

The Roles of Transformational Leadership, Communication Competence and Communication Satisfaction on Employees' Job Satisfaction

Dönüştürücü Liderlik, İletişim Yetkinliği ve İletişim Memnuniyetinin Çalışanların İş Tatmini Üzerindeki Rolü

Bülent Ulutürk, Dr., Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü, E-Posta: bulentuluturk@yahoo.com
Recep Tayfun, Prof. Dr., Başkent Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, E-Posta: tayfun@baskent.edu.tr

Keywords:

Leadership,
Transformational
Leadership,
Communication
Competence,
Communication
Satisfaction,
Job Satisfaction.

Abstract

This article explores how the perceptions of airport security employees' transformational leadership and communication practices are associated with their communication and job satisfaction. Specifically, the study investigates the effects of transformational leadership and communication competence on job satisfaction by considering the mediating role of communication satisfaction. A cross-sectional survey using a self-administered questionnaire was conducted among employees of a private security company in Turkey. The results of the study show that employee perceptions of transformational leadership influence their perceptions of communication and job satisfaction. Moreover, employee communication satisfaction mediated the relationship between employee perceptions of transformational leadership, communication competence and their job satisfaction level. Implications for research and practice are also discussed.

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Liderlik,
Dönüştürücü Liderlik,
İletişim Yetkinliği,
İletişim Memnuniyeti,
İş Tatmini.

Öz

Bu makale, havaalanı güvenlik çalışanlarının dönüştürücü liderlik ve iletişim uygulamalarına yönelik tutumlarının, iletişim ve iş tatminleri ile ilişkisini incelemektedir. Çalışma, iletişim memnuniyetinin aracılık rolünü de göz önünde bulundurarak dönüştürücü liderlik ve iletişim yetkinliğinin iş tatmini üzerindeki etkilerini araştırmaktadır. Çalışma, Türkiye'de özel bir güvenlik şirketinin çalışanları arasında yapılan anket sonuçlarına dayanmaktadır. Çalışmanın sonuçları, çalışanların yöneticilerine ilişkin dönüştürücü liderlik tutumlarının onların iletişim ve iş tatminlerini önemli derecede etkilediğini göstermektedir. Bulgular, çalışanların iletişim memnuniyetinin, onların dönüştürücü liderlik tutumları, iletişim yetkinlikleri ve iş tatmini düzeyleri arasında aracılık rolü üstlendiğini göstermiştir. Ayrıca, çalışmada uygulayıcılara ve araştırmacılara yönelik önerilere yer verilmiştir.

Introduction

Airports serve a significant role in enhancing economic development by encouraging tourism and international business (Bitzan & Peoples, 2017); however, security threats could have negative effects on safety and economic value of these sectors (Baker, 2015). Civil aviation has been one of the most attractive targets for criminals and terrorist organizations since the first hijacking of an airplane in Peru in 1931. Moreover, the aviation security has become important more than ever after the September 11 terrorist attacks in the United States (Baker, 2015; Baeriswyl, Krause, & Schwaninger, 2016). Since providing security at airports and transportation systems is a complex and difficult task, governments around the globe have created policies, regulations, and organizations to achieve the highest level of security at airports. The purpose of aviation security is proactively take security countermeasures to protect airports, transportation systems as well as passengers, staff and general public by identifying and assessing security risks and vulnerabilities, implementing new detection equipment, and implementing rules and regulations to reduce the likelihood of a successful attack based on a security risk management program (Baker, 2015).

In Turkey, a number of international standards and procedures are followed in order to strengthen measures and standards on civil aviation security. Airport security in Turkey is provided by the Turkish National Police Department as well as private security companies; consequently, airport security requires cooperation of both private sector and government stakeholders.

In addition to performing a wide range of police duties, such as preventing crime, conducting investigations, providing a uniformed policing presence, and deterring and responding to crime and disorder, the police cooperate with intelligence agencies for maintaining public order and safety at airports across the country (Walsh, Whetstone, Banton, Brodeur, & Kelling, 2018). On the other hand, security screening of all passengers, airline and airport employees, and their belongings is conducted by private security companies; thus, private security employees interact with travelers, while police officers monitor the operations of private security employees, conduct safety risk assessment and security interviews (Baeriswyl, Krause, & Schwaninger, 2016). Therefore, the terms private security employees and airport security employees are used interchangeably in this study. Similar to the U.S. and many European countries, there has been an enormous growth in the private security industry in Turkey for the last three decades (Steden & Nalla, 2010). Furthermore, the number of airport security employees has exceeded the number of police officers at airports in Turkey. Therefore, the effective implementation of airport security policies is highly relies on commitment and performance of private security employees.

Since the successful implementation of the British privatization of public sector functions in the early 1980s, the policy of privatization has been widely adopted throughout the world (Megginson & Netter, 2001). As in many government services, the privatization policy has influenced the function of public policing, resulting in the transition of law enforcement from a 'monopolistic' model to a 'pluralistic' model. Hence, law enforcement agencies and private security companies have been working closely with each other in the delivery of security services (White, 2010; Steden & Nalla, 2010).

In today's competitive globalized business environment, human resource is considered one of the most important resources of organizations (Banfield & Kay, 2012). The conditions of change in technology, economy, political and social systems have also changed the working environment of employees, resulting in more dynamic, more sophisticated and people-oriented (Banfield & Kay, 2012). Therefore, effectively managing an organization has become more complex and challenging task for managers, because it requires improvement of organizational and individual performance as well as employee satisfaction (Banfield & Kay, 2012).

The private security industry plays a critical role in providing security in today's rapidly changing world. Job dissatisfaction among private security employees and managers would affect their commitment and overall performance. As suggested by Downs and Hazen (1977), communication plays an important role for any kind of organization because it is viewed as a key process for organizations. Likewise, leadership is considered as a communication process between leaders and followers (Luthra & Dahiya, 2015). Communication is an important factor for successful leadership; therefore, effective leadership and effective communication are closely linked with each other, resulting in improving organizational performance to meet strategic objectives (Jablin, 2004; Luthra & Dahiya, 2015). Furthermore, effective leadership requires having strong communication skills which create an atmosphere of mutual trust among organizational members (Northouse, 2013). The literature suggests that leadership and communication have important roles in influencing employees' job satisfaction (Luthra & Dahiya, 2015).

