Survey dataset on leadership styles and job satisfaction: The Perspective of employees of hospitality providers
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ABSTRACT

This study aimed at establishing the relationship between the dimensions of leadership styles and employees’ job satisfaction in hospitality industry in Nigeria. This study was prompted by reports of high labour turnover in this sector of the economy (especially in the guesthouses), because of reduction in the satisfaction of the workforce. Cross-sectional research design which is quantitative in nature, was the methodology adopted for this study to assess the trends of relationships between the constructs. Questionnaire was used as the measuring instrument, and reliability and validity test for the instrument were established using cronbach alpha, for all the variables ranging between 71% and 89%. The study population comprises 410 employees in the six selected functioning guesthouses, which also represents the study sample. Total enumeration sampling technique was adopted. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software package (version 22) was used for the analysis of the data. The field dataset is available to the public for more rigorous, extensive, critical and extended analysis.

© 2018 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).
### Specification Table

| Subject area                  | Human Resource Management |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| More Specific Subject Area    | Leadership                |
| Type of Data                  | Table, figure and text file |
| How Data was Acquired         | Through questionnaire     |
| Data format                   | Raw, analysed, descriptive and inferential statistical data |
| Experimental Factors          |                           |
|                               | - Sample consisted of employees in selected Universities’ guesthouses in southwest, Nigeria |
|                               | - The researcher-made questionnaire including data on demographic, data on idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, contingent reward, management by exception active, management by exception passive and employees’ job satisfaction. |
|                               | - In this data set, the relationship between idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, contingent reward, management by exception active, management by exception passive and employees’ job satisfaction had been studied |
| Experimental features         | Leadership style in every organisation plays a significant role on the employees’ satisfaction, it also has the capabilities to make or mare organisational overall performances |
| Data Source Location          | Southwest (Ogun State, Osun State, Oyo State and Lagos State), Nigeria |
| Data Accessibility            | The data are available with this article |

### Value of data

- These data could assist management to discover the appropriate leadership style, which will enable the organisation to boost employees’ job satisfaction and further improve organisation’s activities.
- The data could provide the organisation with ample information on which of the dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership styles will be the best in boosting employees’ job satisfaction.
- Generally, this data obtained from this study would be important for organizational goal and objectives achievement, gaining competitive advantage that would lead to better organizational performance.
- These data are available for more rigorous, comparative and extended analysis by other researchers.

### Data

According to Table 1, four hundred and ten (410) copies of questionnaire were administered to the employees of the selected Universities guesthouses in southwest, Nigeria. Three hundred and twenty-four (324) were returned and usable, which represented 79%, while the remaining eighty-six (86) were not returned, thus representing 21% of the total questionnaire administered.

Based on the usable copies of questionnaire, Tables 2–5 and Figs. 1–4 revealed the demographic profile of the respondents according to gender, age, marital status and educational qualification. The demographic data of the respondents revealed that 193 (59.6%) were male, while the female respondents were 131 (40.4%). Though, male respondents were more than the female respondents, but the opinion of both genders were adequately represented. Based on Table 3, ages 18–29 years were 184 (56.8%), ages between 30 and 39 were 98 (30.2%), and 42 (13.0%) were the respondents.
between ages 40 and 49 years. From Table 4, the singles among the respondents were 215 (66.4%), while the married were 109 (33.6%) of the total respondents. According to Table 5, 121 (37.3%) of the respondents were Senior Secondary School Certificate Examination (SSCE) holders, 127 (39.2%) of the respondents were Ordinary National Diploma (OND) and National Certificate in Education (NCE) certificate holders. Higher National Diploma (HND) and first degree holders from the University among the respondents were 68 (21.0%), Masters and Professional certificate holders among the respondents were 6 (1.9%), while 2 (0.6%) were Doctor of philosophy (Ph.D) holders among the respondents.

The descriptive statistics evaluating the dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership styles and employees’ job satisfaction are as shown in Tables 6–12. In line with Table 6, 146 (45.1%) of the respondents strongly agree, 73 (22.5%) agree, 35 (10.7%) partially agree, 9 (2.8%) partially disagree, 53 (16.4%) disagree, and 8 (2.5%) strongly disagree, that idealised influence of their leader will have positive effect on their job satisfaction.

According to Table 7, 134 (41.4%) strongly agree, 79 (24.4%) agree, and 43 (13.3%) partially agree that the inspirational motivation of their leader will boost their job satisfaction, whereas, 20 (6.2%) partially disagree, 42 (13.0%) disagree, and 6 (1.9%) strongly disagree that inspirational motivation of the leader will boost their job satisfaction.

