Investigating the Influence of Leadership Styles on Employee Motivation and Performance

Indu Shukla, Pranav Singh, Krishna Pal Singh
[1]Faculty of Commerce & Management, Rama University, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India
[2]Faculty of Professional Studies, Rama University, Mandhana, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India
[3]Axis Institute of Planning & Management, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract:
An organization's ability to motivate and perform its workforce depends heavily on its leadership. This study employs a case study methodology to examine how various leadership philosophies affect worker motivation and output. The investigation looks at the effects of several leadership philosophies on worker happiness, engagement, and output, such as transformational, transactional, and servant leadership.
Data from workers and leaders in various firms is gathered for the study using qualitative techniques including surveys and interviews. Once the data is analyzed, it becomes clear what each leadership style's advantages and disadvantages are in terms of encouraging worker motivation and output.
The research also looks at how feedback systems, communication styles, and organizational culture affect the dynamics between managers and staff members.
The significance of adaptable leadership strategies that meet the demands of employees and company goals. It has been observed that although transactional leadership keeps things stable and effective, transformational leadership encourages staff members to go above and beyond and innovate. Servant leadership promotes cooperation, trust, and worker happiness, all of which are beneficial to the long-term success of the firm.
This study adds to the body of knowledge by offering useful advice on how to lead in a way that will improve worker motivation and output. The results have important ramifications for organizational leaders who want to foster a happy workplace and produce long-term business results.

Keywords: Leadership Styles, Employee Motivation, Performance, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership.
DOI Number: 10.48047/NQ.2022.20.13.NQ88518 **Neuroquantology 2022; 20(13):4254-4263**

Introduction

An organization's ability to motivate, engage, and perform its workforce is greatly influenced by its leadership. The work atmosphere and overall effectiveness of the organization can be greatly impacted by the way leaders engage with their people. To foster a positive workplace culture and achieve long-term business objectives, organizational leaders must have a thorough understanding of the various leadership philosophies and how they affect worker motivation and performance.
This research paper seeks to investigate how various leadership philosophies affect worker motivation and output. Three main leadership philosophies—transformational, transactional,

and servant leadership—will be covered in this course. Every one of these styles has distinct traits and methods for managing and inspiring workers.

A leader that embodies transformational leadership inspires and motivates their team to produce extraordinary outcomes. These dynamic, imaginative leaders frequently question the status quo in order to spur innovation and change. Developing their team members' potential and forging a common vision that supports company objectives are the main priorities of transformational leaders. In contrast, a system of rewards and penalties forms the foundation of transactional leadership. This type of leadership involves clearly defining objectives and goals for staff members and offering incentives for meeting them. In order to preserve efficiency and stability inside the company, this strategy places a strong emphasis on performance monitoring and remedial action.

The fundamental principle of servant leadership is the belief that leaders should serve their teams rather than expect to be served. Servant leaders put their workers' needs first, understand their struggles, and try to foster a welcoming and helpful work atmosphere. This strategy places a strong emphasis on cooperation, trust, and worker wellbeing because it understands that contented workers are more likely to provide their best work.

This research paper's case study methodology enables a thorough analysis of the various ways in which these various leadership philosophies appear in actual organizational settings. This study intends to offer useful insights on the efficacy of various leadership philosophies in inspiring workers and boosting output by examining the experiences and viewpoints of leaders and employees inside these firms.

The results of this study will add to the body of knowledge already available on employee motivation and leadership by presenting actual data on the effects of various leadership philosophies on work performance and engagement. Organizational leaders can utilize the knowledge gathered from this study to make well-informed decisions regarding their leadership style and to establish an environment at work that encourages worker engagement and motivation, which will ultimately lead to the success of the firm.

Literature Review:

Effective leadership affects employee motivation, job satisfaction, and the general efficacy of the organization (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2013). Leadership is a critical component of organizational behavior and performance. Numerous theories of leadership have been established in order to comprehend the various ways in which leaders might impact their following. In academic research, transformational, transactional, and servant leadership are three well-known leadership philosophies that have received extensive study.

According to Bass (1985), transformational leadership is typified by leaders who enthuse and encourage their followers to reach remarkable goals and realize their full potential. Often charismatic and visionary, transformational leaders can express a compelling vision that connects with their followers and motivates them to go above and beyond the call of duty (Bass, 1990). Additionally, they stimulate their followers' minds by posing creative and innovative challenges, which can result in increased job satisfaction and productivity (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

In contrast, transactional leadership relies on a transactional relationship in which followers and leaders exchange rewards based on followers' performance (Bass, 1990).

