

## A Study On Impact Of Leadership Styles On It Professionals In Information Technology Industry

**DR.J. SABITHA<sup>#1</sup>, DR.S. CHANDRAMOULI<sup>#2</sup>, DR.S. KRISHNAKUMARI**

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor,

*Department of Commerce, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Ramapuram*

[sabithakausik@gmail.com](mailto:sabithakausik@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor,

*Department of Commerce, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Ramapuram*

[drcmphd@gmail.com](mailto:drcmphd@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> Associate Professor,

*Department of MBA, Anand Institute of Higher Technology, Chennai*

[krishnakumari.mba@gmail.com](mailto:krishnakumari.mba@gmail.com)

### **Abstract—**

In the advanced innovative world objective of any association isn't just to endure, yet in addition to support its reality by improving execution. To address the issues of the exceptionally serious business sectors, associations should ceaselessly build execution (Arslan and Staub 2013). The job of initiative is fundamentally significant for accomplishing the exhibition of associations (for example Boal and Hooijberg 2000; Peterson, Smith, Martorana and Owens 2003). Associations in any area face critical administration challenges in the event that they will stay practical in a continually evolving world. Lamentably, 'how to' lead individuals through change is as yet not a typical subject for the executives learning and improvement programs. The point of the investigation was to discover the effect of initiative styles on authoritative execution. The fundamental goal of the investigation is to discover the sorts of initiative styles in authoritative execution in the chose IT Sector in Chennai city. The authority speculations and various acts of initiative are talked about in the research.

With assistance of broad audit of writing the applied structure for effect of leadership styles on authoritative execution was set up. The examination study was directed in Chennai City of Tamil Nadu State in Information innovation area. Almost 620 respondents were chosen by utilizing Non-likelihood inspecting procedure from the chose four Information innovation area in Chennai. For assortment of information an organized poll was created and approved.

This exploration work is a scientific, experimental examination dependent on review of IT experts in Chennai.. The example was drawn from the different IT centers in chennai to make it more delegate of the IT expert's population. Through the pre-tested questionnaire used in the survey, data were generated on the respondents' demographics, their perceived leadership styles in their organization.

The findings of this research would contribute fundamentally in better comprehension of the best leadership styles in IT area by the academicians and the practitioners. Finally, this investigation advances the writing on leadership styles concerning the innovative business of India the board regarding software business of India.

**Keywords**—IT industry, Professional, Chennai, leadership styles, Autocratic, Authoritarian, democratic, participative, Delegative, Laissez-Faire

I. INTRODUCTION

Information Technology (IT) industry in India has assumed a vital part in putting India on the worldwide guide. IT industry in India has been perhaps the main development patrons for the Indian economy. The business has assumed a critical part in changing India's picture from a sluggish regulatory economy to a place that is known for imaginative business people and a worldwide part in giving elite innovation arrangements and business administrations. The business has assisted India with changing a provincial and agribusiness based economy to an information based economy. In the IT business dominant part of the populace, around 81.5% are in the age bunch between 20 to 25 years and the mean age of the representatives is 24 years. The prerequisite of night move has been accepting ominous media inclusion, messing social up for the representatives working in this area

A. Leadership Styles

Leadership is the capacity to move a gathering towards a shared objective that would not be met if a leader had not been there (Graham, 1997). Analysts of this research classified authority styles into three principle styles of leadership, which assisted with getting sorted out the perceptions into more improved on information.