In line with Table 8, 133 (41.0%) strongly agree, 72 (22.2%) agree, and 49 (15.1%) partially agree that their superior intellectual stimulation will improve their job satisfaction, while 8 (2.5%), partially disagree 48 (14.8%) disagree, and 14 (4.3%) strongly disagree that intellectual stimulation of their superior will improve their job satisfaction.

Based on Table 9, 119 (36.7%) strongly agree, 86 (26.5%) agree, and 53 (16.4%) partially agree that individualised consideration of their boss would increase their job satisfaction, whereas 9 (2.8%) partially disagree, 47 (14.5%) disagree, and 10 (3.1%) strongly disagree that individualised consideration of their boss would increase their job satisfaction.
According to Table 10, 88 (27.2%) strongly agree, 118 (36.4%) agree, and 31 (9.6%) partially agree that contingent reward from their superior will increase their job satisfaction, while 13 (9.6%) partially disagree, 63 (19.4%) disagree and 11 (3.4%) strongly disagree that contingent reward from their superior will increase their job satisfaction.

In line with Table 11, 63 (19.4%), strongly agree, 36 (11.1%) agree, and 33 (10.2%) partially agree that their leader's management by exception (active) will positively influence their job satisfaction, whereas 58 (17.9%) partially disagree, 100 (30.9%) disagree, and 34 (10.5%) strongly disagree that their leader's management by exception (passive) will positively influence their job satisfaction.

**Table 4**
Marital status of respondent. Source: Field Survey, 2016.

|                 | Frequency | Percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid           |           |         |               |                    |
| Single          | 215       | 66.4    | 66.4          | 66.4               |
| Married         | 109       | 33.6    | 33.6          | 100.0              |
| Total           | 324       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Table 5**
Educational level of respondent. Source: Field Survey, 2016.

|                 | Frequency | Percent | Valid percent | Cumulative percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid           |           |         |               |                    |
| SSCE            | 121       | 37.3    | 37.3          | 37.3               |
| OND/NCE         | 127       | 39.2    | 39.2          | 76.5               |
| HND/B.Sc        | 68        | 21.0    | 21.0          | 97.5               |
| Master/         | 6         | 1.9     | 1.9           | 99.4               |
| Professional    |           |         |               |                    |
| PhD             | 2         | .6      | .6            | 100.0              |
| Total           | 324       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Fig. 1.** Gender of respondents.
Based on Table 12, 57 (17.6%) strongly agree, 38 (11.7%) agree, and 41 (12.7%) partially agree that their superior's management by exception (passive) will improve their job satisfaction, while 39 (12.0%) partially disagree, 124 (38.3%) disagree, and 25 (7.7%) strongly disagree that their superior's management by exception (passive) will improve their job satisfaction.

**Fig. 2.** Age of respondents.

**Fig. 3.** Marital status of respondents.
2. The correlational relationship between the variables

The correlational relationships between idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive), management by exception (non-active), management by exception (non-passive) are assessed through descriptive statistics. These relationships are evaluated for their impact on employees' job satisfaction.,

Table 6
Descriptive statistics evaluating the effect of idealised influence on employees' job satisfaction. Source: Field Survey, 2016.

| Valid          | Frequency | %   | Valid %  | Cumulative % |
|----------------|-----------|-----|----------|--------------|
| Strongly disagree | 146      | 45.1| 45.1     | 45.1         |
| Agree          | 73        | 22.5| 22.5     | 67.6         |
| Partially agree | 35       | 10.7| 10.7     | 78.3         |
| Partially disagree | 9   | 2.8 | 2.8      | 81.1         |
| Disagree       | 53       | 16.4| 16.4     | 97.5         |
| Strongly disagree | 8      | 2.5 | 2.5      | 100          |
| Total          | 324      | 100 | 100      |              |

Table 7
Descriptive statistics assessing the effect of inspirational motivation on employees' job satisfaction. Source: Field Survey, 2016.

| Valid          | Frequency | %   | Valid %  | Cumulative % |
|----------------|-----------|-----|----------|--------------|
| Strongly disagree | 134      | 41.4| 41.1     | 41.1         |
| Agree          | 79        | 24.4| 24.4     | 65.5         |
| Partially agree | 43       | 13.3| 13.3     | 78.8         |
| Partially disagree | 20   | 6.2 | 6.2      | 85.0         |
| Disagree       | 42       | 13.0| 13.1     | 98           |
| Strongly disagree | 6      | 1.9 | 1.9      | 100          |
| Total          | 324      | 100 | 100      |              |