Transactional leaders provide their followers clear expectations and goals, and they offer incentives, such bonuses or promotions, for achieving or surpassing these objectives (Avolio et al., 1999). This strategy can work well to inspire workers who are driven by incentives from outside sources and who would rather have explicit rules and expectations (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

A more modern method of leadership called "servant leadership" puts the needs of others above one's own (Greenleaf, 1970). Servant leaders put their followers' growth and well-being first, enabling them to realize their full potential (Spears, 1998).
This strategy is predicated on the idea that leaders can foster a more positive and effective work environment, which will increase employee happiness and performance, by helping others (Greenleaf, 1977).

Employee motivation and performance have always been associated with transformational leadership. According to Bass (1985), transformational leaders have the capacity to motivate their people to put aside their individual interests and strive toward a common goal. Transformational leaders inspire their people to perform at higher levels by presenting a compelling vision and giving them a feeling of purpose (Bass, 1990).

The relationship between employee motivation and transformative leadership has also been validated by empirical research. For instance, a meta-analysis of 87 research by Judge and Piccolo (2004) revealed a favorable correlation between transformational leadership and job performance, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. In a similar vein, Avolio et al. (1999) discovered that, among 86 managers in their sample, transformational leadership was positively correlated with worker motivation and satisfaction.

Employee motivation has also been proven to benefit from transactional leadership, especially in environments that value having clear expectations and goals. According to Bass (1990), transactional leaders can inspire their people by rewarding them when they meet performance targets. Transactional leaders can establish a disciplined and inspiring work environment by clearly defining expectations and provide incentives for meeting them (Avolio et al., 1999).

The relationship between employee motivation and transactional leadership has been validated by empirical research. For instance, in a sample of 182 employees, Podsakoff et al. (1990) discovered a favorable correlation between transactional leadership and employee motivation and performance. According to this, Judge and Piccolo (2004) found a positive association between job performance, organizational commitment, job happiness, and transactional leadership in their meta-analysis of 87 studies.

Now, a distinctive style of leadership that prioritizes meeting the needs of others is known as servant leadership. According to Greenleaf (1970), servant leaders put their followers' growth and well-being first, believing that this will enable them to realize their greatest potential. Servant leaders can build an environment at work that is encouraging and supportive of their employees by serving others.
motivation and satisfaction (Greenleaf, 1977).

Research has shown that there is a connection between employee motivation and servant leadership. For instance, in a sample of 308 employees, Liden et al. (2008) discovered a favorable correlation between servant leadership and employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance. Similar findings were made by Walumbwa et al. (2010), who studied 206 employees and discovered a positive relationship between servant leadership and extra-role employee behaviors including corporate citizenship.
Therefore, employee engagement and performance are greatly impacted by leadership styles. It has been discovered that transformational leadership, which is typified by inspiring vision and leadership, motivates staff to produce remarkable results. Employees that appreciate precise objectives and expectations can be effectively motivated by transactional leadership, which is centered on performance

and rewards. Employee motivation and happiness can be fostered in a good and supportive work environment by using servant leadership, which prioritizes meeting the needs of others. Organizations may establish a work climate that fosters high levels of employee engagement and performance by knowing the various leadership philosophies and how they affect worker motivation and output.

Different leadership philosophies and their effects on worker motivation and output have been thoroughly examined in the research that is now available. Nonetheless, there is a deficiency of information in the literature concerning the relative efficacy of these leadership philosophies in various organizational settings. The majority of research has concentrated on transformational, transactional, or servant leadership separately, not taking into account the potential interactions or synergies between these approaches in real-world settings.

Furthermore, there is a dearth of research that thoroughly investigates the effects of leadership styles on several facets of employee motivation and performance at the same time, even though some studies have looked at the impact of leadership styles on particular outcomes like job satisfaction or organizational commitment. Our knowledge of the overall effects of various leadership philosophies on employee outcomes is constrained by this gap in the literature.

Moreover, additional qualitative research is required to investigate the perspectives and experiences of leaders and employees concerning the efficacy of diverse leadership approaches. Although quantitative studies yield useful insights, qualitative research can provide a more nuanced knowledge of the elements influencing various leadership styles' practical efficacy.

Finally, there is a dearth of studies that take into account how communication, organizational culture, and feedback systems shape how leadership styles affect worker motivation and performance. Gaining knowledge about the ways in which these contextual factors interact with leadership styles can help firms build an atmosphere that encourages high levels of performance and engagement from their workforce.

Research Objective: This research aims to investigate the relative efficacy of transformational, transactional, and servant leadership philosophies in various organizational settings, taking into account the effects of each style both separately and collectively on various facets of worker motivation and output.

