

Transformational and Transactional Leadership as Predictors of Job Satisfaction, Commitment, Perceived Performance and Turnover Intention (Empirical Evidence from Malakand Division, Pakistan)

Nazim Ali¹, Shahid Jan², Arshad Ali¹, Muhammad Tariq²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, University of Malakand, Pakistan

²Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Abdul Wali Khan University, Pakistan

Abstract: The main aim of this research was to know the impact of transformational and transactional leadership on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, employees' perceived performance and turnover intention of public sector universities' teachers of Malakand division of Pakistan. Data were collected from two hundred and twenty four teachers including lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors and professors. The results of correlation indicated that both transformation and transactional leadership had a significant relationship with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived performance and turnover intention. The results of regression revealed that transformational leadership was a stronger predictor of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior than transactional leadership while transactional leadership was a stronger predictor of organizational commitment, perceived performance and turnover intention than transformational leadership.

[Nazim Ali, Shahid Jan, Arshad Ali, Muhammad Tariq. **Transformational and Transactional Leadership as Predictors of Job Satisfaction, Commitment, Perceived Performance and Turnover Intention.** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(5s):48-53]. (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 9

Key words: Transformational; transactional; leadership; job satisfaction; performance; turnover intention; Pakistan

1. Introduction.

By definition a leader is a person that possesses some powerful and dynamic traits that lead a nation and that such traits affect the management of an organization (Bono & Judge, 2005) and is considered as driving agent in determining an organizational competitiveness (B. Bass & Avolio, 1993). Therefore, quality of leadership is considered to be of prime importance for organizational change that give it competitive advantage (Parry & Sinha, 2005; Singh & Bhandarker, 2002).

Transactional and transformational leadership theories have received much more importance over the last three decades (Hartog, Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). Burns (1978) was the first to introduce Transactional and transformational leadership theories. Later on Bass (B. Bass & Avolio, 1993; B. M. Bass & Avolio, 1994; Tichy & Devanna, 1986) and so many others extended the work of Burns (1978). Burns (1978) has defined Transformational leadership as transformational leadership is when both followers and leaders are engaged in escalating the morale and motivation of each other. According to (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005), transformational leadership encompasses four I's.

- a. Idealized Influence
- b. Inspirational Motivation
- c. Intellectual Stimulation and
- d. Individual Consideration

Idealized influence is demonstrated when the leader formulates and articulate the vision and challenging goals and tries to motivate the followers to

a greater extent to do their work past their self-interest with a view to attaining the organization's goals (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & Spangler, 2004). In idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership, leaders are highly respected, admired and trusted by the followers (B. M. Bass & Riggio, 2006). They further added that idealized influence leaders are always willing to take risks and display high level of ethical and moral conduct. In inspirational motivation dimension of transformational leadership, leaders inspire and motivate followers to stick to the organization's goals by providing clearly communicated expectations (B. M. Bass & Avolio, 1994). According to (B. M. Bass & Riggio, 2006) Intellectual stimulation is displayed when leaders are willing to help the followers to be more creative and innovative. Followers are encouraged to find out new ways to solve problems. In individualized consideration dimension, the leaders pay heed to the followers' developmental needs of followers and give them support and opportunities for growth. The leader takes care of the needs of followers (B. M. Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Transactional leadership takes place when leaders and followers are engaged in the exchange relationship to meet their own self-benefits (Burns, 1978). Leaders reward followers in exchange for work or service. Schermerhorn et al., (2000) has proposed four dimensions of transactional leadership.

- a. Contingent rewards
- b. Active management by exception,
- c. Passive management by exception, and

d. Laissez-faire

In contingent reward dimension of transactional leadership, the leader makes clear to the followers by self-participation or direction what the followers should do to be compensated for their services (Yukl, 2007). In active management by exception, the follower's performance is monitored and corrective actions are taken when the followers fail to meet standards (B. M. Bass & Riggio, 2006). In passive management by exception, the leader does not take any corrective action unless the problem arises (B. M. Bass & Riggio, 2006). In laissez-faire facet of leadership, the leader shuns taking any action (B. M. Bass & Riggio, 2006).

