire, it was the opposite where job satisfaction had a positive correlation and both intentions to quit had negative correlation. The statement asking “If I could, I would quit my job today” had a significantly negative correlation, while the second question asking about their future intention to quit the employer did not have a significant correlation. This suggests that those working with autocratic leaders or abusive supervision are more likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs and want to quit even if they are unsure about future intentions. Those with laissez-faire leaders are more satisfied with their jobs and are less likely to want to quit.

Table 3

Correlations based on Work-settings

Variables	N	Abusive Supervision	Autocratic	Laissez-faire
In-Person Setting:				
Job satisfaction	49	-.623**	-.720**	-.523**
If I could, I would quit my job today.	49	.418**	.526**	.540**
Future intent to quit the employer	49	.555**	.597**	.377**
Hybrid Setting:				
Job satisfaction	26	-.775**	-.816**	.025
If I could, I would quit my job today.	26	.513**	.468*	-.465*
Future intent to quit the employer	26	.268	.283	-.015
Work-From-Home Setting:				
Job satisfaction	17-18	-.621**	-.705**	-.054
If I could, I would quit my job today.	17-18	.343	.362	-.074
Future intent to quit the employer	17-18	.392	.360	.015

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In short, laissez-faire leadership had the least impact for those working in a hybrid or fully remote setting. Only the in-person work setting presented the strongest impact for all three leadership styles and jobs satisfaction and turnover intention. The biggest change for this was for those in a hybrid setting where the correlations had flipped for the items.

Discussion

The results of this study add to existing research regarding autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles in relationship to job satisfaction and turnover intention. Additionally, it provides new results for all three leadership styles in relationship to intention to quit while also establishing grounds for employee work setting. These results are useful for companies looking to maximize employee satisfaction, well-being, and performance while reducing costs related to hiring and onboarding of new members due to employee turnover. Understanding the impacts of individual leadership styles on these two metrics allows organizations to locate and train managers to avoid destructive leadership traits while actively engaging with positive ones. For established managers who consistently show destructive leadership styles, it also provides a baseline for how damaging to the overall well-being of the company their actions are. Using the comparisons between the three leadership styles to one another, organizations can generalize about which traits are potentially beneficial despite the overall leadership style being “destructive.” Finally, the addition of work-setting among the existing research provides a foundation for future research on the relationships between home, home-hybrid, and in-person regarding similar metrics.

This current study found that the autocratic leadership style had the strongest negative correlation with job satisfaction and strongest positive correlation with intention to quit. This aligns with the article by Tromp and Blomme’s (2014) but goes against some older studies where abusive leadership had stronger reactions to both when compared to autocratic (Aasland et al., 2010; Agrawal & Gautam 2020; Ashforth, 1994; Brandebo et al., 2016; Einarsen et al., 2007; Ferris et al., 2007; Fors Brandebo et al., 2019; Gabler et al., 2014; Harris et al., 2007; Harvey et al., 2007; Itzkovich et al., 2020; McCallaghan et al., 2019; Pcy et al., 2019; Qian et al, 2017;

Schaubroeck et al., 2007; Schaubroeck et al., 2007; Skogstad et al., 2014; Tepper, 2000; Tromp & Blomme, 2014). This implies that people are more likely to quit if their boss presents autocratic leadership traits than abusive. One reason for such a result could be the nitpicky behavior or micromanagement of these leaders (Gabler et al., 2014; Harris et al., 2007; Harvey et al., 2007; Pyc et al., 2017; Ronen & Donia, 2020; Tepper, 2000). People may have more dislike for those leaders who are controlling than the abusive supervisors who are rude or tend to bully their teammates. Past research stated that autocratic leadership is concerned with behaviors that aim to broaden and enhance a manager's position of power which led to their employees ultimately gaining more stress (De Cremer, 2006; De Cremer, 2007; De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2009; Rast et al., 2013; Tromp & Blomme, 2014). Therefore, in most cases, it is more harmful than good to employ leaders with such traits.

Despite autocratic and abusive supervision leadership's results not aligning with the initial hypothesis regarding rank, laissez-faire leadership had shown the predicted results with the weakest correlation for both job satisfaction and intention to quit. This aligns with expectations that autocratic and abusive leadership, regardless of severity, both result in a stronger desire to quit and job dissatisfaction than those working with a laissez-faire leader. This result is useful due to the existence of mixed historical research. The current results align with the trend of negative effects being on the weaker end of the spectrum and the effects depending on behavior and context of the work environment (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Overbey, 2012; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Yang, 2015).