1) Democratic (Participative) Leadership

The democratic leaders were the individuals who took an extremely loose yet in-charge way to deal with driving the gathering. Participative leaders, usually, would counsel the gathering when moving toward an issue and think about their ideas, yet the leader holds the last say in what specific methodology is taken (Dessler& Starke, 2004). Inside the campaign setting, a large number of the members showed this sort of authority by getting ideas from different individuals from the gathering to go to a gathering agreement when attempting to take care of an issue or an issue. These pioneers would then talk among themselves and go to a choice regarding what the gathering would do

2) Delegative (Laissez-Faire) Leadership

The laissez-faire approach to deal with leadership is the possibility that the members ought to have the option to work issues out and clear their path through an endeavor without an excessive amount of additional direction. These types of leader would furnish almost no direction when managing team issues on the endeavor and would permit team individuals to think of choices all alone. The abdicate leader would take an amazingly "hands-off" way to deal with driving to support bunch critical thinking and basic intuition, without permitting members to rely upon the pioneer for the last word (Dessler& Starke, 2004). This approach was seen when ideas would be made to the pioneer to adopt a specific strategy and the pioneer would simply react with a straightforward "sure, we should do it," and choices were made without a great deal of thought.

B. Leadership Styles

TABLE I. GENDER VS. LEADERSHIP STYLES

S.No	Factors	Range	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Authoritarian	36.00	9.00	45.00	27.990	8.251
2	Participative	32.00	8.00	40.00	35.714	7.841
3	Delegative	36.00	9.00	45.00	39.229	8.275

A Study On Impact Of Leadership Styles On It Professionals In Information Technology Industry

4	Leadership Styles	104.00	26.00	130.00	102.93	23.158
---	-------------------	--------	-------	--------	--------	--------

The table 1.2 sums up the descriptive statistical measures, such as minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation for the different dimension of leadership styles. The mean scores of the previously mentioned leadership styles classifications with respects authoritarian and delegative has mean score from 27.99 to 39.22 with the most extreme scope of 45.00. It is likewise settled that participative leadership styles which has mean score of 35.71 where it most extreme reach is 40.00. With regards to the various dimensions of leadership styles delegative styles of leadership has the highest mean score because the leaders are hands-off and allow group members to make the decisions.

C. Independent T Test Of Independence

1) . Gender vs Leadership styles

Ha2: Significant difference of perception persists between male and female employees with regards to Leadership styles exhibited by their leaders.

TABLE II. GENDER VS. LEADERSHIP STYLES

Leadership Styles	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t statistic	Significance value
Authoritarian	Male	497	9.19	2.455	5.837	<0.001**
	Female	123	8.59	1.957		
Participative	Male	497	25.52	5.258	5.825	<0.001**
	Female	123	22.18	7.197		
Delegative	Male	497	29.04	4.906	5.626	<0.001**
	Female	123	25.89	7.649		
Leadership Styles	Male	497	83.44	12.649	6.620	<0.001**
	Female	123	73.67	20.902		

Note: 1. \*\* and \* indicates significance value is significant at 99% and 95% confidence level correspondingly

Table 1.3.1 presents the results of the independent test for gender vs leadership styles. The significance values of authoritarian, participative and delegative is significant at 99% confidence level. Therefore, it results that the alternate hypothesis (Ha2) is accepted, which means the significant difference of perception persists between male and female employees with regards to leadership styles of their leaders. It is also identified that both the gender perceive that most of their leaders follow participative and delegative type of leadership styles rather than Authoritative which is a good sign in any kind of industry. However, male employees perceive participative and delegative leadership styles in better manner with higher mean scores of 25.52 and 29.04 respectively, while compared to the female employees. Henceforth, with regards to the overall perception towards leadership decision-making styles male employees have better perception towards various types of leadership styles exhibited by their leaders rather than female employees

2) *Department vs Leadership Styles*

Ha8: Significant difference of perception persists between technical and non-technical employees with regards to leadership styles of their leaders.