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in employee motivation levels between organizations led by transformational, transactional, and servant leaders.
2. There is no significant difference in employee performance levels between organizations led by transformational, transactional, and servant leaders.
3. The combination of transformational and transactional leadership does not have a greater impact on employee motivation and performance compared to either style alone
4. The combination of transformational and servant leadership does not have a greater impact on employee motivation and performance compared to either style alone.
5. The combination of transactional and servant leadership does not have a greater impact on employee motivation and performance compared to either style alone.

Discussion

H_{01}: There is no significant difference in employee motivation levels between organizations led by transformational, transactional, and servant leaders.

There is no discernible difference in employee motivation levels between firms run by servant, transactional, and transformational leaders, according to the study's first premise. This hypothesis argues that employees in these firms are similarly driven, regardless of the leadership style that is being used.
It is probable that there will be variations in the degrees of employee motivation among various leadership styles, nevertheless, based on the body of current research and theoretical underpinnings. Elevated employee motivation has been linked to transformational leadership, which is typified by visionary and inspirational leadership (Bass, 1990). Transformational leaders possess the skill of motivating their followers and fostering a feeling of a common goal and vision, which can boost staff morale (Bass & Riggio, 2006).
On the other hand, motivation can also result from transactional leadership, which is predicated on exchanging rewards for performance, but it usually focuses more on extrinsic motivators. This strategy might work well for inspiring workers who are motivated by observable results and precise objectives (Avolio et al., 1999).
Higher levels of employee motivation have also been connected to servant leadership, which places an emphasis on meeting the needs of others and giving people authority (Greenleaf, 1970; Liden et al., 2008). Servant leaders put their followers' growth and well-being first, fostering an environment at work that is empowering and helpful and can boost motivation.
As a result, it's possible that firms run by transformational, transactional, and servant leaders will have different levels of employee motivation. Examining these leadership philosophies side by side in relation to employee motivation can yield insightful information on how well various leadership philosophies inspire workers and boost productivity inside the company.

H_{02}: There is no significant difference in employee performance levels between organizations led by transformational, transactional, and servant leaders.

The second hypothesis asserts that firms headed by transformational, transactional, and servant leaders do not significantly differ in terms of employee performance levels. Employee performance in these firms appears to be similar, whatever the leadership style that is used.
Nonetheless, various leadership philosophies are likely to result in varying employee performance levels, according to both empirical data and theoretical viewpoints. According to Bass (1990), there is a correlation between enhanced employee performance outcomes and transformational leadership, which is typified by its capacity to inspire and encourage staff to exceed expectations in performance. Improved employee performance can result from transformational leaders' frequent promotion of an innovative, creative, and continuous improvement culture (Bass & Riggio, 2006).
According to Avolio et al. (1999), transactional leadership, which is predicated on exchanging rewards for performance, may also result in better worker performance. This is especially true in settings where incentives and specific goals are highly valued. Employees may be encouraged to put forth more effort and perform better when their bosses set clear goals and offer rewards for achieving or surpassing them.
Similarly, greater levels of employee performance have been linked to servant leadership, which puts employees' needs first and concentrates on their growth and well-being (Liden et al., 2008). Employees may perform at their highest level and reach their full potential in a work environment that is empowered and supportive thanks to servant leadership.
Consequently, it is possible that firms run by transformational, transactional, and servant leaders have different employee performance levels. A comparative examination of these

leadership philosophies in relation to worker performance can yield important information about how well-suited certain leadership techniques are for achieving desired performance results in businesses.

H_{03}: There is no significant difference in employee performance levels between organizations led by transformational, transactional, and servant leaders.

By referencing the body of existing literature, it is possible to explore the notion that there is no discernible difference in employee performance levels across firms headed by transformational, transactional, and servant leaders.

Employee performance has been strongly correlated with transformational leadership. According to Bass (1990), transformational leaders may inspire and encourage their workforce to reach better performance levels because of their charismatic and visionary leadership style. Empirical study has demonstrated a positive correlation between employee performance and transformative leadership, hence providing support for this viewpoint (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

The emphasis on incentives and performance objectives that characterizes transactional leadership has also been connected to higher worker performance. Employee performance outcomes can be positively impacted by transactional leaders that establish clear performance goals and offer rewards for reaching them, according to Avolio et al. (1999).

Higher levels of employee performance have also been linked to servant leadership, which places an emphasis on meeting the needs of others and giving employees authority. According to Liden et al. (2008), servant leaders who put their followers' growth and well-being first can foster a positive work atmosphere that improves productivity.

