NOLEGEIN: Journal of Management Information Systems
Vol. 1: Issue 1
www.mbajournals.in

Analyzing the Efficacy of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles on Employee Performance (With Special Reference OF Small and Medium Enterprise of Jaipur City)

Sakshi Sharma, Manju Nair*
[1]Rajasthan Technical University, Kota, Rajasthan, India
[2]International School of Informatics and Management, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This empirical study was conducted to analyze the employee's performance of small and Medium Enterprises in relation to Transformational and Transactional leadership styles. Moreover, it had map up the leadership styles of SMEs top managers via evaluating the opinion of subordinates regarding their manager's style of leadership prevailing in the enterprise. Design: This study is explorative in nature and used a convenient sampling technique. The primary data was collected through the questionnaire from the sample size of 80 middle n junior level employees of the SMEs in Jaipur city. Different literature observations were also presented of each independent variable n its effect on the dependent variable to validate the research intention. Findings: At the end it was concluded that there is an impact of Leadership styles and employee performance. Transactional leadership style had positive impact on workforce performance of SMEs rather than transformational. Managerial Implications: After "Make in India" initiative, SMEs are also confronting with increased competitions where labor retention is becoming extremely imperative issue for survival. So, SMEs managers must foster a work environment that aids performance of every employee through a right manner of leadership style. Scope for future work/limitations: This study is limited to SMEs of Jaipur city and the sample of the employees was examined in a spectrum of only two leadership styles, it can be expanded for future studies. Theme: Leadership and change management.

Keywords: employee performance, leadership styles, small and medium enterprise's, transformational, transactional

****Corresponding Author***
E-mail: sakshisharma6587@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

Leadership Style

At present human capital is receiving extended value and is being considered the most priceless asset in the organizational development including Small and medium enterprises. For sustaining in global market SMEs calls for an urgent need to foster this human wealth at right path which can give a best upshot as whole from both organization and individual perspective. To keep workforce motivated for new innovations, one requires people, who can lead these human resources efficiently. Here, leaders play an immense role in this context as leadership ability helps in attaining and retaining the qualitative workforce. Effective leaders always persuade employees to contribute their efforts willingly for achieving organizational goals [1]. Over the last decades several leadership styles had emerged and recently most researched styles were transactional and transformational leadership, they were investigated by a great number of researchers like Bass B. M.; Howell and Costley; Brassey-Schouten. These styles are often explored in academic prose especially the disparities of transactional and transformational leadership. In this paper we attempt to examine the efficacy of leadership styles of SMEs supervisors and its impact on the employee performance by analyzing transformational and transactional styles [2].

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership emphasizes the potential power of leaders and looks for foremost changes of policy and direction. It has always forward revelation to initiate innovations and persuades to accomplish victory by giving inspiration and stimulate subordinate to perform finer than estimated. It is noticed when leaders expand colleagues and followers to superior levels of capability and potential; encourage followers to gaze beyond their own interests toward those that will benefit the group, always results to immense satisfaction and higher performance. The following dimension summed the transformational leadership [3].

Idealized Influence

This alludes to a socialized charismatic leader allied to beliefs, values and missions. It is dependent on the degree followers want to emulate the leader due to respect, recognition and faith.

Inspirational Motivation

It abides the degree to which leaders inspire clique by challenging work; passionate communication of visions, enthusiasm and optimism are exhibited. The leader encourages subordinates to envisage attractive prospect while communicating expectations.

Intellectual Stimulation

By questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways, leaders arouse their assistant‟ efforts to be innovative and creative. This encourages subordinates to try new approaches based on rationality.

Individualized Consideration

Individual consideration bears to the degree to which the leader is concerned for follower's needs and competencies and to offer supportive environment to exploit these needs.

TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP

This remarks the potential influence on followers, is likely to move in smaller, incremental steps which is based on transaction or exchange. This proffers "guarantee and reward for superior performance" and "treats and discipline for poor performance" Furthermore, guidance, expectations, work procedures and methods attention, benefits are clearly provided by the leader by holding directive behavior [4]. Following dimension will describe this style more effectively.

Contingent Reward

This feature is based on a bargaining exchange method in which the leader and subordinates have mutual consent to achieve the objectives; in return the subordinates get rewards.