TABLE III. DEPARTMENT VS. LEADERSHIP STYLES

Leadership Styles	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t statistic	Significance value
Authoritarian	Technical	44	25.38	6.287	1.953	0.051
	Non-technical	17	23.82	7.041		
Participative	Technical	44	28.64	6.021	2.693	0.007**
	Non-technical	17	27.50	7.426		
Delegative	Technical	44	28.82	6.097	1.969	0.049*
	Non-technical	17	27.68	7.432		
Leadership Styles	Technical	44	28.85	16.619	2.430	0.015*
	Non-technical	17	27.01	20.021		

Note: \*\* and \* indicates significance value is significant at 99% and 95% confidence level correspondingly

The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted to examine the differences in perception between designations of the employees with regards to various types of leadership styles such as authoritarian, participative and delegative where the mean and standard deviations of all the sub groups were presented in Table 1.4.2. ANOVA compares the variance between the different groups (predictor variable) with the variability within each of the group. In this hypothesis designation is an independent variable and dependent variables are authoritarian, participative and delegative. The junior level employees perceive delegative and participative leadership styles with the highest mean score of 30.194 and 29.842 respectively, whereas the middle level executives perceive second highest level of satisfaction towards participative and delegative leadership style with the mean score of 28.995 and 28.981 respectively.

TABLE IV. DESIGNATION VS. LEADERSHIP STYLES

Leadership Styles	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Authoritarian	Between Groups 6509.425	2	3254.712	56.357	<0.001**

A Study On Impact Of Leadership Styles On It Professionals In Information Technology Industry

	Withi n Group s	35632.5 17	617	57.75 1		
	Total	42141.9 42	619			
Particip ative	Betwe en Group s	5751.66 6	2	2875. 833	54.91 3	<0.00 1**
	Withi n Group s	32312.8 03	617	52.37 1		
	Total	38064.4 69	619			
Delegat ive	Betwe en Group s	6279.07 5	2	3139. 537	53.64 4	<0.00 1**
	Withi n Group s	36110.4 03	617	58.52 6		
	Total	42389.4 77	619			
Leaders hip Styles	Betwe en Group s	55555.2 74	2	27777 .637	62.00 2	<0.00 1**
	Withi n Group s	276423. 015	617	448.0 11		
	Total	331978. 289	619			

Note: 1. The value within ( ) refers to Row Percentage  
2. The value within [ ] refers to Column Percentage

Table 1.3.2 presents the results of the independent test for department vs leadership styles. The significance values of participative leadership style is significant at 99% confidence level, whereas the significance values of delegative leadership style and overall leadership styles are significant at 95% confidence level. Therefore, it results that alternate hypothesis (Ha8) is accepted, which means the significant difference of perception persists between the employee working in technical and non-technical departments with regards to leadership styles of their leaders. However, the significance value of the authoritarian is not significant at 95% confidence level, hence alternate hypothesis (Ha8) is rejected, which is evident that significant difference of perception does not persist between employees working in technical and non-technical departments with regards authoritarian leadership

styles. The employees working in technical department perceive higher level of leadership styles towards performance of the subordinates with the overall mean score of 82.85. Both technical and non-technical employees perceive that their leaders mostly exhibit delegative and participative leadership styles.

**D. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ONE-WAY)**

*1) Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

In order to analyze the primary data using one-way ANOVA, it is must to verify its homogeneity through Levene’s test. Therefore the researcher has applied Levene’s test and found all the factors of the chosen constructs are having homogeneity of variances.

TABLE V. TEST RESULTS OF HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

S. No	Factors	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1	Decision Making Styles	2.241	2	617	0.059
2	Feeling of Closeness	1.574	2	617	0.067
3	Shared sentiments	1.089	2	617	0.510
4	Similarities	0.785	2	617	0.820
5	Intimate behavior	1.363	2	617	0.001

- Note: 1. The value within ( ) refers to Row Percentage
- 2. The value within [ ] refers to Column Percentage
- 3. \*\* Denotes significant at 1% level

In order to have homogeneity in the groups, the variances of the group should be equal. In the above table 1.4.1, the values of Levene’s statistic and its significance values are greater than 0.5 which indicates that the null hypothesis is accepted, which means that the sub groups are having equal variances, therefore the research applied One-way ANOVA in order to find out the existence of significant differences based on designations and the chosen factors of the constructs namely decision-making styles, leadership styles, leadership qualities, supervisory support, interpersonal solidarity, and organizational performance.