Fig. 4. Educational level of respondents.
Table 8  
Descriptive statistics evaluating the effect of intellectual stimulation on employees’ job satisfaction. Source: Field Survey, 2016.

| Valid                  | Frequency | %   | Valid %  | Cumulative % |
|------------------------|-----------|-----|----------|--------------|
| Strongly disagree      | 133       | 41.1| 41.1     | 41.1         |
| Agree                  | 72        | 22.2| 22.2     | 63.2         |
| Partially agree        | 49        | 15.1| 15.1     | 78.3         |
| Partially disagree     | 8         | 2.5 | 2.5      | 80.8         |
| Disagree               | 48        | 14.8| 14.8     | 95.6         |
| Strongly disagree      | 14        | 4.3 | 4.3      | 100          |
| Total                  | 324       | 100 | 100      |              |

Table 9  
Descriptive statistics evaluating the effect of individualised consideration on employees’ job satisfaction. Source: Field Survey, 2016.

| Valid                  | Frequency | %   | Valid %  | Cumulative % |
|------------------------|-----------|-----|----------|--------------|
| Strongly disagree      | 119       | 36.7| 36.7     | 36.7         |
| Agree                  | 86        | 26.5| 26.5     | 63.2         |
| Partially agree        | 53        | 16.4| 16.4     | 79.6         |
| Partially disagree     | 9         | 2.8 | 2.8      | 82.4         |
| Disagree               | 47        | 14.5| 14.5     | 96.9         |
| Strongly disagree      | 10        | 3.1 | 3.1      | 100          |
| Total                  | 324       | 100 | 100      |              |

Table 10  
Descriptive assessing the effect of contingent reward on employees’ job satisfaction. Source: Field Survey, 2016.

| Valid                  | Frequency | %   | Valid %  | Cumulative % |
|------------------------|-----------|-----|----------|--------------|
| Strongly disagree      | 88        | 27.2| 27.2     | 27.2         |
| Agree                  | 118       | 36.4| 36.4     | 63.6         |
| Partially agree        | 31        | 9.6 | 9.6      | 73.2         |
| Partially disagree     | 13        | 4.0 | 4.0      | 77.2         |
| Disagree               | 63        | 19.4| 19.4     | 96.6         |
| Strongly disagree      | 11        | 3.4 | 3.4      | 100          |
| Total                  | 324       | 100 | 100      |              |

Table 11  
Descriptive statistics evaluating the relationship between management by exception active and employees’ job satisfaction. Source: Field Survey, 2016.

| Valid                  | Frequency | %   | Valid %  | Cumulative % |
|------------------------|-----------|-----|----------|--------------|
| Strongly disagree      | 63        | 19.4| 19.4     | 19.4         |
| Agree                  | 36        | 11.1| 11.1     | 30.5         |
| Partially agree        | 33        | 10.2| 10.2     | 40.7         |
| Partially disagree     | 58        | 17.9| 17.9     | 58.6         |
| Disagree               | 100       | 30.9| 30.9     | 89.5         |
| Strongly disagree      | 34        | 10.5| 10.5     | 100          |
| Total                  | 324       | 100 | 100      |              |
exception (passive) and employees’ job satisfaction are as shown in Tables 13–19. The explicit forms of the equation are as follow:

\[ Y = f(X) \]

where \( Y \) = Job Satisfaction

\[ X = \text{Leadership Styles (Transformational and Transactional)} \]

\[ X = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7) \]

where:

\( x_1 \) = Idealised Influence of Transformational leadership style

\( x_2 \) = Inspirational Motivation of Transformational leadership style

Table 12
Descriptive statistics of the relationship between management by exception (passive) and employees’ job satisfaction. Source: Field Survey, 2016.

|                | Frequency | %  | Valid % | Cumulative % |
|----------------|-----------|----|---------|--------------|
| Strongly disagree | 57        | 17.6 | 17.6    | 17.6         |
| Agree           | 38        | 11.7 | 11.7    | 29.3         |
| Partially agree | 41        | 12.7 | 12.7    | 42.0         |
| Partially disagree | 39     | 12.0 | 12.0    | 54.0         |
| Disagree        | 124       | 38.3 | 38.3    | 92.3         |
| Strongly disagree | 25       | 7.7  | 7.7     | 100          |
| Total           | 324       | 100  | 100     |              |

Table 13
Correlations showing relationship between idealised influence and job satisfaction.

|                | IDI2       | JSc2       |
|----------------|------------|------------|
| IDI2 Pearson Correlation | 1          | .610**     |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |             | .000       |
| N              | 324        | 324        |
| JSc2 Pearson Correlation | .610**     | 1          |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |             | .000       |
| N              | 324        | 324        |

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

Table 14
Correlations showing relationship between inspirational motivation and job satisfaction.

|                | IM2       | JSc2       |
|----------------|-----------|------------|
| IM2 Pearson Correlation | 1          | .570**     |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |             | .000       |
| N              | 324        | 324        |
| JSc2 Pearson Correlation | .570**     | 1          |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |             | .000       |
| N              | 324        | 324        |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 15
Correlation showing relationship between intellectual stimulation and job satisfaction.

| Correlations          | IS2                  | JSc2                |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| IS2                   | Pearson Correlation  | .604 **             |
| Sig. (2-tailed)       |                      | .000                |
| N                     | 324                  | 324                 |
| JSc2                  | Pearson Correlation  | .604 *              |
| Sig. (2-tailed)       | .000                 | 1                   |
| N                     | 324                  | 324                 |

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

Table 16
Correlation showing relationship between individualised consideration and job satisfaction.

| Correlations          | IC2                  | JSc2                |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| IC2                   | Pearson Correlation  | .615 **             |
| Sig. (2-tailed)       |                      | .000                |
| N                     | 324                  | 324                 |
| JSc2                  | Pearson Correlation  | .615 *              |
| Sig. (2-tailed)       | .000                 | 1                   |
| N                     | 324                  | 324                 |

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

Table 17
Correlation showing relationship between management by exception active and job satisfaction.

| Correlations          | MEA                  | JSc2                |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| MEA                   | Pearson Correlation  | .053 **             |
| Sig. (2-tailed)       |                      | .001                |
| N                     | 324                  | 324                 |
| JSc2                  | Pearson Correlation  | .053 *              |
| Sig. (2-tailed)       | .001                 | 1                   |
| N                     | 324                  | 324                 |

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

$x_3 =$ Intellectual Stimulation of Transformational Leadership style
$x_4 =$ Individualised Consideration of Transformational Leadership style
$x_5 =$ Management by Exception (Active) of Transactional Leadership style
$x_6 =$ Management by Exception (Passive) of Transactional Leadership style

Explicitly,

\[ Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 + \mu \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

\[ Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_2 + \mu \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)
\[ Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_3 + \mu \]  
\[ Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_4 + \mu \]  
\[ Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_5 + \mu \]  
\[ Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_6 + \mu \]  

where:

\( Y \) = dependent variable (job satisfaction)  
\( \alpha_0 \) = constant  
\( \beta_{1-6} = x_{1-6} \)  
\( \mu \) = error term

Alternatively,

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LDS}_i + \mu_i \]
where:

\[ Y = \text{dependent variable (Job satisfaction)} \]
\[ \beta_0 = \text{constant} \]
\[ \beta_1 = \text{changes in independent variables} \]
\[ \text{LDS} = x_1 - x_6 \]
\[ j = 1-6 \]
\[ \mu = \text{error term} \]

3. Experimental design, material and method

The focus of this study was on six (6) well-functioning Universities’ guesthouses in southwest, Nigeria. The population of the employees working in the selected guesthouses is four hundred and ten (410); they were all taken as the sample because of the small size, and also for adequate representation. However, total enumeration method was the sampling technique [1]. Pen and paper questionnaire were used for gathering quantitative data. Data on demographic characteristics of the respondents were obtained, so also, data on idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive) and employees’ job satisfaction were gathered. The measuring instruments were obtained from extant literature [2,3]. The data revealed a meaningful effect of the dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employees’ job satisfaction among employees of the selected guesthouses in southwest, Nigeria. The data gathered were coded and analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22. Descriptive statistics, Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) and stepwise regression were applied in the analysis.

Acknowledgement

Authors wish to appreciate Covenant University for providing full sponsorship for this work, and also for providing enabling platform to carry out this research.

Transparency document. Supplementary material

Transparency document associated with this article can be found in the online version at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2018.06.033.

Appendix A. Supplementary material

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2018.06.033.

References

[1] H. Tella, C.O. Ayeni, S.O. Popoola, Work motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of library personnel in Academic and research Libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria, Libr. Philos. Pract. (e-J.) 9 (2) (2007) 1–17.
[2] D. Martins, T. Proenca, Satisfaction towards human resources practices and repatriates’ retention: an empirical examination in the Portuguese companies’ context, Eur. Inst. Adv. Stud. Manag. 4 (7) (2012) 221–235.
[3] B.M. Bass, B.J. Avolio, Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Feedback Report, 2006.