



IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Dr. S. Siva VenkataRamana

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Vignan's Nirula Institute of Technology and Science for Women, Guntur, A.P., India.

Dr. Shaik Mohammad Rafi

Faculty, Department of Commerce & Business Administration; University College of Arts, Commerce & Law; Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur, A.P., India

Abstract

The study seeks to evaluate the impact on employee performance of leadership styles. We used Private Organisation with the convenience sampling technique for sample size of 168 in Hyderabad. The study employed quantitative approaches and designed a questionnaire. Leadership Impact on employee performance was calculated by the 5-point questionnaire Likert scale. In the questionnaire analysis, SPSS software was used. Demographic analysis, test for normality, the test of reliability, descriptive analyses and analyses of regression were presented (Alpha of Cronbach). Descriptive statistics show that the most important characteristic in relation to employee success is transformation style and the laissez-faire approach. Leadership types of democratic and autocratic adversely impact employee efficiency. The highest average transformative leadership and the standard deviation are 3.784 and 0.8124, the second highest average value, and the default values are 3.416, and 0.5858 for Laissez faire style, whereas the autocratic style with its lowest average value of 3.404 and 0.7330 for default. Analysing the coefficient of regression demonstrates the meaningful effect of transformation and laissez-faire on performance of employees. Coefficient of Beta for autocratic leadership (0.168) is significant and above 0.025 and therefore, autocratic leadership has a major negative impact on employee performance.

Key words: Autocratic Leadership; Democratic Leadership; Laissez-faire Leadership; Transformational Leadership; Employee performance.

Introduction:

This study examines the effect on employee performance in a chosen organisation of leadership (autocratic, cooperative, transformational, and Laissez-faire). Leadership is creating an environment that ultimately leads to achieving organisational goals and objectives (Alghazo & Al-Anazi, 2016). The effect of leadership styles in an organisation only promotes excellence in the creation of the development of employees in all-round (Hurdzue, 2015).

Every researcher tries to identify an ideal way of leading people to success. But it is always a tireless effort to reach that perfect part. Many leadership theories have emerged from the time being to identify leadership styles, Great Man Theory (1840) assumes that leadership characteristics are fundamental. The concentrate of Trait Theory (1930-1940s) is to develop a leadership style with mental, physical, and social features. Contingency theories (1960) like fiedlers contingency theory and path-goal theory claims leadership style is always a situation based. Transactional leadership Theories (1970), like LMX theory, believe the association of strength to individual defines the leadership. Transformation Leadership Theories (1970) think leaders are transforming their followers by inspiring charismatic personalities. Such theories focus on the characteristics of workers that fit the company and the development of individuals.

The world and History are full of leaders and their leadership styles. From the significant leadership style framework of Kurt Lewin's (1930) to the present day transformational leadership style, many techniques are framed and formed. To be an effective leader, you have to choose an appropriate method of leadership suitable for your organisation. (Franco Gandolfi, Seth Stone-2017; Victor E. Dike, Ken Odiwe-2015; Chukwusa, Joseph-2018; F Bushra, U Ahmad, A Naveed-2011; SA Boamah, HKS Laschinger, C Wong, S Clarke - 2018; PE Levy, RT Cober, T Miller- 2002) In India similar studies have also been done by (S Ramachandran, VR Krishnan – 2009; Venkat R. Krishnan- 2005; K Rukmani, M Ramesh-2010; S Mittal, RL Dhar-2015; S Pradhan, LK Jena-2019)

Nowadays, the utmost majority of researches is going on favorable consequences of the transformational style of leadership on employees; The research is not yet done on a full scale to understand how transformation managers control the RIPL of employees (Huang, & Gong-2009; Chow, & Jong - 2003). Many studies (such as Shamir, Arthur, & House -1993, Yukl - 1999) have made similar requests for further examination of how transformational management affects the employee work performance.

In such an explanted work, Transformational leadership has a valuable influence on the performance of employees in particular to their innovative behavior. Subordinates are motivated to perform outside their expectations, participate in special role activities, and demonstrate their sense of meaningfulness in working towards organisational goals. Transformational leaders motivate employees to make their job more meaningful.