*2) Designation Vs. Leadership Styles*

Ha14: Significant difference of perception exists based on the designations of the employees with regards to their perception towards leadership styles of their leaders.

TABLE VI. DESCRIPTIVE– DESIGNATION VS. LEADERSHIP STYLES

Leadership styles	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Authoritarian	Junior Level	299	26.505	7.566
	Middle Level	210	25.581	7.261
	Senior Level	111	18.252	8.285

A Study On Impact Of Leadership Styles On It Professionals In Information Technology Industry

	Total	620	24.714	8.251
Participative	Junior Level	299	29.842	7.353
	Middle Level	210	28.995	7.215
	Senior Level	111	21.099	6.952
	Total	620	27.990	7.841
Delegative	Junior Level	299	30.194	7.731
	Middle Level	210	28.981	7.267
	Senior Level	111	21.513	8.122
	Total	620	28.229	8.275
Leadership Styles	Junior Level	299	86.541	21.407
	Middle Level	210	83.557	20.333
	Senior Level	111	60.864	22.043
	Total	620	80.933	23.158

- Note: 1. The value within ( ) refers to Row Percentage  
 2. The value within [ ] refers to Column Percentage  
 3. \*\* Denotes significant at 1% level

The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted to examine the differences in perception between designations of the employees with regards to various types of leadership styles such as authoritarian, participative and delegative where the mean and standard deviations of all the sub groups were presented in Table 1.4.2. ANOVA compares the variance between the different groups (predictor variable) with the variability within each of the group. In this hypothesis designation is an independent variable and dependent variables are authoritarian, participative and delegative. The junior level employees perceive delegative and participative leadership styles with the highest mean score of 30.194 and 29.842 respectively, whereas the middle level executives perceive second highest level of satisfaction towards participative and delegative leadership style with the mean score of 28.995 and 28.981 respectively.

TABLE VII. DESIGNATION VS. LEADERSHIP STYLES

Leadership Styles		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Authoritarian	Between Groups	6509.425	2	3254.712	56.357	<0.001**

	Withi n Group s	35632.5 17	617	57.75 1		
	Total	42141.9 42	619			
Particip ative	Betwe en Group s	5751.66 6	2	2875. 833		
	Withi n Group s	32312.8 03	617	52.37 1	54.91 3	<0.00 1**
	Total	38064.4 69	619			
Delegat ive	Betwe en Group s	6279.07 5	2	3139. 537		
	Withi n Group s	36110.4 03	617	58.52 6	53.64 4	<0.00 1**
	Total	42389.4 77	619			
Leaders hip Styles	Betwe en Group s	55555.2 74	2	27777 .637		
	Withi n Group s	276423. 015	617	448.0 11	62.00 2	<0.00 1**
	Total	331978. 289	619			

Note: 1. The value within ( ) refers to Row Percentage  
 2. The value within [ ] refers to Column Percentage  
 3. \*\* Denotes significant at 1% level

Table 1.4.3 encapsulates the results of One-way ANOVA test executed to examine and compare the designation differences with respect to perception of leadership styles such as authoritarian, participative, and delegative. The results adequately exhibited that there is a significant variation subsists in perception of various types of leadership styles such as authoritarian, participative, and delegative leadership styles, hence alternate hypothesis (Ha14) is accepted and all the above-mentioned variables are significant at 99% confidence level

TABLE VIII.

POSTHOC TEST USING TUKEY HSD DESIGNATION VS. LEADERSHIP STYLES



A Study On Impact Of Leadership Styles On It Professionals In Information Technology Industry