1.1 Relationship between Leadership and Commitment

Strong affiliation between an employee and an organization is essential for maintaining workable relationship between them, an employee's work-related attitude and behavior are required to be major concerns for management. And a manager's own attitude and behavior can strongly affect those of the employee's. Positive relationship between organizational commitment and transformational leadership in a diverse organizational cultures and settings has been well established in the extant literature (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Walumbwa, Wang, Lawler, & Shi, 2004). Researchers (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Dionne, et al., 2004; Simon, 1994) are unanimous on the view that a leader's ability of properly practicing transformational styles in management may affect organizational commitment. Similarly, Yukl (2007) contends that transformational leader can majorly affect an organization's members' attitudes thereby promoting commitment for the organization's overall strategies.

1.2 Relationship between Leadership and Turnover Intentions

Turnover is a critical and serious issue (Chan, Yeoh, Limand, & Osman, 2010) and that causes an unwanted upheavals and both direct and indirect cost (Ali, 2009). Employees' turnover is affected by leadership styles (Gwavuya, 2011). A person who has transformational leadership qualities enjoys admiration, loyalty, trust, and respect of the employees and are willing to work harder than originally expected. While in transactional leadership there are leader-follower exchanges: subordinates follow the instructions and expect positive compensation in return. Transactional leaders are supposed to promote and develop such structures which clearly delineate line of actions for the subordinates and let them assure how they could be benefited by following these orders. Results of the studies conducted by Wells and Peachey

(2011) on the relationship between leadership behaviors satisfaction with the leaders, and voluntary turnover intentions revealed significant associations.

1.3 Relationship between Leadership and job satisfaction

No one can deny the role of effective leadership in the growth and better performance of an organization. Whether it is transformational or transactional leadership behavior, its role in the success of an organization is recognized (Laohavichien, Fredendall, & Cantrell, 2009). They help in predicting subordinates' satisfaction with their leaders, however with varying results. It has been noted that transactional leadership style relationship with job satisfaction and organizational identification is comparatively high as compared to transformational leadership style (Wu & Shiu, 2009). Transformational leader with effective communication skills have been found enjoying higher agreement with employees on the strategic goals of the organization (Berson & Avolio, 2004). Resultantly, such leaders voluntarily help their employees and prevent the occurrence of work-related problems (Berson & Avolio, 2004). The prevalence of this aura ultimately promotes sense of job satisfaction among employees (Nemanich & Keller, 2007). They become more committed and have less turnover intentions (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004; Scandura & Williams, 2004).

1.4 Relationship between Leadership and Employee Performance

Organizational performance is the performance of its employees per say. Demand on performance is subject to continuous flux and, in fact, most organizations survive and prosper when they recognize and accept this challenge. Notwithstanding, this ongoing change is required to be relevant to the demand of the market and be in context that comprises frequent, purposeful adjustments and cumulative in effect (Weick & Quinn, 1999). Employees are required to modify their behaviors both on work routines as well as social practices (e.g., relations with their managers and peers). This daily adaptation is really a challenging task and "to cope with the daily challenge of real-time adaptation, employees selectively retain effective elements of their performance routines and integrate them with new, more efficient ones" (Carter, Armenakis, Feild, & Mossholder, 2012). Change at lower level can be affected through informal communication. However, affecting change at upper level, managers are required to engage the subject through unscheduled, face-to-face and informal employee conversations and ask for their input. "In return, employee-initiated questions and comments can stimulate a sizeable proportion of change-related communication" (Carter, et al., 2012). This approach will encourage the simultaneous

participation of employees and the planned change will be affected smoothly through routine work process. According to Levay (2010) such approaches are techniques of interpersonal exchanges which engender positive reactions in employees thereby making change a distinct reality. On the contrary, when change is forced employees experience stress between the expected behavior that the change demands and the existing potential those employees have. This causes a performance maintenance problem (Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989).

1.5 Relationship between Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Research literature is abundant in explaining the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and leadership styles. These researchers (Boerner, Eisenbeiss, & Griesser, 2007; Geyer & Steyrer, 1998; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Schlechter & Engelbrecht, 2006) have mostly discussed leadership styles as a predictor of OCB. It is because it has been established that OCB is largely discretionary and not a formal demand of the organization. However, it is believed that OCB helps employee in the dispensation of task and promote a social and psychological work environment. Parallel to this, transformational leaders possess the potential of motivating the workforce to give priority to collective cause over disintegrated individual interests. Resultantly, "individuals who are intrinsically motivated to fulfill a collective vision without expecting immediate personal and tangible gains may be inclined to contribute toward achieving the shared workplace goal in ways that their roles do not prescribe" (Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005). Through OCB individuals feel elated and their self-concepts are realized. Researchers (Graham, 1991; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990) contend that leadership styles and OCB are inter-related.

From the interpersonal relationship point of view, studies (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Williams & Anderson, 1991) have supported the contention that workable superior-subordinate relationship is central to organizational success. Supportive interpersonal relationship with the employees promotes OCB and as a social exchange employees with high levels of OCB are more likely to show commitment with the organization (Smith, et al., 1983; Williams & Anderson, 1991). This provides guiding principles to those who have concern for the success of the organization that leadership styles promote and encourages the elicitation of OCB. Contrarily, "inappropriate leadership styles may trigger negative consequences, which might further increase the sensitivity and susceptibility to misunderstanding that may lead to organizational dysfunction such as decline

in work performances, absenteeism and high turnover" (Lian & Tui, 2012).

2. Methods

2.1 Data collection

Data were collected through questionnaire from two hundred and twenty four (224) teachers including lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors of public sectors universities of Malakand Division, Pakistan.

2.2 Measurement

2.2.1 Perceived Performance

Perceived performance was measured by four items adapted from Teseema and Soeters (2006). Five point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree was used to note the responses.

2.2.2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) was measured by fourteen items adapted from Podsakoff et al., (1990). Five point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree was used to note the responses.

2.2.3 Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment was measured by eight questions adapted from Porter et al., (1974). Five point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree was used to note the responses.

2.2.4 Turnover Intention and Overall Job Satisfaction

Turnover intention was measured by three items adapted from Cummann et al., (1979). Similarly overall job satisfaction was gauged by 3 items adapted from Cummann et al., (1979). Five point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree was used to note the responses.

2.2.5 Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Transformational and transactional leadership were measured by using self developed questions. Five point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree was used to note the responses.

2.3 Statistical Tools

Correlation and multiple regression were used to find out the relationship between variables.

2.4 Reliability

All factors showed a reliability of above .78 that is acceptable.

3. Results

The results of correlation given in table 1 indicate a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction ($r = 0.356, p < .01$), transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior ($r = 0.399, p < .01$), transformational leadership and organizational commitment ($r = 0.309, p < .01$), transformational

leadership and perceived performance ($r = 0.218$, $p < .01$) and a negative relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention ($r = -0.180$, $p < .01$). Thus the hypothesis that transformational leadership is related to job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, turnover intention and employees' perceived performance are accepted in this sample.

Table 1: Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Job Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational Commitment, Turnover Intention and Employees' Perceived Performance

	Transformational Leadership
Job Satisfaction	.356**
OCB	.399**
Organizational Commitment	.309**
Turnover Intention	-.180**
Perceived Performance	.218**

Table 2: Relationship between Transactional Leadership and Job Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational Commitment, Turnover Intention and Employees' Perceived Performance

	Transactional Leadership
Job Satisfaction	.265**
OCB	.426**
Organizational Commitment	.527**
Turnover Intention	-.326**
Perceived Performance	.383**

The results of correlation given in table 2 indicate a significant positive relationship between transactional leadership and job satisfaction ($r = 0.265$, $p < .01$), transactional leadership and organizational citizenship behavior ($r = 0.426$, $p < .01$), transactional leadership and organizational commitment ($r = 0.527$, $p < .01$), transactional leadership and perceived performance ($r = 0.383$, $p < .01$) and a negative relationship between transactional leadership and turnover intention ($r = -0.326$, $p < .01$). Thus the hypothesis that transactional leadership is related to job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, turnover intention and employees' perceived performance are accepted in this sample.