Another point of interest was the impact that work setting had on the results by leadership styles. People who worked in an in-person setting showed more significantly correlated results to job satisfaction for all three leadership styles. However, those who worked remotely only had

significant correlations to abusive supervision and autocratic leadership, while the correlation to laissez-faire was almost non-existent (-.054, -.074, .015). This could suggest that the remote workers were not bothered by their laissez-faire leaders, either because they are already independent or prefer the independence that such leaders provide. The two questions on intention to quit have interesting correlational results as well. One had a significantly positive correlation for abusive supervision and autocratic while the other did not have a significant correlation for either. It indicates that although the employees would quit if they could, they are not sure if they will soon. Similarly, the hybrid work setting had significant correlations to both abusive supervision and autocratic leadership with job satisfaction. But laissez-faire exhibited the opposite results where job satisfaction had a positive correlation and both intentions to quit had negative correlation. This implies that people favored working for laissez-faire leaders more in such environments.

As the world recovers from the pandemic and adjusts to the changes that are now becoming more common and permanent, there is an increased need to study the relationship between leadership and the work environment. Existing research already shows the improvements to effectiveness by having the options to either work completely remotely or in a hybrid setting (Efimov et al., 2022; Ergovan et al. 2021; Ipsen et al., 2022; Raabe et al., 2020; Schall, 2019). The noteworthy point of this study was that correlations between leadership styles and intention to quit was higher as employees move more towards working face-to-face. This is represented the most in entirely in-person environments, second by home-hybrid, and the least in permanent work-from-home. This suggests that as people work face-to-face more often, they will have stronger reactions and desires to leave than those who work remotely.

In addition to the cultural shift caused by a global pandemic, the constant improvements in technology add to the ever-growing popularity in remote work. So while existing research on leadership has its use, the relational impacts may vary moving forward. For example, previous studies were mostly focused on the impacts in a face-to-face setting, which is starting to lose its luster as many organizations are opting for remote jobs to save costs. Although those results still provide insight to effective management styles, people who work from home or home-hybrid settings require a different approach. This was demonstrated in the study conducted by Ipsen et al. (2022) in which most remote working managers found their jobs to be more demanding. Similarly, this current study was a perfect example demonstrating that effectiveness may vary depending on circumstances; What is effective in one setting may not have the same effects in the other. But it did support Overbey's (2012) study that the leaders who presented a more laissez-faire leadership style made the remote workers less likely to want to quit. It also added information about relationships with autocratic leaders and their employee's intent to quit (Overbey, 2012). Although Overbey's (2012) was an older study, it still holds true for the newer generation.

The results of this study not only add to the inconsistencies of past research regarding the severity of autocratic versus abusive leadership, it also highlights the dependence that all three styles have on the work environment. These inconsistencies and unexpected results enforce the need for additional study on leadership and its impacts on the workforce. However, these results still provide a groundwork for further investigation by researchers and organizations on the variables outside of the ones presented that change leadership effectiveness other than the leader's traits themselves.

Limitations

One of the limitations of the study is the sample size. Although there were a good number of overall participants, there were very few to determine the accuracy of results among the different work settings. The outcomes could have been different if there were more participants, or at least equal number for all three types of work setting. This could also be an issue with slicing the data for the types of leadership. There was far too little data to conduct further analysis for each leadership style and work setting to study each of their impacts on job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Another weakness is the lack of control over the geographical location. Since it was published in an online platform, people from any country outside of the U.S.A. could have participated. Although it does not necessarily make a difference in the results, cultural differences of agreeableness may have impacted the rating of their immediate supervisor/manager's behaviors. Likewise, there was not enough diversity among the job positions as most participants belong to office/desk-jobs. The highest number of individuals were from in-person job settings which also tend to have frequent stress inducing situations with less work-life balance. This indicates more responders are likely to have less satisfaction in their positions.

Lastly, correlation does not mean causation. Leadership style and work setting are correlated to the employees' dissatisfaction with their jobs and their intent to quit. However, there might be variables outside of those listed that influence the results more significantly. Those additional factors, such as predisposed views about their manager or work-life balance, could impact their job satisfaction but were not considered during the survey.

Future Research

For future research, it would be useful to target specific work settings when studying leadership style. Particularly for a hybrid work setting, as in this study, the “worst” results came from those working in a hybrid environment. Thus, it would provide useful data and information on how leaders should approach the employees differently. Additionally, studying that type of work context closely can enable researchers to find the possible causes for such a flip in the results under the laissez-faire leadership. Finally, studying which industries perform best within each work-setting is also a valuable part of research as some industries could cut costs for the organization by operating completely remotely.

By focusing on a specific industry and its performance, future research can have better control over the various pairings of leadership and environment. Targeting specific companies that implement one of those pairs guarantees all responders will be representative of the same demographic. It would make it possible for researchers to analyze the perceptions and impacts of each type of leaders in various sectors along with how they work in each work-setting. This would also enable the study of the perception and preference of the employees on what type of leadership style is preferred for the industry they work in and which of the three work environments is better suited for such divisions of the work force. Since each study would focus on a similar demographic by industry and work-setting, it would also increase the pool of participants of similar type. Larger amounts of underlying data increase the reliability of results when applying them to similar situations.

The leadership styles that previous generations defined as “destructive” may not be viewed the same way. For example, previous studies held laissez-faire leadership in a negative context, yet this study has shown more preference and positive outlook for this type of leader.

Therefore, it could be useful to investigate what underlying factors make a leader good or bad. Depending on the organizational structure, demands, and needs, it could change which leadership is more effective. Some organizations may require a more “autocratic” leader, than a “democratic” one, such as military, construction, and manufacturing. On the other hand, industries such as healthcare, school, and small private businesses would benefit more from a democratic leader as it can utilize and combine various skills to be more efficient and productive.

Studying the impacts by gender and ethnicity can also prove useful. There are general differences in the way male versus female leaders communicate and manage their teammates and followers. There can also be differences in how a leader acts towards followers of the same gender versus different. This type of interaction can be translated into a racial/cultural view as well. There are many underlying biases that arrive due to race and gender that not only have an impact on a leader’s actions, but also the employee’s perceptions of those actions. This could allow organizations to create ways to help reduce biases and improve the overall well-being of the teams.

With technological and generational shifts comes a change in employee perceptions and expectations. What previous generations deemed appropriate and acceptable is vastly different than those of today and tomorrow. The tolerance about what is acceptable, what defines a “good leader,” and what is worthy of time and efforts changes constantly. If the expectations between a single generation vary significantly, the expectations across multiple generations are immense. Therefore, continuous studying of employee characteristics helps us understand which types of leadership styles work best for each group and how those styles shift over time.

References

- Aasland, M. S., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The prevalence of destructive leadership behaviour. *British Journal of Management*, *21*(2), 438–452.
- Alharbi, K. (2021). The relation between leadership style and job satisfaction levels of faculty members at Saudi Arabia university [ProQuest Information & Learning]. In *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences* (Vol. 82, Issue 5–A).
- Agrawal, P., & Gautam, O. (2020). The effects of leaders' behavior on job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, deviant behavior, and job performance of employees. In N. Sharma (Ed.), *Analyzing workplace deviance in modern organizations*. (pp. 100–113). Business Science Reference/IGI Global.
<https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-9996-8.ch006>
- Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations*, *47*(7), 755–778.
<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1177/001872679404700701>
- Batiste-Brazile, G. (2022). The revolving door of teacher intra-district turnover: How principals lock it with the right keys [ProQuest Information & Learning]. In *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences* (Vol. 83, Issue 6–A).
- Brandebo, M. F., Nilsson, S., & Larsson, G. (2016). Leadership: Is bad stronger than good? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *37*(6), 690–710.
<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1108/LODJ-09-2014-0191>

- Breevaart, K., & Zacher, H. (2019). Main and interactive effects of weekly transformational and laissez-faire leadership on followers' trust in the leader and leader effectiveness. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 92(2), 384–409.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12253>
- Broyles, A. T. (2022). Principal laissez-faire leadership on teacher turnover: A look at the role gender has on teachers with different levels of experience [ProQuest Information & Learning]. In *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences* (Vol. 83, Issue 11–A).
- Chénard-Poirier, L. A., Morin, A. J. S., Boudrias, J.-S., & Gillet, N. (2021). The combined effects of destructive and constructive leadership on thriving at work and behavioral empowerment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*.
<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1007/s10869-021-09734-7>
- De Cremer, D. (2006). Affective and motivational consequences of leader self-sacrifice: The moderating effect of autocratic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(1), 79–93.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.10.005>
- De Cremer, D. (2007). Emotional effects of distributive justice as a function of autocratic leader behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(6), 1385–1404.
<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00217.x>
- De Hoogh, A. H. B., Den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2004). De ontwikkeling van de CLIO: Een vragenlijst voor charismatisch leiderschap in organisaties = The development of the CLIO: A questionnaire for measuring charismatic leadership in organizations. *Gedrag En Organisatie*, 17(5), 354–382.

- De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2009). Neuroticism and locus of control as moderators of the relationships of charismatic and autocratic leadership with burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 1058–1067. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016253>
- Efimov, I., Rohwer E., Harth, V., & Mache, S. (2022) Virtual leadership in relation to employees' mental health, job satisfaction and perceptions of isolation: A scoping review. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*:960955. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.960955
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 207–216. <https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002>
- Ferris, G. R., Zinko, R., Brouer, R. L., Buckley, M. R., & Harvey, M. G. (2007). Strategic bullying as a supplementary, balanced perspective on destructive leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 195–206. <https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.004>
- Fors Brandebo, M., Österberg, J., & Berglund, A. K. (2019). The impact of constructive and destructive leadership on soldier's job satisfaction. *Psychological Reports, 122*(3), 1068–1086. DOI: <https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1177/0033294118771542>
- Gabler, C. B., Nagy, K. R., & Hill, R. P. (2014). Causes and consequences of abusive supervision in sales management: A tale of two perspectives. *Psychology & Marketing, 31*(4), 278–293. <https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1002/mar.20694>
- Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Zivnuska, S. (2007). An investigation of abusive supervision as a predictor of performance and the meaning of work as a moderator of the relationship. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 252–263. <https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.007>

Harvey, P., Stoner, J., Hochwarter, W., & Kacmar, C. (2007). Coping with abusive supervision: The neutralizing effects of ingratiation and positive affect on negative employee outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*(3), 264–280.

<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.008>

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). An examination of “nonleadership”: From laissez-faire leadership to leader reward omission and punishment omission. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(6), 1234–1248. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012875>

Itzkovich, Y., Heilbrunn, S., & Aleksic, A. (2020). Full range indeed? The forgotten dark side of leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, *39*(7–8), 851–868.

<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1108/JMD-09-2019-0401>

Ipsen, C., Kirchner, K., Andersone, N., & Karanika-Murray, M. (2022). Becoming a Distance Manager: Managerial Experiences, Perceived Organizational Support, and Job Satisfaction During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*:916234. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.916234

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 755–768. <https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>

McCallaghan, S., Jackson, L. T. B., & Heyns, M. M. (2019). Examining the mediating effect of diversity climate on the relationship between destructive leadership and employee attitudes. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, *29*(6), 563–569.

<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1080/14330237.2019.1695078>

- Overbey, J. A. (2013). Telecommuter intent to leave. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 34(7), 680–699.
<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1108/LODJ-01-2012-0004>
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 438–454.
<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.438>
- Pyc, L. S., Meltzer, D. P., & Liu, C. (2017). Ineffective leadership and employees' negative Outcomes: The mediating effect of anxiety and depression. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 24(2), 196–215.
<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu10.1037str0000030>
- Qian, J., Song, B., & Wang, B. (2017). Abusive supervision and job dissatisfaction: The moderating effects of feedback avoidance and critical thinking. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org10.3389fpsyg.2017.00496>
- Raabe, I. J., Ehlert, A., Johann, D., & Rauhut, H. (2020). Satisfaction of scientists during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown. *Humanities & Social Science Communications*, 7,139.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-00618-4>
- Rast, D. E., III, Hogg, M. A., & Giessner, S. R. (2013). Self-uncertainty and support for autocratic leadership. *Self and Identity*, 12(6), 635–649.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2012.718864>
- Ronen, S., & Donia, M. B. L. (2020). Stifling my fire: The impact of abusive supervision on employees' motivation and ensuing outcomes at work. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 36(3), 205–214. <https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2020a20>

- Schall, M. A. (2019). The Relationship Between Remote Work and Job Satisfaction: The Mediating Roles of Perceived Autonomy, Work-Family Conflict, and Telecommuting Intensity. *Master's Theses*. 5017. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.2x82-58pg>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/5017
- Schaubroeck, J., Walumbwa, F. O., Ganster, D. C., & Kepes, S. (2007). Destructive leader traits and the neutralizing influence of an “enriched” job. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 236–251. <https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.0>
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(1), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80>
- Skogstad, A., Aasland, M. S., Nielsen, M. B., Hetland, J., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2014). The relative effects of constructive, laissez-faire, and tyrannical leadership on subordinate job satisfaction Results from two prospective and representative studies. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie*, 222(4), 221–232.
<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu10.10272151-2604a000189>
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178–190. <https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.2307/1556375>
- Tromp, D. M., & Blomme, R. J. (2014). Leadership style and negative work-home interference in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(1), 85–106.
<https://doi-org.proxyse.uits.iu.edu/10.1108/IJCHM-04-2012-0058>
- Yang, I. (2015). Positive effects of laissez-faire leadership: Conceptual exploration. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(10), 1246–1261. DOI:[10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0016](https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0016)

Appendix

Survey Questionnaire

Q1_ Are you willing to participate in the Study?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

Skip To: End of Survey If Are you willing to participate in the Study? = 2. No

Q2_ Are you currently employed at least part-time?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

Skip To: End of Survey If Are you currently employed at least part-time? = 2. No

Q3_ How old are you? (In years)

Skip To: End of Survey If Condition: How old are you? (In years) Is Less Than 18.

Q3_Sex What is your Gender?

- 1. Male
- 2. Female
- 3. Non-Binary / third gender
- 4. Prefer not to say
- 5. Other _____

Q4_ Which industry do you work in/What is your Profession? (For example: education, healthcare, energy etc.)

Q5_ Length of position in current position (in years):

Q6_ What is the gender of your immediate supervisor/manager?

- 1. Male
- 2. Female
- 3. Non-binary / third gender
- 4. Prefer not to say
- 5. Other _____

Q7_ Which of the following best describes your work setting?

- 1. Work form Home
- 2. In Person
- 3. Hybrid (mix of work from home & office)

Please respond to the following questions indicating to what extent you agree to each of the statements regarding your immediate supervisor/ manager.

Q8_ My immediate supervisor/ manager tells me I am incompetent.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q9_ My immediate supervisor/ manager puts me down in front of others.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q10_ My immediate supervisor/ manager gives me silent treatment.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q11_ My immediate supervisor/ manager does not give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of efforts.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Please respond to the following questions indicating to what extent you agree to each of the statements regarding your immediate supervisor/ manager.

Q11_ My immediate supervisor/ manager is bossy and orders subordinates around.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q12_ My immediate supervisor/ manager does not consult others (followers/teammates) when making decisions.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q13_ My immediate supervisor/ manager believes that only one person can be the leader.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q14_ My immediate supervisor/ manager is very critical of new ideas.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Please respond to the following questions indicating to what extent you agree to each of the statements regarding your immediate supervisor/ manager.

Q15_ My immediate supervisor/ manager is unavailable when needed by the team.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q16_ My immediate supervisor/ manager provides us complete freedom to solve problems on their own.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q17_ My immediate supervisor/ manager provides little input in most situations.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q19_ My immediate supervisor/ manager avoids making decisions.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Please respond to the following questions and rate how strongly you align with these statements.

Q20_ All in all, I am satisfied with my job.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q21_ If I could, I would quit my job today.

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Somewhat disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Slightly agree
- 6. Somewhat agree
- 7. Strongly agree

Q22_ Which of the following statements most clearly reflects your feelings about your future with this employer?

- 1. Definitely will NOT leave
- 2. Maybe will not leave
- 3. Unsure
- 4. Maybe will leave
- 5. Definitely Will leave

Thank you for your time and participation.

Curriculum Vitae

Sumaya Sanam
syasanam@gmail.com

RESEARCH-ASSISTANTSHIP EXPERIENCE

AREC (Applied Research & Education Center)

Indiana University Southeast:
Director: Dr. Melissa S. Fry

March 2022 - Current

Responsibilities:

- Research primarily focused on Qualitative Methodology
- Evaluating the fidelity and quality of presenters to ensure proper procedure is followed
- Conducting participant surveys for Pre & Post Session
 - o Performing Data Entry, Analysis, Coding, Cleaning, and Visualization
- SPARS website data analysis to provide SAMSHA reporting on Mental Health Clinics
 - o CCBHC (Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinic) grant
- Creating monthly reports and semi-annual government reporting
 - o Primarily utilizing SPSS, Excel, & Word

Pennsylvania State University – Harrisburg

Psychology Fad Lab:
Dr. Kimberly A. Schreck, BCBA

June 2020 - Current

Ethics in Media

(In Progress)

Responsibilities:

- Reviewing the information provided on Autism Treatment Reporting
- Recoding transcripts of Major News Networks
 - o ABC, CBS, CNN, FOX, MSNBC, and NBC
 - o Broadcasts from January 2013 to December 2020
- Measuring the accuracy of ABA Treatment Information
- Evaluating the frequency of misinformation
 - o Bleach Therapy, Sensory Integration Therapy, Etc.

Sleep problems Associated with MPS

(In Progress)

Responsibilities:

- Designing reference tables to organize collected literature, data methods, and results
- Establishing demographics tables based on patient symptoms
 - o Physical, Cognitive, Behavioral, Etc.
- Forming contact lists & study questionnaires for future data acquisition

EDUCATION

- Masters of Interdisciplinary Studies** **May 2023**
- Indiana University Southeast
 - Thesis: *“Impacts of leadership styles on job satisfaction and turnover intention”*
 - Graduated Summa Cum Laude (4.00)
- Masters Certification** **June 2022**
- Indiana University Southeast
 - Graduated Summa Cum Laude (4.00)
- Bachelors of Science: Psychology** **May 2020**
- Pennsylvania State University
 - Graduated Summa Cum Laude (3.95)
- Associates of Arts: Psychology** **May 2019**
- Harrisburg Area Community College
 - Graduated Cum Laude (3.2)

HONORS AND AWARDS

- IU Grad School Fellowship **2022 – 2023**
- Psi Chi International Honors Society in Psychology **December 2019**
- SCRA (Society for Community Research & Action) **October 2019**
- APA (American Psychological Association) **January 2020**

PUBLICATIONS

- Sanam, S. (2023). An Interdisciplinary Culture versus Specialized Discipline in Academia. *Graduate Research Journal*, 13, 97-106.
- Sanam, S. (2023). Interdisciplinary Approach to Disability Visibility. *Graduate Research Journal*, 13, 107-120.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

- CITI PROGRAM** **January 2023**
- Social & Behavioral Human Subjects Research (IRB) Course
- CMHS IPP AND NOMS CLIENT-LEVEL SERVICE TOOL TRAINING** **SEPT 2022**
- Purpose:* To Understand, Collect and Work with Data from the Clients of Mental Health Facilities

IOA (Interobserver) Training: <i>Love Notes Fidelity & Quality Control</i> <i>Purpose:</i> To Ensure Consistency in Ratings of sessions	April 2022
Fad Lab <i>Purpose:</i> To Ensure 80-90% accuracy and consistency among peers	April 2022
LOVE NOTES TRAINING CAMP <i>Purpose:</i> Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Session's Observation on Fidelity and Quality Control	March 2022
UDEMY - Full Stack Web Development using Java Script - Microsoft Excel – Excel from Beginner to Advanced	June 2021 February 2021
SHECODES - Responsive Web Developer - React Developer - Front-End Web Development	April 2021 December 2020 November 2020

OTHER WORK EXPERIENCE

INGRAM MICRO-MANAGE Warehouse Associate	June 2021 – November 2021
AMAZON DISTRIBUTION Warehouse Associate	June 2020 – April 2021
CITI TRENDS Store Associate	February 2018 – May 2019
SANAM BABY & PET SITTING Babysitter & Pet Sitter	June 2016 – April 2020
MEENA BAZAR Store Associate	February 2015– January 2016

SERVICES

TO THE UNIVERSITY:

PENN STATE HARRISBURG EVENTS: <i>“We Are” Weekend</i> - Preparing and planning for games and tours	2019 – 2020
--	--------------------

Domestic Violence Awareness

- Hosting and greeting guest speakers for the event

Nursing Home Cardmaking

- Making cards and distributing them to the residents of nursing homes

LGBTQ Pride Month March

TO THE COMMUNITY:

KENTUCKY PETS ALIVE

October 2020 – Current

- Providing care for the yet-to-adopt cats at the shelter
- Hosting adoption events

HOSTED FUND-RAISING CHARITY EVENTS

2014 – 2015

Ambala Foundation & Jamia Imbadia Darul Uloom & Orphanage

- Organizing, planning, and executing the event
- Hosting food bank events to collect donations
- Touring the event to provide information about the organization.

RX TREATMENT DISABILITY & THERAPY CENTER

2013 – 2016

- Planned activities and managed patient schedules
- Engaged in exercise sessions
- Provided focused attention to those in need of care

Azad Ali Pets Animal Shelter

2012 – 2016

- Fostered and cared for animals with special needs
- Helped with rehoming, rehabilitation, & training.

SKILLS

Programming: HTML, CSS, JavaScript.

Applications: SPSS, Excel, Word, PowerPoint, Adobe, Canva.

Research Related: Government Grant Reporting, Qualtrics, Data Visualization, Organizing Data, Data Cleaning, Coding.

Strengths Finder 2.0: Learner, Achiever, Intellection, Input, Discipline