Dependent Variable	(I) Designation	(J) Designation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Authoritarian	Junior Level	Middle Level	.847	0.684	0.648
		Senior Level	8.743*	0.844	<0.001**
	Middle Level	Junior Level	-0.847	0.684	0.648
		Senior Level	7.896*	0.891	<0.001**
	Senior Level	Junior Level	-8.743*	0.844	<0.001**
		Middle Level	-7.896*	0.891	<0.001**
Participative	Junior Level	Middle Level	.924	0.651	0.470
		Senior Level	8.252*	0.804	<0.001**
	Middle Level	Junior Level	-0.924	0.651	0.470
		Senior Level	7.328*	0.849	<0.001**
	Senior Level	Junior Level	-8.252*	0.804	<0.001**
		Middle Level	-7.328*	0.849	<0.001**
Delegative	Junior Level	Middle Level	1.213	0.688	0.236
		Senior Level	8.680*	0.850	<0.001**
	Middle Level	Junior Level	-1.213	0.688	0.236
		Senior Level	7.467*	0.897	<0.001**
	Senior Level	Junior Level	-8.680*	0.850	<0.001**
		Middle Level	-7.467*	0.897	<0.001**
Leadership Styles	Junior Level	Middle Level	2.984	1.905	0.353
		Senior Level	25.676*	2.352	<0.001**
	Middle Level	Junior Level	-2.984	1.905	0.353

	Level	Senior Level	22.692*	2.483	<0.001**
	Senior Level	Junior Level	-25.676*	2.352	<0.001**
		Middle Level	-22.692*	2.483	<0.001**

Note: 1. The value within ( ) refers to Row Percentage  
 2. The value within [ ] refers to Column Percentage  
 3. \*\* Denotes significant at 1% level

The results of the Posthoc test performed using Tukey HSD and Multiple Comparisons is presented in table 1.4.3. From the results so far, it is understood that there are statistically significant differences between the employees based on their designation. It is understood from the table that there is a statistically significant difference in perception towards leadership styles subsists among the employees working in the various designation in the IT sector. The junior level employees significantly differ from the senior level employees but do not significantly differs from middle level employees with respect to authoritative, participative, and delegative at 99% confidence level. In all the leadership styles juniors perceived it much more than their middle level and seniors, Middle level employees perceived it much more than their seniors.

3) Department Vs. Leadership Styles

Ha20: There is a significant association between departments of the employees and their level of perception towards leadership styles with regards to IT industries in Chennai city.

TABLE IX. DEPARTMENT VS. LEADERSHIP MAKING STYLES

Department	Level of perception towards leadership style			Total	Chi-Square Value	Sig. Value
	Low	Medium	High			
Technical	37 (8.3%) [66.1%]	143 (32.0%) [59.3%]	267 (59.7%) [82.7%]	447 (100.0%) [72.1%]	38.44 2	<0.001**
Non-technical	19 (11.0%) [33.9%]	98 (56.6%) [40.7%]	56 (32.4%) [17.3%]	173 (100.0%) [27.9%]		
Total	56 (9.0%) [100.0%]	241 (38.9%) [100.0%]	323 (52.1%) [100.0%]	620 (100.0%) [100.0%]		

Note: 1. The value within ( ) refers to Row Percentage  
 2. The value within [ ] refers to Column Percentage  
 3. \*\* Denotes significant at 1% level

From the Table 1, it is identified that the significance value of the chi-square test of association between department of the employees and their level of perception towards leadership styles of their leaders is less than

0.01, so the alternate hypothesis ( $H_{a20}$ ) is rejected at one per cent level of significance. Therefore, it is decided that there is an association between departments in which the employees are employed and their level of perception towards leadership styles of the leaders. Based on the column percentage (82.7%), it is found that employees working in the technical department have perceived high level of perception towards leadership styles adopted by their immediate superiors, however the employees working in non-technical departments (56.6%) perceive moderate level of satisfaction towards leadership styles exposed by their leaders at selected IT industries in Chennai city

## II. EASE OF USE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The study results also explores that the employees' perception towards various dimensions of leadership styles which indicates that delegative styles of leadership has the highest mean score because the leaders are hands-off and allow group members to make the decisions

### A. *Independent T Test*

With regards to perception subsists between male and female employees with regards to leadership styles of their leaders, from the 't' test it is found that there exist a significant difference opinion among both the gender with regards to different leadership styles possessed by their leaders, where the hypothesis is accepted, however the mean score indicates that the irrespective of the gender they perceive that most of their leaders exhibit participative and delegative leadership styles rather than authoritative leadership styles.