Table 3: Impact of Transformational and Transactional Leadership on Job Satisfaction

R	.379		
R Square	.242		
Adjusted R Square	.234		
Standard Error of the Estimate	1.00115		
F	28.195		
Sig.	.000		
	Beta	T	Sig.
		9.659	.000
Transformational Leadership	.297	4.277	.000
Transactional Leadership	.133	1.918	.056

The results given in table 3 indicate that 24 % of the variance in job satisfaction can be accounted for by transformational and transactional leadership styles. Transformational leadership has 29 percent impact on job satisfaction. Therefore, the strongest predictor of job satisfaction is transformational leadership followed by transactional leadership.

Table 4: Impact of Transformational and Transactional Leadership on OCB

R	.413		
R Square	.170		
Adjusted R Square	.163		
Standard Error of the Estimate	1.05055		
F	22.694		
Sig.	.000		
	Beta	t	Sig.
		10.123	.000
Transformational Leadership	.346	5.063	.000
Transactional Leadership	.119	1.740	.083

The results given in table 4 indicate that 17 % of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior can be accounted for by transformational and transactional leadership styles. Transformational leadership has 34 percent impact on organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, the strongest predictor of organizational citizenship behavior is transformational leadership followed by transactional leadership.

The results given in table 5 indicate that 28 % of the variance in organizational commitment can be accounted for by transformational and transactional leadership styles. Transactional leadership has 48 percent impact on organizational commitment. Therefore, the strongest predictor of organizational commitment is transactional leadership followed by transformational leadership.

The results given in table 6 indicate that almost 21 % of the variance in turnover intention can be accounted for by transformational and transactional leadership styles. Transactional leadership has -30 percent impact on turnover intention. Therefore, the strongest predictor of turnover intention is transactional leadership.

Table 5: Impact of Transformational and Transactional Leadership on Organizational Commitment

R	.533		
R Square	.284		
Adjusted R Square	.278		
Standard Error of the Estimate	.90017		
F	43.914		
Sig.	.000		
	Beta	t	Sig.
		9.687	.000
Transformational Leadership	.094	1.486	.139
Transactional Leadership	.485	7.636	.000

Table.6: Impact of Transformational and Transactional Leadership on Turnover Intention

R	.329		
R Square	.208		
Adjusted R Square	.200		
Standard Error of the Estimate	.73517		
F	17.984		
Sig.	.000		
	Beta	T	Sig.
		17.640	.000
Transformational Leadership	-.044	-.615	.539
Transactional Leadership	-.307	-4.334	.000

Table.7: Impact of Transformational and Transactional Leadership on Perceived Performance

R	.301		
R Square	.091		
Adjusted R Square	.083		
Standard Error of the Estimate	1.124056		
F	11.043		
Sig.	.000		
	Beta	t	Sig.
		11.877	.000
Transformational Leadership	.115	1.606	.110
Transactional Leadership	.232	3.248	.001

The results given in table 7 indicate that only 9 % of the variance in perceived performance can be accounted for by transformational and transactional leadership styles. Transactional leadership has 23 percent impact on organizational commitment. Therefore, the strongest predictor of perceived performance is transactional leadership.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

The main aim of this research was to know the impact of transformational and transactional leadership on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, employees' perceived performance and turnover intention of public sector universities' teachers of Malakand division of Pakistan. Data were collected from two hundred and twenty four teachers including

lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors and professors. The results of correlation indicated that both transformation and transactional leadership had a significant relationship with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived performance and turnover intention. The results of regression revealed that transformational leadership was a stronger predictor of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior than transactional leadership while transactional leadership was a stronger predictor of organizational commitment, perceived performance and turnover intention than transformational leadership.

The management of public sector universities can enhance the employees' job satisfaction, commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and perceived performance and decrease their turnover intention that ultimately culminates in actual turnover by paying special heed towards transformational and transactional leadership styles because both showed a significant relationship with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, employees' performance and turnover intention.

This is one of the papers derived from my research project funded by Higher Education Commission, Islamabad. Therefore I am very indebted to it.