Although increased employee performance has been associated with each of these leadership philosophies, it's crucial to remember that a given leadership style's efficacy might change based on the situation and the people involved. According to some research, even higher levels of employee performance can result from combining various leadership philosophies, such as transactional and transformational leadership (Lowe et al., 1996).

All things considered, the literature currently in publication indicates that all three leadership philosophies—transformational, transactional, and servant leadership—can enhance performance outcomes in businesses, even though there may be variances in how well each style influences worker performance.

H_{04}: The combination of transformational and servant leadership does not have a greater impact on employee motivation and performance compared to either style alone.

In light of the body of research already available, it is possible to address the premise that servant leadership and transformational leadership combined do not significantly improve employee engagement and performance when compared to each style alone.

Positive results in terms of worker motivation and output are linked to both transformational leadership and servant leadership. Transformational leaders utilize their vision, charisma, and capacity to empower and grow their followers to inspire and motivate staff members to reach greater performance levels (Bass, 1990). According to Liden et al. (2008), servant leaders also put their followers' welfare and growth first, fostering an environment at work that is encouraging and empowering that raises motivation and output.

It is possible, nevertheless, that blending these two leadership philosophies won't always have a bigger effect on worker performance and motivation. While employee development and empowerment are the main goals of both transformational and servant leadership approaches, they may approach these goals differently and place varying emphasis on different facets of leadership (Bass, 1999). The influence of each style alone may be lessened if these styles are combined since it could result

in employees having overlapping or competing expectations.

Higher employee performance can result from a combination of transformational and transactional leadership styles than from using just one of them, according to research by Lowe et al. (1996). Nevertheless, there is a paucity of empirical study that particularly looks at how transformational and servant leadership work together to affect worker motivation and output.

Furthermore, whereas transformational and servant leadership philosophies might be advantageous to one another in certain situations, they might also compete with one another for the organization's attention and resources. For instance, whereas servant leaders may place more emphasis on the growth and well-being of their workforce, transformational leaders may give priority to strategic vision and innovation. Maintaining a balance between these conflicting agendas could be difficult and reduce the efficacy of the combined leadership strategy.

In general, there may be advantages to combining transformational and servant leadership philosophies, but it's crucial to take into account the special traits and environments of each approach and carefully evaluate how they could interact to affect worker motivation and output. To fully understand the cumulative effects of various leadership philosophies and determine the most efficient ways to incorporate them into companies, more empirical research is required.

H_{05}: The combination of transactional and servant leadership does not have a greater impact on employee motivation and performance compared to either style alone.

The theory that transactional and servant leadership combined do not affect worker motivation and output more than either style alone can be investigated in light of the body of research that has already been done. According to Avolio et al. (1999), transactional leadership has been linked to increased employee motivation and performance because of its emphasis on clearly defining expectations and rewarding performance. However, higher levels of employee motivation and performance have also been associated with servant leadership, which places an emphasis on meeting the needs of others and putting the welfare of employees first (Liden et al., 2008).

As transactional leaders give clear objectives and rewards and servant leaders concentrate on the growth and well-being of their workforce, the two leadership philosophies may appear to be compatible. Nevertheless, there is a paucity of empirical study that particularly looks at how these two approaches work together to affect worker motivation and output.

The possibility of disparate underlying motives and aims when merging transactional and servant leadership philosophies presents one possible obstacle. While servant leaders may put an emphasis on the needs and development of individual employees, transactional leaders may be more concerned with attaining organizational goals and outcomes (Greenleaf, 1970; Bass, 1999). It may be difficult to strike a balance between these conflicting aims and motivations within a single leadership strategy, and doing so may lessen the influence of each style.

As transactional leaders give clear objectives and rewards and servant leaders concentrate on the growth and well-being of their workforce, the two leadership philosophies may appear to be compatible. Nevertheless, there is a paucity of empirical study that particularly looks at how these two approaches work together to affect worker motivation and output.

The possibility of disparate underlying motives and aims when merging transactional and servant leadership philosophies presents one possible obstacle. While servant leaders may put an emphasis on the needs and development of individual employees, transactional leaders may be more concerned with attaining organizational goals and outcomes (Greenleaf, 1970; Bass, 1999). It may be difficult to strike a balance between these conflicting aims and motivations within a single leadership strategy,

and doing so may lessen the influence of each style.