### B. *CHI-SQUARE TEST*

With regards to leadership styles there is an relationship found among the style which is adopted by the leader and the department which in the employees are employed, where almost 82% of the opined that there is an association

### C. *ONE-WAY ANOVA*

The One-Way ANOVA analysis of Designation Vs. Leaders Decision making styles explores that there is a difference in perception between designations of the employees with regards to various types of leadership styles, where the junior level employees perceive delegative and participative leadership styles with the highest mean score of 30.194 and 29.842 respectively, whereas the middle level executives perceive second highest level of satisfaction towards participative and delegative leadership style with the mean score of 28.995 and 28.981 respectively. The research results further explores that the there is a significant variation subsists in perception of various types of leadership styles such as authoritarian, participative, and delegative leadership styles. Likewise the outcome of the Posthoc test also proved that the junior level employees significantly differ from the senior level employees but do not significantly differs from middle level employees with respect to authoritative, participative, and delegative. The junior level employees have been encouraged to participate in decision-making and allowed to share their views, suggestion in order to improve the process, product and services offered by the IT industries, whereas the middle and senior level executives offered the similar kind of atmosphere, however it is not matching with their expectations, hence there is a less satisfaction exposed by them towards leadership styles.

### D. *Implications related to Leadership Styles*

The results of the study indicate that the employees are more satisfied towards Participative and Delegative leadership styles and not much happy with the Authoritarian leadership styles. In general, irrespective of nature of industry whether manufacturing or service industry, the employees prefer to work with the leaders who follow Participative and Delegative leadership styles rather than authoritative leaders. The results of the study indicates that still there are few leaders follow Authoritative leadership styles in the IT industries, which is not a good sign and will not help the organization to develop future leaders. Hence it is suggested that the organization must

identify such leaders through employees' attitude survey or some other specific survey and they should be sent to "Leadership Training Programmes", which may include

- Concept of leadership behaviour - Introduction
- Group Discussion or brain storming session about leadership
- Discussion / debate on leadership stereotypes
- Personal understanding of individual leadership qualities and strengths.
- Differentiating Leadership from Management.
- Identifying the impact of leadership on business performance.
- Pros and Cons of different leadership styles through sharing personal experience.

However, the types of leadership styles to be used may also depends upon the competency and nature of the employees, organization culture, etc.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

The consequences of the exploration have given part of bits of knowledge and put a lime light on what degree the effect of leadership practices influences the discernment towards the hierarchical presentation and its builds. This exploration additionally passed on to the outside world about the view of the representatives working in IT ventures in Chennai city what they feel about their nearby bosses' (for example leaders). In view of the consequences of the investigation, it is tracked down that the workers of IT businesses in Chennai city have moderate degree of fulfillment towards the leadership practices embraced their prompt bosses (for example leaders), on account of their initiative styles and characteristics, in light of the fact that the greater part of them are having specialized schooling foundation as opposed to administrative foundation. It is prescribed to the key individuals (or's Leaders) that the "Initiative Training Programs or workshops" might be coordinated for center level and senior level professionals and chiefs, to fabricate their expertise and ability in Leading individuals. This research ends with the note that, "Best Leaders constructs Best Performing Organizations".