Management-by-Exception (Active)

It indicates clearly the standards for compliance and what constitutes ineffective performance, which may reprove subordinates for being out of agreement with those values.

Laissez-Faire Leadership

This style holds nearly no influence over his followers and leaders will always keep away from getting drawn in the significant issues and evade making decisions and consider the philosophy of "leave it alone". This addresses the followers to have total freedom to set their own goals and to supervise their own work. These styles have negligible information and resources, practically no contribution, no involvement or communiqué and the perceptive of policies and procedures solely occur among followers [6].

Leadership Style and Employee Performance

The performance of employees comprises of definite duties, meeting targets, employee proficiency, and efficacy in doing work, but this trait cannot be alone inculcated among employees until they have an influential leader to inspire them. Today SMEs call for strong leadership styles that can stimulate the employee performance [7]. An effectual leader has a charge to give direction and allocate the information to the worker to escort them for greater performance and build them proficient in maintaining quality, becoming a head of all team members is such a great responsibility. Still many organizations fail to get a good leader, this problem happen due to lack of strategic interventions of specific leadership styles to the particular situations, which were continuously affecting employee performance. That's why researchers need to examine the best leadership style that stimulates change and improvement in the performance of employees. This paper has articulate three different leadership styles, transactional, transformational and laissez-faire which are taken as independent variables and employee performance key factors i.e., new challenging tasks, job security, opportunities, fair assessment, work life balance, value added service, enjoyment n comfort-zone would be taken as dependent variable. With a view to explore which leadership style is primarily suitable to develop the performance of SMEs employees, a theoretical model is developed on the basis of their relationship [8].

Objectives of Research

[1] To identify whether the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles of supervisors prevailing in SMEs of Jaipur city.
[2] To determine the impact of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles of supervisors on employee performance of SMEs in Jaipur city.
[3] To determine the level of impact of different Factors of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles on employee performance of SMEs in Jaipur city [9].

Hypothesis for Testing

H_{10}: There is no significant transactional and transformational and laissez-faire leadership style prevailing in SMEs of Jaipur city.
H_{20}: There is no significant impact of transformational leadership style on employees' performance of SMEs of Jaipur city.
H_{30}: There is no significant impact of transactional leadership style on employees' performance of SMEs of Jaipur city [10].

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In today's organizational milieu, human capital is accepting more importance and is being considered the most valuable asset in the organizational development. Many theorists stated that leaders need to identify that Humans are not machines and could not be treated as such. They started to examine the correlation between the leader behavior and the other outcomes such as follower performance or satisfaction level, organizational productivity and profitability. In 1939 researchers Lewin, Lippit, and White, and Blake and Mouton in 1964) tried to categorize effective leadership styles and to relate them with diverse aspects of organizational outcomes [11]. Contemporary researches have decisive mainly on the leader-follower outlook and proposed two core facets of leadership styles: transactional and transformational (Bass and Avolio, 1990; Meyer and Botha, 2000). Employee performance and Leadership has a strong association with each other (Ogbonna and Harris 2000). Author like Howell, Merenda (1999) and Goodwin (2001) recommended that transformational leadership plays a vital role in increasing job performance, organization's goal and employee’s acts without enforcing extra burden (Schlotz, 2009).

It was suggested that transactional leaders were effectual in markets which were repeatedly growing and where there was slight or denial competition (Ristow (1998) but this is not the crate in the markets of today, where war is fierce, and resources are limited. Bass and Avolio (1994) assured that the dissimilarity between these two models is that group of transformational leadership display performance which is further than expectations, while transactional leadership, at best, leads to likely performance. It was recommended by Bass (1990) and Burns (1978) that strong leaders outperform weak leaders, and that transformational leadership produce higher performance than transactional leadership. The analysis done by Pruijn and Boucher (1994) demonstrate that transformational leadership is a lean-to of transactional leadership was also supported by (Bass, 1997). Pragmatic facts tend to support the sight that leaders will make best use of their effectiveness when they exhibit both transformational and transactional behaviors (Avolio et al, 1988; Bass and Yammarino, 1989).