References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organisation: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 49, 252-276.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ). *Mind Garden*.
- Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 25(8), 951-968.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17, 112-121.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership, 2. Aufl., Mahwah*.
- Berson, Y., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). Transformational leadership and the dissemination of organizational goals: A case study of a telecommunication firm. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(5), 625-646.
- Boerner, S., Eisenbeiss, S. A., & Griesser, D. (2007). Follower behavior and organizational performance: The impact of transformational leaders. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 13(3), 15-26.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2005). The advice and influence networks of transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1306-1314.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. NY: Harper & Row.

11. Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(4), 468.
12. Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (Eds.). (1979). *The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire*. : University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
13. Carter, M. Z., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Mossholder, K. W. (2012). Transformational leadership, relationship quality, and employee performance during continuous incremental organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
15. Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L. E., & Spangler, W. D. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of organizational change management, 17*(2), 177-193.
16. Geyer, A., & Steyrer, J. (1998). Messung und Erfolgswirksamkeit transformationaler Führung. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung, 12*(4), 377-401.
17. Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 4*(4), 249-270.
18. Gwavuya, F. (2011). Leadership Influences on Turnover Intentions of Academic Staff in Tertiary Institutions in Zimbabwe. *Academic Leadership the Online Journal, 9*(1).
19. Hartog, D. N., Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70*(1), 19-34.
20. 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.
21. Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (1989). Motivation and cognitive abilities: An integrative/aptitude-treatment interaction approach to skill acquisition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(4), 657.
22. Laohavichien, T., Fredendall, L. D., & Cantrell, R. S. (2009). The effects of transformational and transactional leadership on quality improvement. *Quality Management Journal, 16*(2).
23. Levey, C. (2010). Charismatic leadership in resistance to change. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(1), 127-143.
24. Lian, L. K., & Tui, L. G. (2012). Leadership Styles and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Effect of Subordinates' Competence and Downward Influence Tactics. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 13*(2), 59-96.
25. Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School Leadership that Works: From Research to Results*: ERIC.
26. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of vocational behavior, 61*(1), 20-52.
27. Nemanich, L. A., & Keller, R. T. (2007). Transformational leadership in an acquisition: A field study of employees. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(1), 49-68.
28. Parry, K. W., & Sinha, P. N. (2005). Researching the trainability of transformational organizational leadership. *Human Resource Development International, 8*(2), 165-183.
29. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly, 1*(2), 107-142.
30. Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*(5), 603.
31. Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(3), 329-354.
32. Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (2004). Mentoring and transformational leadership: The role of supervisory career mentoring. *Journal of vocational behavior, 65*(3), 448-468.
33. Schlechter, A. F., & Engelbrecht, A. S. (2006). The relationship between transformational leadership, meaning and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Management Dynamics, 15*(4), 2-16.
34. Simon, L. S. (1994). *Trust in leadership: Its dimensions and mediating role*. Kansas State University.
35. Singh, P., & Bhandarker, A. (2002). *Winning the Corporate Olympiad: The Renaissance Paradigm*: Vikas Publishing House.
36. Smith, C., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(4), 653.
37. Tessema, M., & Soeters, J. (2006). Challenges and prospects of HRM in developing countries: testing the HRM-performance link in Eritrean civil service. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17*(1), 86-105.
38. Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). The transformational leader. *Training & Development Journal*.
39. Walumbwa, F. O., Wang, P., Lawler, J. J., & Shi, K. (2004). The role of collective efficacy in the relations between transformational leadership and work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*(4), 515-530.
40. Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of management journal, 48*(3), 420-432.
41. Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual review of psychology, 50*(1), 361-386.
42. Wells, J. E., & Peachey, J. W. (2011). Turnover intentions: Do leadership behaviors and satisfaction with the leader matter? *Team Performance Management, 17*(1/2), 23-40.
43. Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of management, 17*(3), 601-617.
44. Wu, F. Y., & Shiu, C. (2009). The Relationship between leadership styles and foreign English teachers job satisfaction in adult English cram schools: Evidences in Taiwan. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, 14*(2), 75-82.
45. Yukl, G. A. (2007). *Leadership In Organizations* (6th ed.): Pearson Education India.