### REFERENCES

- [1] Abdulhafith Yahya Alharbi(2017), Leadership styles of nurse managers and their effects on nurse and organisational performance, issues and problems, International Journal of Information Research and Review, Vol. 04, Issue, 09, pp.4516-4525.
- [2] Ahmed, E., Reaburn, P., Samad, A., & Davis, H. (2015). Towards an understanding of the effect of leadership on employee wellbeing and organizational outcomes in Australian universities. Journal Of Developing Areas, 49(6), 441-448.
- [3] Alireza Nazarian, Anabela Soares, Benjamin Lottermoser, (2017) "Inherited organizational performance? The perceptions of generation Y on the influence of leadership styles", Leadership & Organization Development Journal, Vol. 38 Issue: 8, pp.1078-1094.
- [4] Arslan, A., & Staub, S. (2013). Theory X and Theory Y Type Leadership Behavior and its Impact on Organizational Performance: Small Business Owners in the Āžishane Lighting and Chandelier District. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 75, 102-111.
- [5] Automobile Industry Profile - <https://www.ibef.org/industry/india-automobiles.aspx>
- [6] Azogor, Nchedo Somgolie(2017), Leadership styles and organizational performance in deposit money banks (evidence from rivers state, International Journal of Advanced Academic Research | Social & Management Sciences, Vol. 3, Issue 5, pp:78-89.

- [7] Bamiatzi, V., Jones, S., Mitchelmore, S., & Nikolopoulos, K. (2015). The Role of Competencies in Shaping the Leadership Style of Female Entrepreneurs: The Case of North West of England, Yorkshire, and North Wales. *Journal Of Small Business Management*, 53(3), 627-644. doi:10.1111/jsbm.12173
- [8] Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1993) Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture, *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17(1): 112–17.
- [9] Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2015). Leadership Style, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Culture in the Greek Banking Organization. *Journal Of Management Research (09725814)*, 15(2), 101-110.
- [10] Belias, D., Gkolia, A., Koustelios, A., & Varsanis, K. (2015). Leadership Style and Personal Characteristics of Greek Banking Employees. *Journal Of Management Research (09725814)*, 15(3), 156-164.
- [11] Bilal el Toufaily (2017), The effects of transformational leadership on organizational performance - A theoretical approach, *Proceedings of the 11th International Management Conference “The role of management in the economic paradigm of the XXIst century”*, bucharest, Romania, pp:153-163.
- [12] Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2000). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 515-549. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00057-6
- [13] Boin, A., Hart, P. ‘., Mcconnell, a., & Preston, t. (2010). Leadership style, crisis response and blame management: the case of hurricane Katrina. *Public Administration*, 88(3), 706-723.
- [14] Boykins, C., Campbell, S., Moore, M., & Nayyar, S. (2013). An Empirical Study of Leadership Styles. *Journal Of Economic Development, Management, IT, Finance & Marketing*, 5(2), 1-31.
- [15] Carroll, J. S., & Tosi, H. L. (1973). *Management by objectives: Application and research*. New York: Macmilln.
- [16] Cenkci, A. T., & Özçelik, G. (2015). Leadership Styles and Subordinate Work Engagement: The Moderating Impact of Leader Gender. *Global Business & Management Research*, 7(4), 8-20.
- [17] Chu, L., & Lai, C. (2011). A Research on the Influence of Leadership Style and Job Characteristics on Job Performance among Accountants of County and City Government in Taiwan. *Public Personnel Management*, 40(2), 101-118.
- [18] Clarke, S. (2013). Safety leadership: A meta-analytic review of transformational and transactional leadership styles as antecedents of safety behaviours. *Journal Of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 86(1), 22-49
- [19] Cox, A., Hannif, Z., & Rowley, C. (2014). Leadership styles and generational effects: examples of US companies in Vietnam. *International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, 25(1), 1-22.
- [20] Crites, S. N., Dickson, K. E., & Lorenz, A. (2015). Nurturing Gender Stereotypes In The Face Of Experience: A Study Of Leader Gender, Leadership Style, And Satisfaction. *Journal Of Organizational Culture, Communications & Conflict*, 19(1), 1-23.
- [21] Dahlstrom, T. R. (2013). Telecommuting and Leadership Style. *Public Personnel Management*, 42(3), 438-451. doi:10.1177/0091026013495731
- [22] Day, C., Twigg, N. W., & Keels, J. K. (2010). The Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Satisfaction with Performance Evaluations. *Leadership & Organizational Management Journal*, 2010(2), 31-45.