RESEARCH GAP

The prior research in this area so far, have not been conducted which is focusing on

relationship between employer’s transactional and transformational leadership style and employee performance in small scale enterprise in Rajasthan, yet to find out specifically which leadership styles is effective to employees in SMEs. The prominent implication of this paper is the outlook that further researchers may be able to utilize for future studies that will create an enormous impact on society and new conclusions might prove to be encouraging in introducing change to the SMEs.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire was distributed for primary data collection and it has also used secondary data from many literatures, journals, preceding researches, publication, and other documents and archives.

Population in this study was all of the permanent employees of small scale industries in Jaipur city covering mainly the area of Sitapura, Saganer, Vidhadharnagar, Pratap Nager and 22 Godam [12].

Random sampling technique was used with sample size of 80, and 5 points Likert scale was used to measure. The questionnaires were given away to 100 respondents and only 80 were responded.
To measure transformational and transactional leadership style, I used the (MLQ) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire proposed by Bass and Avolio in 1995 where it has 4 multi-item subscales corresponding four transformational dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration and two item of Transactional leadership i.e. management by exception and contingent rewards and

one of lassize-fair and 5 items were based on employee performance.

DATA ANALYSIS

Table 1. *Profile of respondent.*

Small and medium enterprise of Jaipur	No of the respondents (60)	Small & medium enterprise of Jaipur	No of the respondents (60)
1. LaherPVFootwearPvtLtd,		8. Midar Export Pvt Ltd	
2. PPRubberLtd,Vidhadhar	6	9. Rastogi Furnishes and	6
Nagar	5	Decorators Pvt Ltd	5
3. DevEnterprise,Vidhadhar	5	10. Autolite Ltd	5
Nagar	5	11. Jain Sarogi Cold Storage	4
4. Amul Pharmaceutical Pvt Ltd	6	12. APPL	5
5. Radika Pvt Ltd	5	13. Rajdhani Handicrafts	7
6. Shyampur Ltd	6	14. Dhunseri Tea Industries	8
7. Haits Ltd		15. Lidbl Handicrafts.	2

Table 2. *Leadership styles factors and employee performance one way ANOVA.*

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
II	Between groups	4.527	3	1.509	5.951	.001
	Within groups	19.273	76	.254		
	Total	23.800	79			
IM	Between groups	3.308	3	1.103	1.972	.125
	Within groups	42.492	76	.559		
	Total	45.800	79			
IS	Between groups	2.259	3	.753	2.371	.077
	Within groups	24.129	76	.317		
	Total	26.388	79			
IC	Between groups	12.160	3	4.053	11.974	.000
	Within groups	25.727	76	.339		
	Total	37.888	79			
CR	Between groups	6.169	3	2.056	5.241	.002
	Within groups	29.818	76	.392		
	Total	35.988	79			
MBE	Between groups	1.030	3	.343	1.045	.378
	Within groups	24.970	76	.329		
	Total	26.000	79			
LF	Between groups	2.932	3	.977	3.404	.022
	Within groups	21.818	76	.287		
	Total	24.750	79			

As shown in the table the significant level is .001, .125, .077, .000, .002, .378 and .022 showing 7 variable namely idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception, laissez-faire. Among which idealized influence, individualized consideration, contingent reward, laissez-faire is below .05, and therefore there is a statistically significant difference in the mean of these four variable and remaining value of inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and management-by-exception result has no significant effects.

Table 3. *Transformational leadership style and its four variable significance (4 variables and their mean).*

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Idealized inspirational	Between groups	1.509	2	.755	2.606	.080
	Within groups	22.291	77	.289		
	Total	23.800	79			
Influence motivation	Between groups	17.073	2	8.536	22.881	.000
	Within groups	28.727	77	.373		
	Total	45.800	79			

Intellectual stimulation	Between groups	5.978	2	2.989	11.278	.000
	Within groups	20.409	77	.265		
	Total	26.387	79			
Individualized consideration	Between groups	11.188	2	5.594	16.132	.000
	Within groups	26.700	77	.347		
	Total	37.887	79			

The first column is the between-groups degrees of freedom, 77 is the within-groups degrees of freedom, 2.606, 22.881, 11.278, 16.132 is the F ratio from the F column, .080, .000, .000 and .000 is the value in the Sig. column (the p value), and .289, .373, .265 and .347 is the within-groups mean square estimate of variance. With the sig value of .000 inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and management-by-exception result has significant effects while The p value of Idealized inspirational equals .080, which is greater than the α level (.05), therefore there is a statistically significant difference.