Leadership, communication, and job satisfaction are some of the most researched topics in organizational behavior (Asrar-ul-Haq & Anwar, 2018; Rafferty & Griffin, 2009). However, there has been a scarcity of empirical research examining relationships among all of these variables simultaneously. Moreover, to date, the effects of leadership style on employee performance (Abdullah, Islam, & Al-Homayan, 2013), the determinants of job satisfaction, including employee participation, organizational commitment, work-life balance, job insecurity, work characteristics, emotional exhaustion, employee characteristics, working conditions, organizational and environmental factors (Lim & Nalla, 2014; Nalla, Paek, & Lim, 2016; Nalla & Cobbina, 2017; Anyango & Aila, 2017; Mushtaq, Ahmad, & Shafiq, 2015; Saliu, Gbadeyan, & Olujide, 2015; Onyelankea, 2017; Choi & Jang, 2018; Baeriswyl, Krause, & Schwaninger, 2016; Anyango, Ojera, & Ochieng, 2015; Noreen & Dominic, 2017; Tayfun & Uluturk, 2016) have been studied in the private security industry; however, variables of leadership and communication have never been studied simultaneously among private security employees. Therefore, the current study attempts to fill this gap and improve our understanding by investigating the role of transformational leadership, communication competence, and communication satisfaction on employees' job satisfaction in the private security context.

Based on the evidence linking leadership style and communication competence to communication satisfaction and job satisfaction (Steele & Plenty 2014; Madlock, 2008 and 2012), we draw on transformational leadership and communication theories to suggest that leadership and communication play very crucial roles in employee satisfaction. Thus, the current study aims to examine the relationship between perceived transformational leadership, communication competence, communication satisfaction and job satisfaction

among airport security employees in Turkey. Moreover, the present study will test the mediating role of communication satisfaction between transformational leadership, communication competence, and job satisfaction.

Literature Review

Transformational Leadership

Leadership is considered one of the most significant factors on individual and organizational performance (Albloshi & Nawar, 2015). Hence, over the last century, thousands of empirical studies on leadership, from different perspectives, have been carried out in different settings (Vinger & Cilliers, 2006), resulting in more than 65 different classification. Most of the focus on leadership has been on process, traits or characteristics, act or behavior, power relations, knowledge and skills (Northouse, 2013). Although, no universally accepted definition of leadership exists, Northouse (2013) identified the main components of the concept. Northouse defines leadership as follows, “leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (2013, p. 5). According to Peter Drucker, who emphasizes the role of leadership in the managerial process, “leadership is lifting of a man’s vision to higher sights, the raising of a man’s performance to a higher standard, the building of a man’s personality beyond its normal limitations” (2011, p. 138). To date, various leadership theories have been proposed to define leadership dimensions and to examine different leadership characteristics (Northouse, 2013). Among them, transformational leadership has been considered as one of the most attractive leadership styles since the 1980s ((Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Mujkic, Sehic, Rahimic, & Jusic, 2014).

The transactional and transformational leadership styles (Burns, 1978) have attracted many researchers’ interest. According to Burns (1978, p. 20), transforming leadership “occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality”. Bass and Riggio (2006) considered transformational leadership as an extension of transactional leadership (Sabella, 2016). According to MacKenzie and colleagues (2001), transformational leadership differs from transactional leadership in terms of the process and behaviors through which leaders have influence on their followers. Transactional leadership focuses on the exchanges or transactions among leaders, colleagues and followers, in which leaders discuss their role requirements, conditions and rewards with followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transactional leadership is characterized by positive or negative reinforcement and active or passive forms of management by exception (Bass & Avolio, 1994); whereas, transformational leadership is characterized by individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

At least one of the elements of transformational leadership need to be employed to achieve remarkable results (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The component of idealized influence means that transformational leaders become role models for their followers who admire, respect, trust, and imitate their leaders (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Inspirational motivation refers to transformational leaders motivating and inspiring their followers through having

a vision and meeting high expectations (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The leader emphasizes team work by establishing a shared vision in the organization. Intellectual stimulation means that transformational leaders encourage innovation and creativity among followers. The leader stimulates followers to challenge the traditional way of thinking and suggests trying new approaches to old problems. Individualized consideration means that the leader identifies followers' individual needs and abilities, and coaches them to enhance their skills and capabilities (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

There is empirical evidence showing that transformational leadership has positive relationship with a wide variety of organizational and individual outcomes, including job satisfaction, (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Aydogmus, Camgoz, Ergeneli, & Ekmekci, 2017), follower satisfaction with leader (Banks, McCauley, Gardner, & Guler, 2016), motivation (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), task performance, (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001; Banks, McCauley, Gardner, & Guler, 2016), organizational commitment (Tyssen, Wald, & Heidenreich, 2013; Mahdian & Poor, 2014), citizenship behavior, (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001; Mahdian & Poor, 2014). Furthermore, a number of research studies have suggested that transformational leadership has more significant effect on job satisfaction than any other leadership styles (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Top, Tarcan, Tekingunduz, & Hikmet, 2013; Mujkic, Sehic, Rahimic, & Jusic, 2014; Aydogmus, Camgoz, Ergeneli, & Ekmekci, 2017; Barnett, 2017), and transformational leadership also has positive relationships with internal communication (Men, 2014) and communication satisfaction (Terek, Nikolic, Gligorovic, Glusac, & Tasic, 2014). Based on the results of previous studies, the following hypotheses were developed:

Hypothesis 1: Perceived Transformational leadership is positively associated with job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: Perceived Transformational leadership is positively associated with communication satisfaction.