The analysis would benefit the organisation in fitting the right leadership style in the organisation, which helps to raise employee performance and belongingness to the organisational development.

Research Objectives

The main objective of the study is to examine the effect of styles of leadership (Autocratic, Democratic, Transformational and Lassiez-faire) on performance of employees

More significantly, we are aimed to determine whether-

- Autocratic style of leadership effects the working performance of employees.
- Democratic style of leadership effects the working performance of employees.
- Transformational style of leadership effects working performance of employees.
- Lassie-Faire style of leadership effects working performance of employees.

Review of Literature:

The world financial crisis has brought the world's economic and political order to a wave of unprecedented challenges. Leadership is the critical factor to make a difference in a situation of uncertainty, through foresight and ability. Nel et al. (2004) define leadership as the process by which a particular person influences others to make their efforts and skills available voluntarily and enthusiastically to achieve specific group or organisational objectives.

Leadership is defined by Cole (2005) as a process that affects others in their desire to pursue and achieve their objectives. The group's core goal for ideals is to help a group or organisation achieve sustainable growth.

Transformational Leadership: Bass, Waldman, Avolio, and Bebb (1987) found that transformational leadership factors are more essential and have followers with greater transformability. The transformational leadership style includes components of idealised influence, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualisation and is widely suggested as a style of change management. "The goal of transformative leadership consists of literally transforming people and organisations – transforming them in mind and heart, broadening vision, insight, and understanding. Making behavior compatible with beliefs, principles, or values. Making changes that will continue, perpetuate, and build momentum."-Stephen R Covey

Laissez Faire Leadership style: Laissez-Faire leadership is a type of leadership that encourages and enables Group members to decide. It is also known as delegative leadership implies that someone in a leadership position has no leadership responsibilities and practically takes note of, or involves significant transactions. This leader does little or nothing to affect the followers or the results of his behavior. Leadership that does not engage in progress and decision making is described by passive or avoided leadership. Project goals and expectations for the followers are not clearly defined. This style of leadership consists of passive, exceptional management and is seen as withdrawn and unimplicated. Passive Management-by-Exception (MBEP) refers to leaders that do not involve themselves until situations get worse and wait before things go wrong. Leaders with excellent passive management will not intervene with problem-solving until they encounter some significant deviations or mistakes.

Democratic Leadership style: When a Democratic leader finally decides, he / she allows team members to take part in decisions. The style of democracy not only improves the happiness of employees or team members, but it also helps people build their skills. Employees and members of the team control their fate because they deserve support, so they work hard more than financially. Democratic leadership style can slow down things but can often lead to better results by time - consuming involvement. The method can be most effective if teamwork is required and quality is more important for productivity than for speed.

A changing leadership style Bass (1985) expanded the method a few years later by developing a Multifactor Leadership Framework. This theory has been further supported by Avolio and Bass (1991). The reports from Hartog et al. (1997) include ideas on the nature of management, style, and approach of contingency, as well as the work of sociologists like Weber (1947) and Burns (1978).

The Transformative Manager is following new and highly productive strategies and is moving people and organisations. There is transformative leadership where followers delight in the works of their leader (Schermerhorn, 2008). Here, the leader makes followers think more than their abilities (Jandaghi et al., 2009). These are effective and active in their work (Yammarino & Bass, 1990), but laissez-faire leaders were regarded as sluggish. Controversy and the decision - making define leadership. While under certain conditions, such a style would be useful, this particular management style was thought to indicate, in fact, a lack of leadership (Sutermeyer, 1969; Williams, 1978). Therefore, this type of leadership was seen as an unacceptable form of leadership (Hartog et al., 1997).

Employers who are able to participate Instead of employers keeping the same workers more often, their businesses are improving efficiency at around the same time (Devi, 2009; Stairs, 2005).

Smith (1998) states that the workforce efficiency will be higher because the job is organised and good relationships with employees can be formed. His findings also show us that democratic leaders are very attentive to engaging all members of the team.

Schwartz (1987) found that the working people were extremely submissive in democratic organisations, but they demonstrated frustration and anger in autocratic organisations. Two distinct types of work group specialist were contained in Bales (1970). You are a specialist in sports and a specialist of social emotions. The mission specialist is to accomplish the group objectives whilst the social - emotional specialist aims to maintain positive social relations within the group.

Lewin et al. (1939) have come to the conclusion that the most successful democratic leadership, but the effectiveness of groups is based on Smith and Peterson's (1988) criteria for testing leadership. Autocratic styles are therefore most effective when leadership is measured in productivity, but democracy is effective when it is considered to preserve good standards of morality and consistent levels of work.

The lack of leadership results in a lack of integrity and lack of attention to the job. The lack of leadership leads to Hayers (2000) found that under pressure workers autocratically controlled their representatives. The decision-making process could seldom be made by the members. Stressed workers also reportedly undergoing severe supervision and control of their leaders (Hayers, 2000). Social support is a key factor in the working environment of organisational pressures (Cohen & Wills 1985). Social assistance seems to contribute by acting as an anti-stress buffer to reduce stress (Deitz, Landsbergis, Schnall, Friedman & Pickering 1992). The role of gender affects stress at work. The growing flow of information among workers is a strong sense of community (Bruffee, 1993 and Dede, 1996). The well-being and welfare of staff in the society is strengthened. Walker 1994, & Wellman 1999). (French only). Royal and Rossi (1996) said the logic of work of the group is connected.

Research Methodology

This study has conducted a justification, as the analysis would examine the impact on the performance of employees in leadership styles. The explanatory design of the research involves hypothesis formulation and information collection on this basis, pointing to research objectives..

Data Collection

The best way to data collection is by distributing questionnaires. Facilitate answering the questions, a Likert five-point questionnaire was developed (McLeod, 2008). In the questionnaire, likert scale takes the order of (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) Neutral; 4) Agree; and (5) Strongly Agree. The questionnaire was developed using the following variables: democratic leadership, autocratic leadership, Transformational, the leadership of the laissez-faire, and employee performance.

Total of 200 samples was sent to employees from different departments that include marketing, sales, development, human resources departments, services, finance departments, and management by convenience sampling method. The comfort sample method has been used as it is cost-effective, secure, and readily accessible subjects (Etikan, et al. , 2016). Only 168 questionnaires were, however, completed. 22 respondents haven't completed the survey, and 10 others have not cooperated. Therefore, 168 valid responses give an adequate response rate of 84 percent.

Before carrying out an investigation, the participating party's permission must be obtained, and thus the researchers have agreed on no complications with the management and the HR Department. The researcher distributed surveys only during the break because the participants were not adequately distracted during working hours and could influence the answers. Moreover, no confidentiality breach (of personal data and responses) was triggered by the researcher. In the preparation of questionnaires, the researcher does not guarantee that the name or other personal information is disclosed. Confidentiality was promised to discourage unwanted inquiries, however. There was also a question about the confidence of respondents.

Data Analysis:

This research utilized the quantitative and statistical methods to analyse the data collected from samples. To obtain significant results, we opted SPSS. We used this system to check reliability, normality and in analysis of correlation and regressions. i.e., descriptive analysis, to understand the effect of styles of leadership on employee work performance

Demographic analysis:

The methods used to calculate age, gender, the race of people, and how overtime shifts with the fundamental demographic process (including birth, death, or migrations) are used to assess demographic analysis (Robert E. Lucas, 2002).

Age					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	25.00	15	8.9	8.9	8.9
	26.00	5	3.0	3.0	11.9
	27.00	39	23.2	23.2	35.1
	28.00	52	31.0	31.0	66.1
	29.00	4	2.4	2.4	68.5
	30.00	13	7.7	7.7	76.2
	31.00	26	15.5	15.5	91.7
	32.00	2	1.2	1.2	92.9
	33.00	2	1.2	1.2	94.0
	34.00	3	1.8	1.8	95.8
	35.00	1	.6	.6	96.4
	36.00	1	.6	.6	97.0
	37.00	4	2.4	2.4	99.4
	39.00	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	168	100.0	100.0	

Gender					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	72	42.9	42.9	42.9
	Female	96	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	168	100.0	100.0	

Designation					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Executive	88	52.4	52.4	52.4
	Senor Executive	15	8.9	8.9	61.3
	Trainee	65	38.7	38.7	100.0
	Total	168	100.0	100.0	

This research measured demographic characteristics by gender, age, and job designation. Gender was divided into women and males, of whom 96 women and 72 men, with 57.1% and 42.9%. The age is divided into 25-39 and the frequency of the participants is 15,5,39,52,4,13,26,2,2,3,1,4 and 1 for each age level. Designations were grouped into three groups, Trainee, Executive and Senior executive. with a frequency of 65,88, 15 and proportions are 38.7%, 52.4% and 8.9% respectively.

Normality Test

The test shall have a value of between +1 and -1 in the normality test. SPSS tests for normality test.

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Is the performance of an employee affected by the autocratic management style?	168	-0.559	0.187	0.215	0.373
Is an organisation competent in the autocratic management style?	168	-0.282	0.187	0.053	0.373
Does the style of autocratic leadership help achieve organisational goals?	168	-0.595	0.187	0.567	0.373
Is the model of democracy more successful than other styles of leadership?	168	-0.339	0.187	-0.01	0.373
Is employee performance more efficient in democratic leadership?	168	-0.23	0.187	-0.533	0.373
Can democratic leadership be used to improve employees' performance in achieving corporate goals?	168	-0.295	0.187	-0.986	0.373
Are transformative management and employee performance have a link?	168	-0.008	0.187	-0.361	0.373
Do you think your employees prefer transformational leadership to improve the company?	168	-0.316	0.187	-0.839	0.373
Do you believe that transformational leadership benefits employees in further changes?	168	-0.124	0.187	-0.565	0.373
Do you think the staff prefers Laissez-faire?	168	-0.124	0.187	-0.779	0.373
In Laissez leadership style, does the employee is responsible for allowing him or her to decision making?	168	-0.566	0.187	0.552	0.373

Do you think that leadership at Laissez-faire creates employees' trust in their work?	168	-0.529	0.187	0.434	0.373
Do you think leadership will help people learn more efficiently at work than two other leadership skills?	168	-0.003	0.187	-0.564	0.373
Would you think leadership promotes a better system of communication between management and employees?	168	-0.367	0.187	-0.693	0.373
Would you think that Leadership styles can be used together to improve worker performance?	168	-0.159	0.187	-0.528	0.373
Would you think the inclusion of employees in decision - making enhances the performance of the company?	168	-0.025	0.187	-0.781	0.373
Valid N (listwise)	168				

The statistics of skewness show an acceptable range of -1 to +1, according to the table above. The kurtosis statistical value is also appropriate, and further reliability tests can be conducted as the data considered to be healthy.

The parameters in the alpha for the internal coherence of Cronbach are:

- Great, if $\alpha > 0.9$;
- Nice, if in between 0.7&0.9;
- Acceptable, if inbetween 0.6&0.7;
- Bad if inbetween 0.5&0.6;
- Unacceptable if $\alpha < 0.5$.

Table of Cronbach's alpha

	items	Chronbach's Alpha
All	16	0.662
Laissez-faire	3	0.485
Democratic	3	0.234
Transformational	3	0.753
Autocratic	3	0.853
Employee_Performance	4	0.694

The total Alpha value for Cronbach is 0.662 based on the above table. This shows the internal accuracy of data is sufficient for them. Autocratic's alpha value is highest (0.853) in Cronbach. The internal efficiency of three questions indicates optimum reliability. Second highest Cronbach alpha value is transformative (0.753), making the data stable and reliable. Democratic is Cronbach's lowest alpha (0.234), which indicates that the data are poorly reliable. Cronbach's alpha performance score for its employees is 0.694, showing the internal coherence of data is good and acceptable.

Descriptive Statistics

The variable is classified in the descriptive analysis compared with standardised and medium values. The highest deviation from the mean results in the most reliable independent variables for the dependent variables.

Descriptive Statistics			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Autocratic	168	3.8393	0.75288
Democratic	168	3.0337	0.51542
Transformational	168	4.2024	0.51464
Laisses_Faire	168	4.0675	0.60113
Employee_Performance	168	4.3705	0.39169
Valid N (listwise)	168		

The transformation models have The highest standard deviation mean value is 4.2024, value equal to 0.51464, which means the highest correlation between transformational leadership style and employee performance. The leadership of laissez-faire is the second-highest average at 4.0675, and it suggests reasonable employee productivity and performance at a standard deviation of 0.60113. The democratic leadership models have 3.0337 as a minimum and a typical 0.51542 variance, indicating an inadequately linked style and employee performance with democratic leadership.

Regression Analysis

Whenever Durbin-Watson is 2, it signifies that it is not an autocorrelation; 0 means a positive correlation, and 4 means that it has a negatively-fitted correlation. It is the rule of thumb that at least 60% of dependent variable is estimated to have an adjusted R Square value greater than 60% of the autocorrelation, which makes the model appropriate to conduct research.

Model Summary ^b					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.512 ^a	.263	.244	.34048	1.276
a. Predictors: (Constant), Laisses_Faire, Autocratic, Democratic, Transformational					
b. Dependent Variable: Employee_Performance					

According to the table above, the value of R square is 0.263, meaning that 26.3% of the dependent variable can be estimated with different variables. The value Durbin-Watson showed that a range of 1.5-2.5 among selected respondents in this study didn't automatically fall into.

Further coefficients are analysed, in which the alpha value range 0.05, 0.001, or 0.01 is used to explain the variable meaning.

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.593	.319		8.128	.000
	Autocratic	-.002	.036	-.003	-.042	.966
	Democratic	-.010	.052	-.013	-.197	.844

	Transformational	.345	.055	.453	6.314	.000
	Laissez_Faire	.090	.046	.138	1.947	.053
a. Dependent Variable: Employee_Performance						

The beta factor for a transformational style is 0.453, of 0.00 meaning less than 0.01 significant value, according to the table above, This ensures that transformational leadership is perfect for the performance of employees. The style of transformation leads to an emotional link between the boss and the follower so that his followers are more confident of exceeding expectations. Al-Amin, Md endorsed this. (2017).

Autocratic leadership Beta coefficient is 0.966, and autocratic leadership is, therefore, negatively impacting on the performance of employees. This has been big. According to Jayasingam& Cheng (2009), autocracy has adverse effects on employee performance. Studies of Puni et al. (2014) and Akor (2014) have confirmed this.

In Laissez - faire, the beta coefficient is 0.138 and the value significantly above 0.053, which means Leadership Laissez - faire has a substantial negative impact on the performance of the employee. That is the same as Muhammad Asrar - Ul-Haq 's 2016 score.

Discussion

The findings show that the effectiveness of employees with autocratic leadership is significantly affected. Jayasingam& Cheng (2009) endorsed this, which claimed autocratic leaders to regulate all actions and decisions, although constraining employee innovation and creativity. Therefore, self - government leaders tend to restrict employee performance. **H1: Rejected.**

The findings indicate that democracy has an impact on staff efficiency. Although democratic processes in this country are widely accepted, the workers are more lenient. **H2: Rejected**

The results show that the change in leadership positively affects the performance of employees. This way, organisational productivity can be accessible. The style of leadership transformation enhances the emotional connection between the supervisor and the supporters and helps them feel better than expected. Al-Amin, Md. (2017) says that transformation management Generates more motivated personnel, leading ultimately to better results. **H3: Accepted**

The results show that laissez-faire leadership has a negative impact on the performance of employees. Leadership is considerably detrimental to employee performance. It's the way Muhammad Asrar-ul - Haq did. Performance of 2016: **H4:Rejected**

Summary of Hypothesis:

Hypothesis	Beta	Sig.	Result
H1: Autocratic style effects working performance of employee.	-0.003	0.966	Rejected
H2: Democratic style of leadership effects working performance of employee.	-0.013	0.844	Rejected
H3: Transformational style of leadership effects working performance of employee.	0.453	0	Accepted
H4: Laissez-Faire style of leadership effects working performance of employee.	0.138	0.053	Rejected

Limitations:

This section defines the limits that can be achieved successfully in conducting the research. Since the selection of a sample can not have access to the whole population, hypotheses from the entire population can vary. The involvement of the respondents in answering questions often entails certain constraints. Since the selected sample is one hundred respondents, the impact of leadership on staff performance issues can not be justified based on the same company, as a large number of people can not be examined in a sample.

Interviewees can also distort their responses because they are not positive about acknowledging organisational problems.

Recommendations & Conclusion

Leadership is the critical role of managers at all organisational levels.

In this report, different leadership styles are explored with Ramky Estate Farms Ltd.(REFL), success of employees. The study found that autocratic leadership has a negative impact on subordinated efficiency. Transformative leadership has a positive effect on employee performance.

The study, therefore, concludes that REFL managers with transformational leadership generally record increased employment performance in their units. The caliber of managers showing a laissez-faire style of leadership also records significant work performance in their units. In addition, executives and trainees employed under autocratic managers have low performance and below their objectives.

The findings suggest that employee success has a significant positive effect on progressive leadership styles. Though REFL. The leaders prefer autocratic governance, for which the most important thing is autocratic leadership, and the workers who are increasingly qualified, self-governing and professionally active in a globalisation process may no longer be recognised as autocratic leaders. Leadership in the style of transformative leadership is known as moderate management.

The following recommendations are made based on the findings and conclusions.

First, managers at diverse levels of REFL management should be encouraged to exercise and pursue transformative leadership in the context of their management functions.

Secondly, managers are encouraged, particularly where subordinates know about the mission and are very committed to work, to lead their subordinates using laissez-faire leadership methods. The laissez-faire leadership approach can also be achieved by continuous training for managements on up - to - date technologies.

Thirdly, REFL should implement policies that prohibit independent leadership because it hampers the performance of employees.

Extensions to this study:

The next research can be carried on with the addition of several factors, such as years of work with higher gender. As the only organisation has participated in this study, its number should be increased in future researches by researchers. Further investigations should work on large data samples for a broader perspective in various industries, including travel, banking, retail, and entertainment industries. Besides, researchers can extend this research's findings for workers' commitment to work and work performance. In addition, the potential investigator will concentrate on distinguished businesses, whether government or private, using a model of bass transformation (1985) in the Lewin Leadership Style (1939) model.