Table 4. *Transactional leadership style and two variable significance (2 variables and their mean).*

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Contingent reward	Between groups	13.988	2	6.994	24.478	.000
	Within groups	22.000	77	.286		
	Total	35.988	79			
Management-by-exception	Between groups	5.087	2	2.543	9.364	.000
	Within groups	20.913	77	.272		
	Total	26.000	79			

The fist column is the between-groups degrees of freedom, 77 is the within-groups degrees of freedom, 24.478 and 9.364, is the F ratio from the F column, .000 and .000 is the value in the Sig. column (the p value), and .286 and .272 is the within-groups mean square estimate of variance. The p value of CR and MBE equals .000, which is less than the α level (.05), therefore there is a statistically significant difference in the mean of these transactional leadership style factors.

Table 5. *Correlation between leadership style and employee performance.*

		Leadership style	Employee performance
Leadership style	Pearson correlation	1	.289(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.009
	N	80	80
Employee performance	Pearson correlation	.289(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.
	N	80	80

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

In this Pearson's r is 0.289. As we can see the correlation between leadership styles and employee performance is 0.289. Squaring this number yields .083521, meaning that Leadership styles shares approximately 8.35% of its variability with employee performance, which signifies the strong relationship between LS and EP. And the Sig. (2-Tailed) value in our table is 0.009. This value is less than .05. Because of this, we can conclude that there is a statistically significant correlation between the level of leadership style of supervisors in small and medium enterprise and employee performance.

Table 6. *Transformational, transactional, lassize faire means and employee performance (1:1)*

		N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error	95% Confidence interval for mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower bound	Upper bound		
Transfor	2.00	2	4.0000	.00000	.00000	4.0000	4.0000	4.00	4.00
	3.00	33	3.5152	.50752	.08835	3.3352	3.6951	3.00	4.00
	4.00	44	3.9545	.42887	.06466	3.8242	4.0849	3.00	5.00
	8.00	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	Total	80	3.7625	.50925	.05694	3.6492	3.8758	3.00	5.00
Transact	2.00	2	3.0000	.00000	.00000	3.0000	3.0000	3.00	3.00
	3.00	33	3.5152	.50752	.08835	3.3352	3.6951	3.00	4.00
	4.00	44	3.7955	.50942	.07680	3.6406	3.9503	3.00	5.00
	8.00	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	Total	80	3.6625	.52636	.05885	3.5454	3.7796	3.00	5.00
Laissez	2.00	2	3.0000	.00000	.00000	3.0000	3.0000	3.00	3.00
	3.00	33	3.1818	.58387	.10164	2.9748	3.3889	2.00	4.00
	4.00	44	3.5455	.50369	.07593	3.3923	3.6986	3.00	4.00
	8.00	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	Total	80	3.3750	.55972	.06258	3.2504	3.4996	2.00	4.00

Table 7. *One-way ANOVA (three leadership style and employee performance).*

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Transfor	Between groups	4.336	3	1.445	6.801	.000
	Within groups	16.152	76	.213		
	Total	20.487	79			
Transact	Between groups	2.486	3	.829	3.246	.026
	Within groups	19.402	76	.255		
	Total	21.887	79			
Laissez	Between groups	2.932	3	.977	3.404	.022
	Within groups	21.818	76	.287		
	Total	24.750	79			

The first column is the between-groups degrees of freedom, 76 is the within-groups degrees of freedom, 6.801, 3.246 and 3.404 of transactional, transformational and lassize faire leadership style is the F ratio from the F column, .000, .026 and .022 is the value in the Sig. column (the p value), and .213, 255 and .287 is the within-groups mean square estimate of variance. The p value equals that is .000, .026 and .022, which is greater than α level (.05), so we fail to reject H_{2a}, i.e., there is no significant relationship between transformational leadership style of supervisors and employees' performance. On the other side we accept the H_3a that there is a significant relationship between transactional leadership style of supervisors and employees' performance.

Table 8. *One way ANOVA.*

VAR00001	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	5.212	3	1.737	8.929	.000
Within groups	14.788	76	.195		
Total	20.000	79			

The p value equals that is .000 which is less than α level (.05), so we reject H_0, i.e. there is no significant relationship between leadership style of supervisors and employees' performance of SMEs.