Communication Competence

Effective communication is regarded as an important factor for organizational success (Luthra & Dahiya, 2015). A manager or leader persuades his or her followers, creates and manages value system, and supports, motivates, and inspires them to work beyond the expectations through effective leadership and communication. Good communication skills are considered to be one of the most important aspects of leadership in the workplace (Luthra & Dahiya, 2015). According to Morreale, Spitzberg, and Barge (2007, p. 21), "communication is a process of managing messages for the purpose of creating meaning", while leadership is considered "as an ongoing conversation between leaders and followers in which communication can be conceived of as doing the work of leadership" (Jablin, 2004, p. 222). Similarly, Hackman and Johnson (2018, p. 12) state that "leadership is human communication that modifies the attitudes and behavior of others in order to meet shared group goals and needs." Accordingly, poor communication may lead to ineffective leadership, ultimately resulting in poor relationships in the workplace and goal failure (Ruben & Gigliotti, 2016). Hackman and Johnson (2018), consequently, highlight the importance of having good communication skills and competencies for effective leadership communication.

Communication competence has been an interest of research for more than fifty years (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Scientists and philosophers have developed a wide variety of definitions of communication competence and used related terms such as “interpersonal competence, communicative competence, social competence, and relational competence” (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989, p.2). Morreale, Spitzberg, and Barge defined “communication competence as the use of verbal and nonverbal behavior to accomplish preferred outcomes in a way that is appropriate to the context” (2007, p. 43). Based on the definition of the concept, Morreale and colleagues (2007) highlighted the importance of appropriateness and effectiveness for communication success (Morreale, Spitzberg, & Barge, 2007, p. 30). The basic model of communication competence also includes motivation, knowledge, and skills. (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989; Morreale, Spitzberg, & Barge, 2007). Competent leaders, having a high sense of adaptability and collaboration, understand different situations and personal motives and pressures within the communication, adopt new communicative strategies under different circumstances, and have favorable relationships with others in the organization (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989).

Despite the vast amount of research examining communication competence, few studies have been conducted on the relationship between communication competence and personal outcomes. However, recent research suggests that communication competence is positively associated with communication satisfaction, (Madlock, 2008), job satisfaction, (Madlock, 2008 and 2012; Henderson, 2008; Cetin, Karabay, & Efe, 2012), motivation, (Mikkelsen, York, & Arritola, 2015), organizational commitment, (Mikkelsen, York, & Arritola, 2015), and team member satisfaction and productivity (Henderson, 2008). One such study was that of Madlock (2008), whose findings showed that leadership styles and supervisor communication competence had significant effects on both job satisfaction and communication satisfaction. More recently, Mikkelsen, York, and Arritola (2015) found that supervisor communication competence and relations-oriented leadership style were significant predictors of job satisfaction, motivation and commitment. The current study differs from the previous studies in that it focuses to what extent transformational leadership and communication competence impact employee satisfaction in one study. Hence, the following hypotheses were proposed in the study:

Hypothesis 3: Communication competence is positively associated with job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4: Communication competence is positively associated with communication satisfaction.

Communication Satisfaction

Since one of the focus of this study is to offer an overview of communication within an organization, we begin with the definition of organizational communication. Conrad and Poole (1998, p. 5) defined “organizational communication as a process through which people, acting together, create, sustain, and manage meanings through the use of verbal and nonverbal signs and symbols within a particular context.” According to Miller and Barbour (2014), the communication process is becoming more complex since the organizational world has become much more complicated than earlier periods. Moreover,

the history of industrialization, management, and social change offer insights into how organizations, institutions, and social groupings have been evolved over time (Miller & Barbour, 2014). Similarly, organizational communication has been evolved from the classical approach to the cultural approach, resulting in a more human oriented working environments (Miller & Barbour, 2014). Hence, it is crucial to understand attitudes of employees to the changing nature of organizational communication for success. Consequently, the literature suggests that a successful internal communication should be created in the workplace in which employees are satisfied with communication practices and organizational goals are met.

There has been an increasing attention on communication satisfaction since it is a crucial determinant of quality of life and well-being (Hecht, 1978). Hecht (1978), highlighted the importance of communication in the improvement and preservation of mental health. According to Hecht (1978), understanding communication satisfaction is essential to explain the present issues and predict future communication behavior. Communication satisfaction is defined by Thayer (1968, p. 144) as “the personal satisfaction inherent in successfully communicating to someone or in successfully being communicated with”. The concept of communication has been used in different settings, such as interpersonal, group, and organizational (Hecht, 1978).

According to Pincus (1986), two dominant perspectives have been used in the organizational setting: process and perception. Research on communication satisfaction use perception or attitude approach. In earlier studies, communication satisfaction was treated as a unidimensional concept, whereas a multidimensional approach consists of eight factors was developed by Downs and Hazen (1977): Supervisory communication, organizational integration, media quality, communication climate, personal feedback, horizontal communication, organizational perspective, and subordinate communication (Downs & Hazen, 1977).

Many researchers have attempted to link the concept of communication satisfaction with leadership style (Madlock, 2008), communication competence (Madlock, 2008), organizational commitment (Engin & Akgoz, 2013), job satisfaction (Pincus, 1986; Abdullah & Hui, 2014; Hua & Omar 2016), job performance (Pincus, 1986), and organizational citizenship behavior (Chan & Lai, 2017). One such study was that of Hua and Omar (2016), which found that there was a strong relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Another example was a study by Pincus (1986), whose findings indicated that communication satisfaction was associated with both job satisfaction and performance. Furthermore, findings of Carriere and Bourque (2009) indicated that communication satisfaction was a full mediator between job satisfaction and communication practices. Since prior research indicates that communication satisfaction is directly and indirectly related to personal outcomes, we expect the followings:

Hypothesis 5: Communication satisfaction is positively associated with job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6: Communication satisfaction mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 7: Communication satisfaction mediates the relationship between communication competence and job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one of the most studied subjects in organizational behavior (Spector, 1997). According to psychologists, for most individuals, feelings about work and its meaning in their lives are important elements for employment experiences (Rafferty & Griffin, 2009). Locke defined job satisfaction as “the pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (1976, p.1304), while Spector defined it as “the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs” (1997, p. 2). The importance of Locke’s definition comes from the fact that it includes cognitive and affective component of attitudes. Namely, Locke underlined the interplay between work feeling and thinking based on the idea that cognitive and affective components of job satisfaction are closely correlated (Saari & Judge, 2004). Furthermore, job satisfaction has cognitive, affective, and behavioral components (Hulin & Judge, 2003). Hence, Hulin and Judge (2003) recognized that the assessment of cognitive and affective responses of individuals would expand understanding of their behavior towards workplace.

Job satisfaction has been recognized as a global concept that includes different facets (Saari & Judge, 2004). Researchers examined job satisfaction using either an instrument consists of various dimensions of the job or a global (overall) measure. Facet satisfaction scales are used to explore the particular job dimensions such as pay, coworkers, supervision, promotions, and the work itself (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), in contrast, overall or global satisfaction is the sum of the assessments of various job dimensions (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951; Locke, 1969).

The concept of job satisfaction has received much attention by researchers and practitioners because of its considerable effects on individual and organizational outcomes. Job satisfaction has been positively related to organizational commitment (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Srivastava, 2013), job performance (Platis, Reklitis, & Zimeras, 2015; Bakotic, 2016); organizational citizenship behavior (Hulin & Judge, 2003; Pavalache-Illie, 2014), and negatively related to absenteeism (Martin & Miller, 1986) and employee turnover (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Lucas, Parasuraman, Davis, & Enis, 1987).

It is also noteworthy to discuss the possible consequences of job dissatisfaction (Henne & Locke, 1985). Henne and Locke (1985) argued that dissatisfied people might make alternative plans depending on their situation and abilities. Henne and Locke (1985) further stated that dissatisfaction with the workplace would cause lower employee performance, protest, or withdrawal. Employees would change their perceptions and focus on enjoyable things at work, change their values to adopt organization’s values, ignore negative aspects of the job, or tolerate their dissatisfaction (Henne & Locke, 1985). According to Henne and Locke (1985), satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the workplace affect life satisfaction, mental health, and physical health. Likewise, Farrell (1983) argued that dissatisfied employees might either leave the organization, initiate some efforts to improve workplace conditions, wait for some improvements to come about, or show negligent behaviors such as absenteeism and less effort at work.

As discussed in detail above, airports, particularly international airports, are considered critical infrastructures for not only national security but also economic

vitality; therefore, ensuring safety and security of passengers, staff, and public depends on the high performance of airport security employees, otherwise security failures cause immeasurable damage. Consequently, it is a necessity to measure the job satisfaction level of airport security employees and identify factors influencing job satisfaction in order to take necessary precautions. Therefore, this research attempts to determine the effects of leadership, communication competence, and communication satisfaction on job satisfaction of airport security employees.

Method

Research Context

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the effects of transformational leadership, communication competence, and communication satisfaction on job satisfaction controlling for several background variables within the private security sector. This study used a self-administered questionnaire for data collection. A total of 826 non-managerial employees working for the private security business participated in the study. This study was carried out in an international airport operated by TAV Private Security Company in Turkey. Upon obtaining permission from the senior management of the organization, administrative managers helped in the survey administration process. Out of 1000 distributed questionnaires, 826 participants provided useable completed surveys; hence, the response rate was 82 per cent. A consent form was provided to participants regarding topics such as the purpose, benefits, risks and methods of the study as well as voluntary participation. Furthermore, the participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity throughout the study. The English version of the questionnaire was translated into Turkish and back translated into English by three bilingual professionals. The survey was conducted from February through April 2018.

The sample consisted of 442 males (41.5 %), 343 (53.5 %) females and 41 (5 %) undisclosed. Participants were aged 20-29 (25.5 %), 30-39 (50.9 %), and 40 + years (17.6 %), and (5.9%) were undisclosed. Of the respondents who answered the question about marital status, 53.6 percent were married while 39.5 percent were unmarried. The sample comprised 18 secondary school graduates (2.2 %), 555 high school graduates (67.2%), 151 two-year college graduates (18.3%), 56 four-year college graduates (6.8 %), and 3 postgraduates (0.4%). Out of 770 (93.2%) who reported their experience (tenure) in their current organization, 19.4 percent of the respondents had less than 1 year, 18.4 percent had 1-2 years, 20 percent had 3-4 years, 10.7 percent had 5-6 years, 3.6 percent had 7-8 years, 4.4 percent had 9-10 years, and 16.8 had more than 10 years.

Measures

Previously validated measurements were adopted for the current study. A 5-point, agree-disagree Likert scale was used in this study. The authors standardized the responses by changing some of the original 7-point Likert scales to 5-point Likert scales to avoid confusion and inconsistency. Participants were asked to fill out the questionnaire with their immediate supervisor in mind when answering the questions. The coefficient alpha and composite reliability estimates were above 0.70.

Transformational Leadership Behavior was measured by 23-item Transformational Leadership Behavior Inventory developed by Podsakoff and colleagues (1990). The instrument measured “six dimensions of transformational leadership behavior: articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, having high performance expectations, providing individualized support, and providing intellectual stimulation” (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990, p.7). However, CFA and reliability tests supported a two-factor (i.e., core transformational leadership behavior and providing individualized support) structure for this instrument. Due to high intercorrelation among the three dimensions (articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals), a single dimension (12 item) called “core transformational leadership behavior” was created as in the studies of Podsakoff et al. (1990), Mackenzie et al. (2001), and Terek et al. (2014). In addition, “providing individualized support” dimension (5 item) was also found to be a reliable and valid construct in this study.

Communication Competence was measured by the Communicator Competence scale developed by Monge and colleagues (1982). This scale aims to measure the communication competence of supervisors. The original scale consists of 12 items; nevertheless, two items were dropped because of cross loadings and low loadings.

The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire was used in this study to measure employees’ perspective about communication practices within the department (Downs & Hazen, 1977). The questionnaire originally consisted of 40 items covering eight dimensions: “communication with superiors, organizational integration, media quality, communication climate, personal feedback, horizontal communication, organizational perspective, and communication with subordinates” (Downs & Hazen, 1977, p.69). Since this study included non-managerial officers, subordinate communication dimension was excluded from this study. Although each dimension originally consisted of five items, several items were dropped because of cross loadings and low loadings (i.e., horizontal communication (3 item) and organizational perspective (4 item)).