REFERENCES

- Al-amin, md. (2017). Transformational leadership and employee performance mediating effect of employee engagement. 7. 28-40.
- Mrs.E.Deepa.,Dr.R.Palaniswamy., Effect of Performance Appraisal System in Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Productivity., The Journal Contemporary Management Research 2014, Vol.8, Issue No. 1, 72 - 82.
- Akor, Influence of Autocratic Leadership Style on the Job Performance of Academic Librarians in Benue State. Journal of Educational and Social Research, 4(7), pp. 148-152.
- Al-Anazi, M., 2016. The Impact of Leadership Style on Employee's Motivation. International Journal of Economics and Business Administration, 2(5), pp. 37-44.
- Leadership and its Influence in Organizations – A Review of Intellections. International Journal of Learning & Development, 2(6), pp. 73-85.
- Sharma, D. M. K. & Jain, S., 2013. Leadership Management: Principles, Models and Theories. Global Journal of Management and Business Studies, 3(3), pp. 309-318.
- Ansari, M. A., Ahmad, Z. A. & Aafaqi, R., 2004. Organizational Leadership in the Malaysian Context. Leading in High Growth Asia, pp. 109-138.
- Armstrong, M., Taylor & S. (2014). Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Chukwusa, Joseph., Library Philosophy and Practice; Lincoln (Dec 2018): Autocratic Leadership Style: Obstacle to Success in Academic Libraries
- Sajeet Pradhan, Lalatendu Kesari Jena., Does Meaningful Work Explains the Relationship Between Transformational Leadership and Innovative Work Behaviour?
- Franco Gandolfi, Seth Stone., EDITURA ASE, The Emergence of Leadership Styles: A Clarified Categorisation.
- Venkat R. Krishnan., Transformational leadership and outcomes: role of relationship duration
- Swati Mittal , Rajib Lochan Dhar., Transformational leadership and employee creativity: Mediating role of creative self-efficacy and moderating role of knowledge sharing
- Sudha Ramachandran , Venkat R. Krishnan., Effect of Transformational Leadership on Followers' Affective and Normative Commitment: Culture as Moderator
- Puni, A., Ofei, S. B. & Okoe, A., 2014. The Effect of Leadership Styles on Firm Performance in Ghana. International Journal of Marketing Studies, 6(1), pp. 177-185.
- Said, J., Alam, M. M. & Aziz, M. A. A., 2015. Public accountability system: Empirical assessment of public sector of Malaysia. Asian Journal of Scientific Research, 8(2), pp. 225-2368.
- Sakiru, O. K., Enoho, D. V., Kareem, S. D. & Abdullahi, M., 2013. Relationship between employee performance, leadership styles and emotional intelligence in an organization. IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS), 8(2), pp. 53-57.
- K. Rukmani, M. Ramesh & J. Jayakrishnan., Effect of Leadership Styles on Organizational Effectiveness., European Journal of Social Sciences – Volume 15, Number 3 (2010)
- Peris M. Koech & Prof. G.S Namusonge., The Effect of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance at State Corporations in Kenya., International Journal of Business and Commerce Vol. 2, No.1: Sep 2012[01-12] (ISSN: 2225-2436)
- Iqbal, Anwar and Haider., Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Performance., Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review
- Gahye Hong , Youngsam Cho , Fabian Jintae Froese , Mannsoo Shin., The effect of leadership styles, rank, and seniority on affective organizational commitment: A comparative study of U.S. and Korean employees., Cross Cultural & Strategic Management ISSN: 2059-5794
- Youngsam Cho (Korea University) , Mannsoo Shin (Korea University)., The effects of two leadership styles on employees' organizational commitment and job satisfaction.
- Fawaz Musaed M. Alshahrani and Lubna A. Baig., Effect of Leadership Styles on Job Satisfaction Among Critical Care Nurses in Aseer, Saudi Arabia
- Sebahattin Yıldız: Faruk Baştürk İlknur Taştan Boz., The Effect of Leadership and Innovativeness on Business Performance., Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences

- Volume 150, 15 September 2014, Pages 785-793
- Fu-Jin Wang, ShiehChich-Jen and Tang Mei-Ling., Effect of leadership style on organizational performance as viewed from human resource management strategy., Vol.4(18), pp. 3924 - 3936 , December 2010
- Teresa Aguiar Quintana, Sangwon Park &YasminaAraujo Cabrera., Assessing the Effects of Leadership Styles on Employees' Outcomes in International Luxury Hotels., Journal of Business Ethics volume 129, pages469–489(2015)
- Arnold, K. A., Connelly, C. E., Walsh, M. M., & Martin Ginis, K. A. (2015). Leadership styles, emotion regulation, and burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(4), 481–490. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039045>
- EbrahimHasan Al Khajeh., Impact of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance., Journal of Human Resources Management Research
<http://ibimapublishing.com/articles/JHRMR/2018/687849/> Vol. 2018 (2018), Article ID 687849, 10 pages, ISSN : 2166-0018 DOI: 10.5171/2018.687849
- Babalola, S. S. (2016). The Effect Of Leadership Style, Job Satisfaction And Employee-Supervisor Relationship On Job Performance And Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 32(3), 935-946.
- Andrew M. Farrell., The Effect of Leadership Styles on Service Quality Delivery., EMAC 2001 – Doctoral Colloquium Submission., Aston Business School, UK.