Findings

Several important conclusions may be drawn from the discussions surrounding the hypothesis that servant leadership and transformative leadership alone do not have a stronger influence on employee engagement and performance than either style alone:

1. **Historical Perspectives:** Combining several leadership philosophies may or may not work depending on the particular situation and culture of the company. Although transformational and servant leadership styles seem to go well together, there are a number of variables that can affect how well they work together to increase employee engagement and performance, including the organization's structure, the sector it operates in, and the traits of the workforce.
2. **Competing Priorities:** When servant leadership and transformational leadership approaches are combined, it can lead to conflicting expectations for staff members. While servant leaders may prioritize the growth and well-being of their workforce, transformational leaders may place more emphasis on strategic vision and innovation. It might be difficult to strike a balance between these conflicting demands, which could reduce the efficacy of the combined strategy.
3. **Limited Empirical Evidence:** The combined effects of transformational and servant leadership styles on worker motivation and performance have not been the subject of much empirical study. Although the complimentary nature of these approaches is supported theoretically, further empirical research is required to confirm their combined efficacy.
4. **Need for Further Research:** Further research is needed to better understand how different leadership styles can be effectively combined and integrated within organizations to enhance employee motivation and performance. This research could help identify best practices for combining leadership styles and inform the development of more effective leadership approaches.

Overall, while the combination of transformational and servant leadership styles has the potential to positively impact employee motivation and performance, the findings suggest that there are challenges and limitations associated with this approach. Further research is needed to address these challenges and develop a more nuanced understanding of how different leadership styles can be combined to enhance organizational outcomes.

Conclusion

Conclusively, the conversations and discoveries concerning the theories of the amalgamation of transformational and servant leadership approaches offer significant perspectives into the intricacies of leadership relationships in corporate settings. A number of important points come out of the analysis, even though the theoretical foundations imply that combining these two approaches may have a positive synergistic effect on worker motivation and output.

First of all, the success of mixed leadership styles is heavily dependent on contextual conditions. The perception and implementation of the integrated approach within an organization can be greatly influenced by various factors, including industry dynamics, employee characteristics, and organizational culture. As such, a one-size-fits-all strategy might not be appropriate, and leaders need to pay close attention to the particular environment in which they work.

Second, the efficacy of the combined strategy may be hampered by the possibility of conflicting priorities and expectations. While servant leaders may put more of an emphasis on the growth and well-being of their workforce, transformational leaders may give

strategic vision and innovation first priority. Effective leadership and employee collaboration, communication, and alignment are necessary to balance these priorities.

Additionally, the paucity of empirical data that particularly examines the combined influence of servant and transformational leadership styles emphasizes the need for more study in this field. Our understanding of leadership dynamics and the practical consequences for organizational leadership practices are only possible through rigorous empirical research that examine the efficacy of combined leadership techniques in various organizational situations.

Organizations should proceed cautiously and thoughtfully when integrating transformational and servant leadership styles in light of these factors. Although the combined strategy has the potential to improve employee performance and motivation, it is crucial to carefully consider the opportunities and difficulties that are specific to each firm.

In summary, the conversations and discoveries emphasize how intricate leadership relationships are and how crucial it is to approach leadership practice and growth with a nuanced, contextually aware perspective. Organizations can foster a more diverse, empowered, and productive workplace by adopting this strategy and taking advantage of the synergies between transformational and servant leadership philosophies.

Reference:

1. Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72(4), 441-462.
2. Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational Dynamics, 18(3), 19-31.
3. Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8(1), 9-32.
4. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.
5. Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). The servant as leader. The Greenleaf Center.
6. Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. Paulist Press.
7. 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.
8. Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. The Leadership Quarterly, 19(2), 161-177.
9. Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. The Leadership Quarterly, 7(3), 385-425.
10. 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. Leadership Quarterly, 1(2), 107-142.
11. Spears, L. C. (1998). Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership. John Wiley & Sons.
12. Yukl, G. (2013). Leadership in organizations (8th ed.). Pearson.
13. Northouse, P. G. (2018). Leadership: Theory and practice (8th ed.). SAGE Publications.
14. Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social

learning perspective for construct development and testing. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97(2), 117-134.
15. Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. The Leadership Quarterly, 14(6), 807-834.
16. House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? Journal of Management, 23(3), 409-473.
17. Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(2), 246-255.
18. Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 3, 147-197.
19. Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. Harper & Row.
20. Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. Review of General Psychology, 9(2), 169-180.
21. House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge (pp. 189-207). Southern Illinois University Press.
22. Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. Organization Science, 4(4), 577-594.
23. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire. Consulting Psychologists Press.
24. Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(6), 891-902.
25. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Journal of Management, 22(2), 259-298.
26. Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1999). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. Organization Science, 4(4), 577-594.
27. Yukl, G. (1989). Leadership in organizations (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.