Job Satisfaction was measured by the Overall Job Satisfaction Scale developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951). Although, Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Scale consists of 18 items, a short version (6 items) was used in this study as in the study of Agho, Price and Mueller (1992). The instrument aimed to measure the degree to which respondents are satisfied and happy with their current job.

Control Variables. Demographic variables such as gender (female = 0, male = 1), marital status (unmarried = 0, married = 1), age (20-29 = 1, 30-39 = 2, 40 years and above = 3), level of education (1 = secondary school, 2 = high school, 3 = two-year college, 4 = 4-year college/university, 5 = graduate school) and experience (1= less than 1 year, 2= 1-2 years, 3= 3-4 years, 4= 5-6 years, 5= 7-8 years, 6= 9-10 years, 7= more than 10 years) were controlled in this study, since these variables could influence employees’ attitudes.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed in three phases. First, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to evaluate the psychometric properties of instruments. After verifying the

adequacy of the measurement model (i.e., reliability and validity), the structural equation model was used to test the hypothesized model. Lastly, the bootstrapping method was performed to assess indirect effects in mediational models (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Meanwhile, a Pearson correlation analysis was performed to identify relationships between the key study variables. All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS 18 and AMOS 21.

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Table 1 and 2 show the results of the CFA, means, standard deviations, reliabilities (both Cronbach's and composite reliabilities), average variances extracted (AVE), and Pearson correlation coefficient between the variables examined in this study. The results show that the model fit the data adequately ($\chi^2 = 789.25$, $p < .001$, "degrees of freedom [df] = 3,373; comparative fit index [CFI] = 0.96; goodness for fit index [GFI] = 0.92; normal fit index; [NFI] = 0.95; root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] = 0.05)" (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006, p. 559). The reliability and validity of the scales were evaluated by examining Cronbach's alpha and the Composite reliability coefficients both of which exceeded 0.8, indicating that the measures are very reliable.

Moreover, the criterion of Fornell and Larcker (1981) were used to assess the convergent and discriminant validity. The results indicate that the AVE values for each of the latent variables are higher than 0.50. The findings demonstrated convergent validity of the instruments since most items loaded strongly and significantly on a single factor; however, 11 items were removed from scales due to cross-loadings or low loadings (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2014). Taken together, these results supported the convergent and discriminant validity of the transformational leadership, communication competence, communication satisfaction, and job satisfaction scales.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, Intercorrelations, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) Results

Variable	M	SD	α	CR	AVE	1	2	3	4
1. CommunicationSatisfaction	99.01	27.34	0.96	0.93	0.68				
2. JobSatisfaction	17.77	5.52	0.93	0.93	0.74	.59**			
3. TransformationalLeadership	56.82	15.29	0.95	0.88	0.78	.75**	.55**		
4. CommunicatorCompetence	33.81	9.40	0.94	0.94	0.61	.80**	.57**	.74**	-

Model fit: $\chi^2 = 789.257$, $p < .001$, $df = 3,373$; $GFI=0.92$; $CFI = 0.96$; $NFI=0.95$; $RMSEA = 0.054$.

Notes: N=826. M= Mean; SD= standard deviation; df= degrees of freedom; CR= composite reliability; AVE= average variance extracted; CFI= comparative fit index; GFI= goodness for fit index; NFI= normal fit index; RMSA= Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. Transformational leadership and communication satisfaction were included in the CFA as second-order factors each composed of two and seven dimensions, respectively. ** $p < 0.01$.

Table 2. Correlation Coefficients, Composite Reliability, and Average Variance Extracted for Constructs

Construct	Factor	CR (Above 0.6)	AVE (Above 0.5)	α
Transformational Leadership		0,91	0,83	0,95
	Core Transformational L.	0,94	0,59	0,94
	Individual Consideration	0,88	0,61	0,88
Communication Satisfaction		0,93	0,68	0,96
	Climate	0,88	0,6	0,88
	Integration	0,86	0,55	0,85
	Supervisory Communication	0,92	0,69	0,91
	Media Quality	0,9	0,64	0,9
	Horizontal Communication	0,75	0,5	0,74
	Feedback	0,88	0,59	0,88
Communication Competence	Organization Perspective	0,83	0,56	0,84
		0,94	0,61	0,94
Job Satisfaction		0,93	0,72	0,93

Finally, transformational leadership and communication satisfaction instruments were included in the CFA as second-order factors each composed of two and seven dimensions, respectively. This study operationalized transformational leadership as a latent factor composed of two dimensions: individual considerations and core transformational leadership; likewise, communication satisfaction composed of seven dimensions: climate, integration, communication with superiors, horizontal communication, feedback, media quality, and organizational perspective.

The research question addresses the impact of transformational leadership, communication competence, and communication satisfaction on employee job satisfaction. Based on the results of Pearson's correlation, all variables were found to have significant correlations with each other. As indicated by Table 1, job satisfaction was significantly positively correlated with transformational leadership ($r=0.55$, $p<0.01$), communication competence ($r=0.57$, $p<0.01$), and communication satisfaction ($r=0.59$, $p<0.01$). These findings provided insights into the relationship among these variables. For a complete picture, further analyses were performed to explore the relationships between study variables (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2014).

Structural Model

The structural equation modeling (SEM) technique was employed through AMOS 21 to assess the hypothesized relationships of the conceptual model. The background variables such as age, gender, experience, and marital status were controlled in the final model. The results of the structural model are shown in Figure 1 and Table 3; the results of indirect effects using bootstrap method are demonstrated in Table 4. The hypothesized model provided a good fit to the data: $\chi^2 = 967.537$, $p < .001$, $df = 2.880$; $NFI = 0.95$; $TLI = 0.95$; $CFI = 0.96$; $RMSEA = 0.048$. Moreover, as illustrated in Figure 1, significant covariation was found between transformational leadership and communication competence, $\beta = 0.82$, $p < 0.001$. This result suggested that leaders exhibiting transformational leadership qualities also have good communication competence.

Figure 1. Estimates of Structural Equation Modeling.