Table 9. *Regression descriptive statistics.*

	Mean	Std. deviation	N
Emperfor	3.5875	.74109	80
Transfor	3.7625	.50925	80
Transact	3.6625	.52636	80
Nonlead	3.3750	.55972	80

Correlations[a]

		Emperfor	Transfor	Transact	Nonlead
Pearson correlation	Emperfor	1.000	.140	.288	.195
	Transfor	.140	1.000	.075	.316
	Transact	.288	.075	1.000	.134
	Nonlead	.195	.316	.134	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Emperfor	.	.108	.005	.042
	Transfor	.108	.	.254	.002
	Transact	.005	.254	.	.118
	Nonlead	.042	.002	.118	.
N	Emperfor	80	80	80	80
	Transfor	80	80	80	80
	Transact	80	80	80	80
	Nonlead	80	80	80	80

Model summary[b]

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.336[(a)]	.113	.078	.71167

[a]*Predictors: (constant), nonlead, transact, transfor.* [b]*Dependent variable: emperfor*

The R-square is the proportion of variation in the dependent variable (employee performance) that is explained by the three independent variables. It is expressed as a percentage. So, 11.3 percent of the variation in overall employee performance can be explained by three independent variables (transactional, transformational and non-leadership) in the model.

ANOVA (B)

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.895	3	1.632	3.222	.027(a)
	Residual	38.492	77	.506		
	Total	43.388	80			

As stated before, this table shows that the overall model explains a significant proportion of variance, or that the overall model is statistically significant – all three independent variables have a significant combined effect on overall performance, $F(3, 77) = 3.222$, $p < .001$.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.203	.828		1.454	.150
	Transfor	.112	.166	.077	.678	.500
	Transact	.371	.154	.264	2.417	.018
	Nonlead	.178	.152	.135	1.175	.244

[a]*Dependent variable: emperfor*.

The table also shows that Employee performance with transformational leadership style (Beta = .077, $p < .001$) and Employee performance with transactional leadership style, (Beta = .264, $p < .001$) were positively correlated with Employee performance, suggesting that higher levels of leadership style with the two categories are associated with higher levels of Employee performance. Non-leadership style is not a significant predictor of overall performance ($p = .135$). The overall model explained 11.3 percent of variance in Employee performance, which was revealed to be statistically significant, $F(3, 77) = 3.222$, $p < .001$.

FACT AND FINDINGS

[1] The first hypothesis would be positively correlate as there is a significant category of transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership ship style found in the Small and medium enterprise of Jaipur city consisting the 12% leaders use transformational, 64% transactional leadership styles and surprising 24% leaders still following nonleadership concept.

[2] The second hypothesis that leadership style would be positively correlated with employee's performance was supported with the Pearson's value i.e. 0.289. Leadership styles shares approximately 8.35% of its variability with employee performance. The Sig. (2-Tailed) value 0.009 concluded that there is a statistically significant correlation between the level of leadership style of supervisors in SMEs and employee performance.

[3] The degrees of freedom 6.801, 3.246 and 3.404 of transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership style is the F ratio from the F column, .000, .026 and .022 is the value in the Sig. column (the p value) fails to reject H3a and H4a, i.e. there is no significant relationship between transformational leadership style of supervisors and employees' performance.

[4] On the other side we accept the H2a that there is a significant relationship between transactional leadership style of supervisors and employees' performance. Findings indicate that according to the leaders, the most applicable Style was transactional leadership style [13].

[5] It can be proved with a probability value of 0.000 < □ = 0.05, meaning transformational leadership has significant or noticeable effect on employee performance of SMEs in Jaipur.

[6] The significant level of 7 variable showing with the value of idealized

influence (.001), inspirational motivation (.125), intellectual stimulation (.077), individualized consideration (.000), contingent reward (.002), management-by-exception (.378) and laissez-faire (.022). II, IC, CR, LF has significant impact and remaining factor result has no significant effects.

[7] Idealized influence was powerfully imparted to develop performance of individual workers by sig mean of .080 but, inspirational motivation specify that respondent were not much interested to carry out this chore because managers were lacking the ability to stimulate the enthusiasm and trust of subordinates

[8] It was found that among SMEs workers work was not much based on creativity as leaders have not the ability to widen wisdom and creativity in the job of workers which fails to get intellectual stimulation and same thing identified in individualized consideration also.