Table 3. Structural Model Results

Paths	b	β	S.E.	C.R.	p
Transformational Leadership → Communication Satisfaction	0,41	0,37	0,044	9,417	***
Communicator Competence → Communication Satisfaction	3,017	0,57	0,227	13,283	***
Communicator Competence → Job Satisfaction	0,163	0,13	0,092	1,772	0,076
Transformational Leadership → Job Satisfaction	0,049	0,19	0,017	2,853	0,004**
Communication Satisfaction → Job Satisfaction	0,079	0,34	0,019	4,113	***

Model fit = $\chi^2 = 967.537$, $p < .001$, $df = 2.880$; NFI=0.95; TLI=0.95; CFI = 0.96; RMSEA = 0.048.

Notes: The table displays unstandardized (b) and standardized regression (β) coefficients, standard error (S.E.), and t-value in the C.R. (critical ratio) column. ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

H1, H3, and H5 posit the positive impact of transformational leadership, communication competence, and communication satisfaction on job satisfaction. The findings showed that transformational leadership ($\beta = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$) and communication satisfaction ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.001$) had significant and positive relationships with job satisfaction; nevertheless, the impact of communication competence was not statistically significant ($\beta = 0.13$, $p > 0.05$). Therefore, the results supported H1 and H5, but not H4.

H2 and H4 proposed positive effect of transformational leadership and communication competence on communication satisfaction. As presented in Table 2, both of the hypotheses were supported; transformational leadership ($\beta = 0.37$, $p < 0.01$), and communication competence ($\beta = 0.57$, $p < 0.01$) were significantly and positively related to communication satisfaction.

Besides direct effects, the indirect effects of transformational leadership and communication competence on communication satisfaction were analyzed through the

bootstrapping method. Findings indicated that both transformational leadership ($\beta = 0.13$; 95% [CI] [-0.12, 0.37], $p < 0.01$) and communication competence ($\beta = 0.19$; 95% CI [-0.35, 0.72], $p < 0.01$) had significant indirect effects on job satisfaction through communication satisfaction. Hence, H6 and H7 were supported.

Table 4. Bootstrap Test of the Standardized Indirect Effects.

Paths				Indirect Effect (IE)	β Direct Path	CI	
Transformational Leadership	→	Communication Satisfaction	→	Job Satisfaction	0,13**	0,19	[-0.12, 0.37]
Communicator Competence	→	Communication Satisfaction	→	Job Satisfaction	0,19**	0,13	[-0.34, 0.72]

Notes: $p < 0.01$; CI = confidence interval.

Since transformational leadership had a significant direct impact on job satisfaction, communication satisfaction was regarded as a partial mediator of the relation between job satisfaction and transformational leadership. On the other hand, communication competence did not have a significant direct impact on job satisfaction; therefore, communication satisfaction served as a full mediator in the relationship between communication competence and job satisfaction.

Discussion

The present study contributes to the literature that addresses employees' perceptions of transformational leadership and communication competence. Limited number of research have explored how employees' perceptions of their supervisor's leadership and communication competence influence communication and job satisfaction. Therefore, the present study tested the impacts of perceived transformational leadership, communication competence, and communication satisfaction on job satisfaction among airport security employees. This study is important for the reason that leadership and communication competence were taken into account simultaneously to assess to what extent they influence employee satisfaction. Moreover, this study predicted that communication satisfaction would serve as a mediating variable between transformational leadership, communication competence and job satisfaction.

In order to determine the degree to which transformational leadership, communication competence, and communication satisfaction influence employees' job satisfaction, the structural equation modeling was conducted while controlling for demographic variables. The findings indicated that transformational leadership and communication competence had significant associations with communication satisfaction. In addition to examining direct associations between leadership and communication practices, we also investigated the effects of leadership and communication competence on employees' job satisfaction. Transformational leadership and communication satisfaction were found to have significant associations with job satisfaction. However, contrary to expectations, a significant direct association was not found between communication competence and job satisfaction. Moreover, findings indicated that communication satisfaction was found to significantly

mediate the relationship between transformational leadership, communication competence and job satisfaction. Additional findings indicated that communication competence was a stronger predictor of communication satisfaction than transformational leadership. Furthermore, the findings showed that communication satisfaction was a greater predictor of job satisfaction than both transformational leadership and communication competence.

The findings of the current study are consistent with the findings of previous studies in which perceived transformational leadership is a significant predictor of communication satisfaction (Terek et al., 2014) and job satisfaction (Banks et al., 2016; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Moreover, the findings are consistent with previous research indicating that communication competence significantly predicts employees' communication satisfaction (Madlock, 2008), but not consistent with previous research in which communication competence is directly associated with job satisfaction, (Madlock, 2008 and 2012; Henderson, 2008; Cetin, Karabay, & Efe, 2012; Mikkelsen, York, & Arritola, 2015), which might have been caused because of the Turkish cultural influence. Finally, the findings are consistent with earlier studies suggesting that communication satisfaction is a significant predictor of job satisfaction (Pincus, 1986; Abdullah & Hui, 2014; Hua & Omar, 2016).

Our research has important implications for management practices. The findings indicate that communication competence and transformational leadership are important factors in affecting employees' job satisfaction. Therefore, a positive organizational culture and effective workplace relationships should be built in organizations in which transformational leadership with communication competence need to be employed. Leaders with good communication skills and competencies should act as role models for organization members, motivate and inspire their followers, emphasize team work, encourage innovation and creativity among followers, suggest trying new approaches to old problems, and coach their followers to enhance their skills and capabilities (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Leaders should be able to understand different situations and personal motives, adopt new communicative strategies under different circumstances, and develop and maintain good relationships with others in the organization (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). All of these assignments will encourage employees to participate in decision making, feel more valuable, and facilitate communication horizontally and vertically throughout the organization. Hence, organizations should provide leadership and communication training programs at all levels, which in turn would influence employee satisfaction (Madlock, 2008).

Our research is not without limitations, which offers opportunities for future research to understand more about employees' perceptions of leader behavior, communication and job satisfaction. The influences of both organizational and national cultures should be taken into consideration when conducting researches. First, the present study focused on private security employees at an international airport in Turkey; therefore, researchers should replicate this study by focusing on both private security officers and law enforcement officers working in the same workplace. Such a study will help examine the relationships between these working groups and compare their results. Moreover, this study should be replicated using different types of agencies to discover the effects of leadership and communication competence in other organizational settings and

countries. Further research ought to be conducted in different countries, because Turkish culture could have affected the perception of employees. Second, a limited number of variables were studied in the current study. Hence, the effects of possible variables such as organizational culture, organizational justice, organizational citizenship, and employee engagement should be studied in the future research. Specifically, examining transformational leadership and transactional leadership will allow us to compare the impacts of leadership styles on employee satisfaction. Third, a mixed methods approach rather than cross-sectional quantitative study design should be used to better understand the factors affecting employee satisfaction. Such a research design also would improve the generalizability of findings. Lastly, longitudinal studies ought to be conducted to examine the influence of employee satisfaction on employee performance.

References

Abdullah, A. A., Islam, R., & Al-Homayan, A. M. (2013). The effect of leadership style on security guards' performance: A case study on Riyadh military hospital in Saudi Arabia. *Advances in Environmental Biology*, 7(9), 2633-2641.

Abdullah, Z., & Hui, J. (2014). The relationship between communication satisfaction and teachers' job satisfaction in the Malaysian primary school. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 58-71.

Agho, A. O. Price J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1992). Discriminant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, 185-196.

Alblosi, F.A., & Nawar, Y.S. (2015). Assessing the impact of leadership styles on organizational performance: The case of Saudi private SME's. *Journal of Organizational Studies and Innovation*, 2(2), 66-77.

Anyango, C., Ojera, P., & Ochieng, I. (2015). Employee Characteristics and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 4(6), 2607-2610.

Anyango, C., & Aila, F. (2017). Employee voice and job satisfaction among security guards. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Innovative Technology*. 4(2), 25-34.

Asrar-ul-Haq, M. & Anwar, S. (2018). The many faces of leadership: Proposing research agenda through a review of literature. *Future Business Journal*, 4(2), 179-188.

Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 345-373.

Aydogmus, C., Camgoz, S. M., Ergeneli, A., & Ekmekci, O. T. (2018). Perceptions of transformational leadership and job satisfaction: The roles of personality traits and psychological empowerment. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 24(1), 81-107.

Baeriswyl, S., Krause, A., & Schwaninger, A. (2016). Emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction in airport security officers – work–family conflict as mediator in the job

demands– resources model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7(1), 1-13.

Baker, D. (2015). Tourism and terrorism: Terrorists threat to commercial aviation safety & security. *International Journal of Safety & Security in Hospitality & Tourism*, 12(1), 21-40.

Bakotic, D. (2016). Relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance. *Economic Research*, 29(1), 118-130.

Banfield, P., & Kay, R. (2012). *Introduction to Human Resource Management*, (2nd ed.). UK: Oxford University Press.

Banks, G. C., McCauley, K. D., Gardner, W.L., & Guler, C.E. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy. *Leadership Quarterly*, 27(4), 634-652.

Barnett, D. (2017). Leadership and job satisfaction: Adjunct faculty at a for-profit university. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 4(3), 53-63.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1994), Introduction. In B.M Bass & B.J. Avolio,(Eds.), *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership (1-9)*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bitzan, J. D., & Peoples, J. H. (2017). Introduction. In J.D. Bitzan & J.H. Peoples (Eds.) *The Economics of Airport Operations: Advances in Airline Economics (1 – 14)*. WA, UK: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Brayfield, A.H., & Rothe, H.F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35(5), 307-311.

Burns, M. J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Carriere, J., & Bourque, C. (2009). The effects of organizational communication on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in a land ambulance service and the mediating role of communication satisfaction. *Career Development International*, 14(1), 29-49.

Cetin, M., Karabay, M.E., & Efe, M. N. (2012). The Effects of leadership styles and the communication competency of bank managers on the employee's job satisfaction: The case of Turkish banks. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 227-235.

Chan, S.H.J., & Lai, H.Y.I. (2017). Understanding the link between communication satisfaction, perceived justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Research*. 70, 214-223.

Choi, J., & Jang, Y. (2018). A study on job anxiety, turnover intention and job satisfaction of aviation security search employees. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 120(6), 5703-5717.

Conrad, C., & Poole, M.S. (1998). *Strategic Organizational Communication: Into*

The Twenty-First Century (4th ed.). Forth Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Downs, C., & Hazen, M. (1977). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 14(3), 63-67.

Drucker, P. F. (2011). *The Practice of Management*. (Revised Edition). Abingdon: Routledge.

Engin, E., & Akgoz, B.E. (2013). The effects of communication satisfaction on organizational commitment. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*. 14(2), 109-124.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D.F. (1981) Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39-50.

Hackman, M. Z., & Johnson, C.E. (2018). *Leadership: A Communication Perspective* (7th ed.). Long Grove; IL: Waveland Press.

Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R.E. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Hecht, M.L. (1978). Measures of communication satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*. 4(4), 350-368.

Henderson, L. S. (2008). The impact of project managers' communication competencies: validation and extension of a research model for virtuality, satisfaction, and productivity on project teams. *Project Management Journal*, 39(2), 48-59.

Henne, D., & Locke, E.A. (1985). Job dissatisfaction: What are the consequences?. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20(2), 221-240.

Hua, W., & Omar, B. (2016). Examining communication satisfaction, confucian work dynamism and job satisfaction: A comparative study of international and domestic hotels in Hainan, China. *The Journal of the South East Asia Research Centre for Communication and Humanities*, 8(1), 105-127.

Hulin, C.L., & Judge, T.A. (2003). Job attitudes. In W.C. Borman, D.R. Ilgen & R.J. Klimoski (Eds). *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 255-276). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Jablin, F. M. (2004). Communication. In G.R. Goethals, G.J. Sorenson & J. MacGregor Burns (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Leadership* (pp. 222-227). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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.

Lim, S.S., & Nalla, M.K. (2014). Attitudes of private security officers in Singapore toward their work environment. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 9(1), 41-56.

Locke, E.A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 4(4), 309-336.

Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature of causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette

(Ed.). *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp.1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Lucas, G.H., Parasuraman, A., Davis, R.A., & Enis, B.M. (1987). An empirical study of salesforce turnover. *Journal of Marketing*, 51(3), 34-59.

Luthra, A., & Dahiya, R. (2015). Effective leadership is all about communicating effectively: Connecting leadership and communication. *International Journal of Management & Business Studies*, 5(3), 43-48.

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Rich, G. A. (2001) Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29(2), 115-134.

Madlock, P. E. (2008). The link between leadership style, communicator competence, and employee satisfaction. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 45(1), 61-78.

Madlock, P. E. (2012). The Influence of supervisors' leadership on telecommuters. *Journal of Business Strategies*, 29(1), 1-24.

Mahdian, M. J., & Poor, M. Z. (2014). A study of the relationship between leadership styles and employees' behavioural outcomes with respect to the mediating role of organizational politics. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences*, 4(3), 292-299.

Martin, J.K., & Miller, G.A. (1986). Job satisfaction and absenteeism: Organizational, individual, and job-related correlates. *Work and Occupations*, 13(1), 33-46.

Meggison W. L., & Netter, J.M. (2001). From state to market: A survey of empirical studies on privatization. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 39, 321-89.

Men, L.R. (2014). Strategic internal communication: Transformational leadership, communication channels, and employee satisfaction. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 28(2), 1-21.

Meyers, L.S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A.J. (2006). *Applied Multivariate Research: Design and Interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mikkelsen, A.C., York, J.A., & Arritola, J. (2015). Communication competence, leadership behaviors, and employee outcomes in supervisor-employee relationships. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 78(3), 336-354.

Miller, K., & Barbour, J. (2014). *Organizational Communication: Approaches and Processes* (7th ed.). Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

Monge, P.R., Backman, S.G., Dillard, J.P., & Eisenburg, E.M. (1982). Communicator competence in the workplace: Model testing and scale development. *Communication Yearbook*, 5, 505-528.

Morreale, S.P., Spitzberg, B.H., & Barge, J.K. (2007). *Human Communication: Motivation, Knowledge, and Skills*. (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth

Mowday, R.T., Steers, L.W., & Porter, R.M. (1982). *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment Absenteeism and Turnover*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Mujkic, A., Sehic, D., Rahimic, Z., & Jusic, J. (2014). Transformational leadership and employee satisfaction. *Ekonomski Vjesnik*, 27(2), 259-270.

Mushtaq, A., Ahmad, N., & Shafiq, M. (2015). Job satisfaction and work commitment among security agencies of Kashmir: A comparative study. *European Academic Research*, 2 (1), 14660-14673.

Nalla, M. K., Paek, S. Y., & Lim, S.S. (2016). The influence of organizational and environmental factors on job satisfaction among security guards in Singapore. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*. 50(4), 548–565.

Nalla, M.K., & Cobbina, J. E. (2017). Environmental factors and job satisfaction: The case of private security guards. *Security Journal*, 30(1), 215-226.

Noreen, S. G., & Dominic, U. (2017). The effects of working conditions of private security guards on job satisfaction. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 22 (3), 48-53.

Aydogmus, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Onyelankea, I. K. (2017). Work-Life balance and employee's job satisfaction of private security firms in Port Harcourt. *Scholarly Journal of Science Research and Essay*, 6(4), 99-104.

Pavalache-Illie, M. (2014). Organizational citizenship behaviour, work satisfaction and employees' personality. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 127, 489-493.

Pincus, J.D. (1986). Communication satisfaction, job satisfaction, and job performance. *Human Communication Research*, 12(3), 395-419.

Platis, C., Reklitis, P., & Zimeras, S. (2015). Relation between job satisfaction and job performance in healthcare services. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 175, 480-487.

Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 879-891.

Rafferty, A.E., & Griffin, M.A. (2009). Job satisfaction in organizational research. In D.A. Buchanan & A. Bryman (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Research Methods* (196-212). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ruben, B.D., & Gigliotti, R.A. (2016). Leadership as social influence: An expanded view of leadership communication theory and practice. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 23(4), 467-479.

Saari, L.M., & Judge, T.A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), 395-407.

Sabella, S.A. (2016). Stratified leadership components and needs within public rehabilitation. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 61(1), 41-53.

Saliu, A.Y., Gbadeyan, R. A., & Olujide, J. O. (2015). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction of security operatives in selected tertiary institutions in Kwara state. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(4), 43-49.

Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Spitzberg, B.H., & Cupach, W.R. (1989). *Handbook of Interpersonal Competence Research*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Srivastava, S. (2013). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment relationship: Effect of personality variables. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 17(2), 159-167.

Steden, R. V., & Nalla, M. K. (2010). Citizen satisfaction with private security guards in the Netherlands: Perceptions of an ambiguous occupation. *European Journal of Criminology*, 7(3), 214–234.

Steele, G.A. & Plenty, D. (2014). Supervisor–Subordinate communication competence and job and communication satisfaction. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 52(3), 294-318.

Tayfun, R., & Uluturk, B. (2016). Assessing the effects of supervisory communication, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational support on organizational commitment. *Turkish Journal of Security Studies*, 18(2), 15-36.

Terek, E., Nikolic, M., Gligorovic, B., Glusac, D., & Tasic, I. (2015). The impact of leadership on the communication satisfaction of primary school teachers in Serbia. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 15(1), 73-84.

Thayer, L. (1968). *Communication and communication systems*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Top, M., Tarcan, M., Tekingunduz, S., & Hikmet, N. (2013). An analysis of relationships among transformational leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational trust in two Turkish hospitals. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 28(3), 217-241.

Tyssen, A. K., Wald, A., & Heidenrich, S. (2013). Leadership in the context of temporary organizations: A study on the effects of transactional and transformational leadership on followers' commitment in projects. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 21(4), 376-393.

Walsh, W.F., Whetstone, T., Banton, M.P., Brodeur, J.P., & Kelling, G. L. (2018). Police: Law Enforcement. Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/police>.

White, A. (2010). *The Politics of Private Security: Regulation, Reform and Re-Legitimation*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.

Vinger, G., & Cilliers, F. (2006). Effective transformational leadership behaviours for managing change. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(2), 1-9.