[9] The consequences verify that transactional leadership style have considerable and positive effect on employee performance that shown with value of .264 with the application of transactional leadership dimensions (contingent ward, management by active exception)

LIMITATIONS

[1] First, this research was conducted in Jaipur City which was restricted to the Small and medium enterprise only. Therefore, outcomes cannot be surly applied to every types of industries in Rajasthan or worldwide.

[2] For future research, there can be a development on research instruments on transformational and transactional leadership style can be customized for different objects like Employees commitment and satisfaction [14]. Further a comparative study could also be conducted among transformational and transactional leadership style.

[3] Lastly, the study propose is cross-sectional rather than longitudinal. More time could cause different perceptions in terms of other styles of leadership like servant leadership, blue ocean style, ethical leadership style, etc.

RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION

The consequence of the paper is supported by several researches which stated that to grow employee performance; the implementation of Transactional leadership model is considered crucial particularly with behaviors that eloquent vision, providing the exact model, humanizing demand-objectives of the member, and individual support. It is identified that transformational leadership has a positive significant weight on employees' performance within the SMEs but with a very low level of impact. Small enterprises must foster transformational leadership styles which attempt in making changes, in which changes to be better through its employees' performance. The result of this also in line with research conducted by that transactional leadership will be stressing more on incentives and can be used to raise employees' performance and focusing on finishing tasks. Considering the employees of Small scale industry, the transactional leadership style was felt to be more motivating and performance oriented [15]. So, its suppose that the findings will help the leaders in organization of India especially in SMEs and those in developing countries in general to respond the long-standing issue of how to boost employee performance through leaders' style.

REFERENCES

[1] B.M. Bass, B.J. Avolio. *Transformational Leadership*

Development: Manual for MLQ. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologist Press; 1990.
[2] S.B. Mackenzie, P.M. Podssakoff, G.A. Rich. Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance, *J Acad Market Sci*. 2001; 2: 115–34p.
[3] R. Jansen. Transactional & Transformational Leadership Style, *Motivation and the Effect on Team Performance & Team Creativity*. (Stripped/Edited Version), MSc Business Studies – International Management, 2013.
[4] E. Emmanuel Iriemi, A. Ugochukwu David. Impact of transactional and transformational leadership styles on organisational performance: empirical evidence from Nigeria, *J Commerce*. 5(1). ISSN: 2218-8118,2220-6043.
[5] Iqbal, Anwar, Haider. Effect of leadership style on employee performance, *Arab J Bus Manage Rev*. 5(5). 1000146 ISSN: 22235833.
[6] S. Christopher, K. Apostolos. *Leadership Style, National Culture and Employee Satisfaction:Empirical Evidence from European R&D Companies*. Blekinge Institute of Technology September 15th, 2014.
[7] B.M. Bass, B.J. Avolio. *Improving Orgainizational Effectiveness Through Tranformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication; 1994.
[8] K.M. Peris, G.S. Namusonge. The effect of leadership styles on organizational performance at state corporations in Kenya, *Int J Bus Commerce*. 2012; 2(1). (ISSN: 2225-2436)
[9] Tinofirei charity, the unique factors affecting employee performance in non-profit organisations university of south Africa, November 2011.
[10] Teshome, Temesgen. The relationship between Leadership Styles and Employee Commitment in Private Higher Education Institutions at Addis, A.A.U, Ethiopia, Ababa City, June, 2011.
[11] R. Bolden, T. Rohini. Leadership development in small and medium sized enterprises leadership development in SMEs, *Phase 1 Report*. December 2000.
[12] Taiwo, Olawale. *Leadership Style: Impact on Employee*. Lahti University of Applied Sciences Degree Programme in International Business, Spring 2013.
[13] F. Cedwyn, A. Raed. The impact of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employee's satisfaction and performance: an empirical test in a multicultural environment, *Int Bus Econ Res J*. 2004; 3(8).
[14] K. Sandell. *Transformational Leadership, Engagement, And Performance: A New Perspective*. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, Fall, 2012.
[15] N. Kawooya. *Effect Of Leadership Styles On Employee Performance In Kampala District Council*. September 2010, Research Dissertation Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies.