

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

Role of Leadership Styles in Enhancing Employee Productivity

Priya Sharma

Department of Management Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, Haryana, India

Abstract

Leadership is one of the most influential factors in shaping how employees think, feel and perform at work. The manner in which a leader makes decisions, communicates, motivates and develops subordinates, commonly called leadership style, determines the climate of a work group and the level of effort that employees are willing to contribute. This paper examines the role of leadership styles in enhancing employee productivity on the basis of secondary data collected from classical leadership studies, journal articles, meta-analytic reviews and standard textbooks. The paper explains the concepts of leadership and productivity, reviews the autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transactional, transformational, servant and relationship-based approaches, and synthesises the findings of earlier studies. The review shows that transformational and relationship-oriented styles are generally associated with higher satisfaction, motivation and performance, that transactional leadership is effective when contingent rewards are used, and that laissez-faire leadership is mostly associated with negative outcomes. The paper concludes that no single style is best in every situation and that effective leaders adapt their style to the task, the maturity of followers and the organizational context.

Keywords: Leadership styles, Employee productivity, Transformational leadership, Transactional leadership, Employee performance, Organizational effectiveness

Introduction

Every organization depends on people to convert plans into results, and the person who guides, influences and coordinates these efforts is the leader. Over the last century, the study of leadership has moved from the search for inborn traits to the examination of behaviours, situations, relationships and values. Early research reviewed by Stogdill found that traits alone could not explain leadership effectiveness and that the characteristics required of a leader vary with the situation in which the leader operates (Stogdill, 63). Later researchers therefore concentrated on what leaders actually do and how followers respond. Dinh and colleagues, reviewing leadership research of the new millennium, show that the field has broadened to include neo-charismatic, relational, ethical and contextual perspectives (Dinh et al., 38).

Productivity is a central concern for managers because it determines competitiveness and the ability of an organization to grow. Employee productivity is not simply a function of working hours; it depends on skills, tools, systems and, above all, on the willingness of employees to apply their abilities. Leaders influence this willingness. Yukl defines leadership as the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives (Yukl, 23). The leader's style therefore becomes a decisive link between organizational objectives and employee effort.

Concept of Leadership Styles and Employee Productivity

Leadership style refers to the relatively consistent pattern of behaviour that a leader displays while working with and through other people. It includes the way of taking decisions, giving directions, delegating authority, providing feedback and handling conflict. Northouse describes leadership as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 5). Styles are not simply personality preferences; they represent systematic ways of balancing concern for task accomplishment with concern for people, as shown in the Ohio State studies and in the managerial grid of Blake and Mouton (Blake and Mouton, 10).

Employee productivity, in the organizational context, means the quantity and quality of work produced by employees in relation to the resources and time used. It also includes non-quantitative elements such as accuracy, innovation, cooperation and the willingness to go beyond the formal job description. Productivity can therefore be improved through technology and process design, but it is equally dependent on the behavioural environment created by supervisors. Robbins and Judge point out that leaders influence group performance through their ability to communicate a vision, to inspire commitment and to provide support for followers (Robbins and Judge, 385).

Objectives of the Study

The study is guided by the following objectives:

1. To explain the concept of leadership style and its relationship with employee productivity.
2. To review the major leadership styles and the theories on which they are based.
3. To analyse secondary evidence on the effect of different leadership styles on employee satisfaction, motivation, and performance.
4. To suggest managerial practices and leadership approaches that can enhance employee productivity and organizational performance.

Research Methodology and Scope

The study follows a descriptive and analytical design and is based entirely on secondary data. The data were collected from books on leadership and organizational behaviour, original theoretical papers, review articles and meta-analytic studies published in recognised journals, and standard textbooks. No primary data were generated through surveys or interviews. The sources were selected on the basis of relevance to leadership styles and their link with performance, and the material was classified into styles, theoretical explanations and empirical findings. The findings are presented in the form of three tables that compare styles, summarise evidence and synthesise the effect of each style on productivity dimensions. The scope of the paper is limited to supervisory and managerial leadership within organizations. Since the study depends on previously published findings, its conclusions are general in nature and may not apply equally to every sector or culture.

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

Theoretical Perspectives and Leadership Styles

The classic experiment of Lewin, Lippitt and White on social climates in boys' clubs identified three styles of leadership: autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire (Lewin et al., 271). The autocratic leader determines policies and gives orders, the democratic leader encourages group discussion and decision making, and the laissez-faire leader allows complete freedom with minimum participation. In that study the democratic climate was associated with greater group initiative and friendliness, while the autocratic climate produced either aggressive or apathetic behaviour (Lewin et al., 277). Although the study was conducted in a small experimental setting, its categories remain widely used in organizational discussions. The Ohio State and Michigan studies further reduced leader behaviour to two broad dimensions, concern for task and concern for people. Blake and Mouton combined the two dimensions in the managerial grid and argued that a high concern for both production and people is the most effective orientation (Blake and Mouton, 10). Fiedler's contingency model challenged the idea of one best style by proposing that effectiveness depends on the match between the leader's orientation and the favourableness of the situation, determined by leader-member relations, task structure and position power (Fiedler, 13). Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership theory similarly suggested that leaders should vary the amount of direction and support according to the readiness of followers (Hersey and Blanchard, 161).

Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Burns distinguished between transactional leaders, who exchange rewards for performance, and transformational leaders, who raise followers' motivation and morality by appealing to higher ideals and values (Burns, 20). Bass developed this distinction into a model in which transformational leadership is explained through its effects on followers: they trust the leader, admire the leader and are motivated to do more than originally expected (Bass, p. 31). Bass and Avolio identified four components of transformational leadership, namely idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration (Bass and Avolio, 3). Transactional leadership, in contrast, includes contingent reward and management by exception, in which the leader monitors performance and intervenes when standards are not met. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter showed that transformational behaviours such as articulating a vision, providing an appropriate role model and fostering acceptance of group goals are related to followers' trust, which in turn influences citizenship behaviour (Podsakoff et al., 108). Because transformational leaders raise both commitment and the willingness to exert extra effort, this style is considered particularly relevant to productivity in conditions of change and uncertainty.

House's path-goal theory proposes that the leader's function is to clarify the path to goals and to remove obstacles, using directive, supportive, participative or achievement-oriented behaviour as demanded by the task and the follower (House, 324). Greenleaf's concept of servant leadership places the needs of followers before the leader's own interests and emphasises listening, empathy, stewardship and the growth of people (Greenleaf, 27). Graen and Uhl-Bien described leader-member

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

exchange as a relationship-based approach in which the quality of the dyadic relationship between a leader and each follower develops through stages and influences the follower's opportunities, trust and performance (Uhl-Bien, 225). Goleman, on the basis of research on a large number of managers, described six styles, namely coercive, authoritative, affiliative, democratic, pacesetter and coaching, and argued that leaders who can switch flexibly among styles, depending on the situation, create a better climate and stronger results (Goleman, 82). Avolio, Walumbwa and Weber likewise observe that current leadership theories emphasise the relationship between leaders and followers, the role of authenticity and ethics, and the importance of context in determining the effect of leadership (Avolio et al., 430). Table 1 presents the main leadership styles and their characteristics.

Table 1: Major Leadership Styles and Their Key Characteristics

Leadership Style	Key Characteristics	Typical Condition of Suitability
Autocratic	Leader takes decisions alone; close supervision; one-way communication	Emergencies, unskilled or new workers, tasks requiring quick and uniform action
Democratic / Participative	Shared decision making; open discussion; leader values opinions	Complex problems, skilled employees and situations needing commitment
Laissez-Faire	Minimum leader involvement; complete freedom to followers	Highly skilled and self-motivated professionals who need little guidance
Transactional	Contingent reward; monitoring of standards; management by exception	Stable environments with clear tasks and measurable performance
Transformational	Vision, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, individual attention to followers	Change, innovation and situations needing high commitment
Servant	Putting followers' needs first; listening, empathy, development	Knowledge work, service organizations and teams requiring trust
Leader–Member Exchange	Quality of individual leader–follower relationship determines support and opportunity	Teams where roles are developed through interpersonal exchange

Source: Compiled by the author from Lewin et al., Burns, Bass, Bass and Avolio, Greenleaf, Graen and Uhl-Bien, and Northouse (see References).

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

Review of Literature on Leadership Styles and Productivity

Meta-analytic evidence provides strong support for the role of transformational leadership. Lowe, Kroeck and Sivasubramaniam reviewed studies using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and found that transformational leadership was consistently and positively related to leadership effectiveness, with stronger relationships than transactional leadership in most cases (Lowe et al., 411). Judge and Piccolo carried out a further meta-analysis to compare the relative validity of the two styles and reported an overall validity of about 0.44 for transformational leadership across criteria such as follower satisfaction, motivation and leader effectiveness; they also found that contingent reward, a transactional behaviour, was almost as strongly related to outcomes (Judge and Piccolo, 765). Wang, Oh, Courtright and Colbert examined transformational leadership across criteria and levels and concluded that it is positively related to performance at the individual, team and organizational levels, including task performance, contextual performance and creativity (Wang et al., 250). These findings imply that leaders who inspire and develop their followers influence not only the output of individuals but also the collective performance of groups and organizations. At the same time, Judge and Piccolo's result about contingent reward shows that clear targets and fair rewards remain important parts of effective leadership (Judge and Piccolo, 755). Gerstner and Day reviewed research on leader-member exchange and reported that high-quality exchange relationships are associated with better performance ratings, higher satisfaction, stronger commitment and lower turnover intentions among followers (Gerstner and Day, 836). Graen and Uhl-Bien argued that leaders can improve outcomes by offering the opportunity of a high-quality relationship to every member of the group, instead of limiting it to a small in-group (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 237). This perspective implies that productivity can be raised when supervisors invest time in trust building and fair treatment of all subordinates.

Not all styles contribute positively to productivity. Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland and Hetland studied laissez-faire leadership and found that it is related to role conflict, role ambiguity, conflicts with colleagues, bullying and psychological distress, and is therefore a destructive rather than a neutral form of leadership (Skogstad et al., 87). Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt and van Engen, in a meta-analysis comparing women and men, found that women leaders were on average somewhat more transformational and more likely to use contingent reward, while men were somewhat more likely to use management by exception and laissez-faire styles (Eagly et al., 580). Their study also noted that the styles associated with higher effectiveness are those that develop followers, and this finding shows that leadership effectiveness is related to behaviour and not to the leader's gender.

Situational and contingency approaches remind us that style effectiveness depends on context. House proposed that directive behaviour is more useful when tasks are ambiguous, whereas it may be resented when tasks are already clear and structured (House, 330). Fiedler likewise argued that the best style for one situation may be the worst in another (Fiedler, 13). Lord, Day, Zaccaro, Avolio and Eagly, summarising three waves of leadership research in applied psychology, show that modern

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

research increasingly treats leadership as a multilevel and dynamic process involving leader identity, follower perceptions and team contexts (Lord et al., 445). Table 2 summarises selected secondary evidence on the leadership–performance relationship.

Table 2: Summary of Selected Secondary Evidence on Leadership Styles and Performance

Source	Type of Evidence	Main Finding Relevant to Productivity
Lowe et al.	Meta-analysis of MLQ-based studies	Transformational leadership is positively related to effectiveness, generally more strongly than transactional leadership
Judge and Piccolo	Meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership	Overall validity of transformational leadership about 0.44; contingent reward also strongly related to outcomes
Wang et al.	Meta-analysis across criteria and levels	Transformational leadership improves individual, team and organizational performance
Gerstner and Day	Meta-analysis of leader–member exchange	High-quality exchange is linked with better performance, satisfaction and commitment
Skogstad et al.	Empirical study of laissez-faire leadership	Laissez-faire leadership is associated with role stress, conflict and distress among employees
Eagly et al.	Meta-analysis of gender and leadership styles	Women were somewhat more transformational; effective styles are those that develop followers

Source: Compiled by the author from Lowe et al., Judge and Piccolo, Wang et al., Gerstner and Day, Skogstad et al., and Eagly et al. (see References).

Leadership style also operates through the organizational climate. Bass argued that transformational leaders change the way followers see their work, so that employees come to view tasks as important and to value collective goals above personal interests (Bass, 20). Podsakoff et al. found that the effect of transformational behaviours on citizenship behaviour is largely explained by trust in the leader, which means that productivity gains depend on the credibility of the leader and not merely on the use of inspirational language (Podsakoff et al., 125). When leaders fail to keep their promises or treat followers unfairly, trust declines and the benefits of vision and encouragement are quickly lost. Avolio et al. point out that contemporary theories also pay attention to the authenticity and ethical standards of leaders, since followers evaluate not only what leaders say but also how consistently they act (Avolio et al., 423). Ethical consistency strengthens psychological safety, which allows employees to report problems, to experiment with new methods and to learn from mistakes.

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

In this way the leader shapes the conditions for continuous improvement, which is a major source of long-term productivity. Northouse adds that effective leaders pay attention to the needs, values and development of followers and that this attention increases the willingness of followers to contribute to shared goals (Northouse, 90).

Analysis and Discussion

The reviewed literature suggests that leadership styles influence productivity through at least four mechanisms. The first is motivation. Transformational leaders raise intrinsic motivation by giving meaning to work, while transactional leaders use rewards to direct effort toward clear targets. The second is clarity. House's path-goal approach shows that when leaders clarify goals, roles and the path to rewards, employees waste less effort and perform better (House, 324). The third is trust and relationship quality; employees who trust their supervisor are more willing to share information, accept change and cooperate with colleagues (Podsakoff et al., 125). The fourth is psychological climate. Autocratic and passive styles tend to create stress, ambiguity and disengagement, whereas supportive styles create a climate in which people feel safe to contribute ideas (Skogstad et al., 80).

It is important to note that productivity depends on both task and human aspects of leadership. Leaders who concentrate only on tasks may obtain short-term compliance but may reduce morale and creativity, while leaders who concentrate only on relationships may create a friendly climate but weak accountability. Blake and Mouton's grid and the Ohio State studies both emphasised the need to integrate the two concerns (Blake and Mouton, p. 10). Goleman's analysis supports this view by showing that leaders who can use authoritative, affiliative and coaching styles flexibly are more likely to create a positive working climate than those who rely heavily on coercive or pacesetter styles (Goleman, 80).

Table 3 synthesises the literature reviewed above in order to compare the likely influence of the major styles on important dimensions of productivity. The table is an interpretive summary prepared by the author on the basis of the cited secondary sources and is not a statistical result.

Table 3: Synthesis of the Likely Effect of Leadership Styles on Dimensions of Employee Productivity

Leadership Style	Employee Motivation	Job Satisfaction	Task Performance	Innovation and Initiative
Autocratic	Low to moderate; compliance-based	Generally low	Good in short term for routine tasks	Low
Democratic	High	High	Good, especially for complex tasks	High
Laissez-Faire	Low	Low	Low unless followers are highly skilled	Mixed

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

Transactional	Moderate; reward-driven	Moderate to high with fair rewards	High for clear targets	Low to moderate
Transformational	High; intrinsic	High	High at individual, team and organization levels	High
Servant / LMX	High	High	Good; supports commitment and retention	Moderate to high

Source: Author's synthesis based on Lewin et al., Bass, Judge and Piccolo, Wang et al., Gerstner and Day, Skogstad et al., and Greenleaf (see References).

Several practical implications emerge from the review. First, organizations should select and develop leaders who are capable of transformational behaviour, since this style is consistently related to better outcomes across criteria and levels (Wang et al., 225). Training programmes can be designed to improve skills such as communicating a vision, coaching, giving feedback and showing consideration for individuals, which are central to the components of transformational leadership (Bass and Avolio, 3). Second, leaders should combine inspiration with clear goals and fair rewards, because contingent reward is an effective component of leadership (Judge and Piccolo, 765). Third, leaders should adjust their style to the readiness of followers and the nature of the task instead of using one fixed pattern (Hersey and Blanchard, 161). Fourth, passive avoidance of responsibility should be discouraged, since it is associated with stress and conflict (Skogstad et al., 87).

Fifth, organizations should invest in the quality of relationships between supervisors and subordinates by promoting fair treatment, open communication and recognition for all team members (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 237). Sixth, performance appraisal of managers should include the assessment of leadership behaviour, for instance through feedback from subordinates, so that styles that reduce productivity can be corrected. Finally, leadership development should be linked with the culture of the organization, because the same behaviour may be interpreted differently in different cultural and sectoral contexts (Yukl, 70). The study has certain limitations. Because it relies on secondary data, it reflects the samples, measures and contexts of the original studies, many of which were conducted in Western and large-organization settings. Correlations reported in meta-analyses do not prove that leadership style causes productivity, since high-performing teams may also influence leaders' behaviour. Moreover, productivity is measured differently across studies, using ratings, objective output or perceived effectiveness. Lord et al. note that leadership processes unfold over time and across levels, which means that single-time surveys may capture only part of the process (Lord et al., 436). Future research may use primary data from specific industries in India, such as banking, education, information technology or manufacturing, to examine which styles are most effective in local conditions.

The choice of an effective style cannot be separated from the nature of the organization. In manufacturing units with standardised tasks and strict safety requirements, a structured and directive

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

approach, combined with contingent reward, may be required to maintain quality and discipline. In knowledge-based and service organizations, where employees possess specialised skills and deal directly with customers, participative, coaching and transformational styles are more likely to bring out initiative and creativity. Hersey and Blanchard's model supports this reasoning by linking the amount of direction and support to the readiness of followers (Hersey and Blanchard, 1961), and Goleman's research suggests that the best leaders possess a repertoire of styles and use them according to the situation (Goleman, 1982).

Organizational size, structure and culture also play a role. In hierarchical cultures employees may expect directive leadership and may interpret participative behaviour as a lack of decisiveness, while in flatter organizations employees may expect consultation and autonomy. Yukl stresses that leader effectiveness depends on the fit between leader behaviour and situational variables such as the nature of the task, the structure of the organization and the characteristics of subordinates (Yukl, 1970). Managers should therefore diagnose the context before deciding on a leadership approach, and organizations should avoid assuming that a style which succeeded in one setting will automatically succeed in another.

Another important issue is the development of leaders at different levels. Top managers shape strategy and culture, middle managers translate strategy into action and first-line supervisors influence the daily experience of employees. Productivity is strongly affected by the last group because they are closest to the work. Dinh et al. observe that leadership research increasingly recognises the multilevel nature of leadership, in which the behaviour of leaders at one level influences followers and leaders at other levels (Dinh et al., 2005). It follows that leadership development programmes should reach supervisors and team leaders and should not be limited to senior executives. When leadership capability is built throughout the hierarchy, consistent standards of fairness, communication and support can be maintained, and the benefits of effective styles can be experienced by the entire workforce.

Technology and new forms of work, including remote and hybrid arrangements, add a further dimension. Where employees work at a distance, leaders cannot rely on direct observation and must depend on trust, clear goals and regular communication. This situation favours styles that emphasise empowerment, results orientation and individual consideration, which are characteristic of transformational and relationship-based leadership (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Graen and Uhl-Bien, 2005). Organizations that adopt flexible working arrangements without developing such leadership skills may find that productivity falls because of weak coordination and reduced engagement.

The discussion also shows that leadership style should be viewed as a developmental capability and not as a fixed personal characteristic. Bass and Avolio argued that transformational behaviours can be strengthened through training and feedback, and that organizations benefit when such programmes are linked with real work challenges (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Coaching, mentoring and job rotation allow managers to experience different perspectives and to practise new behaviours in a

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

supportive environment. Over time, leaders who learn to listen, to delegate meaningfully and to recognise good performance build a stronger bond with their teams, and this bond translates into higher effort, lower absenteeism and better quality of work. Productivity gains obtained in this manner are more durable than those obtained through pressure alone, because they are based on commitment and trust and not on fear of punishment.

Conclusion

The paper examined the role of leadership styles in enhancing employee productivity through a review of secondary sources. The evidence indicates that leadership style is a significant determinant of employee motivation, satisfaction and performance. Transformational leadership has the strongest and most consistent association with positive outcomes at individual, team and organizational levels, while transactional leadership, particularly contingent reward, contributes to productivity when targets are clear and rewards are fair. Relationship-based and servant approaches improve trust, commitment and retention. Autocratic leadership may be useful in certain emergencies or routine situations but tends to reduce initiative, and laissez-faire leadership is mostly associated with ambiguity, conflict and poor outcomes. It is concluded that no single style is universally best. The most effective leaders combine a clear task orientation with genuine concern for people, inspire followers with a meaningful vision and adapt their behaviour to the situation. Organizations that wish to enhance productivity should therefore invest in leadership development, evaluate leadership behaviour regularly and create a culture of trust, fairness and open communication. Further empirical studies based on primary data in specific sectors would help to strengthen and refine the conclusions presented here.

References

- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 36–62.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569–591.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

International Conference on Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Education, Science, and Technology (ICMPEST)

Organized by- Jeevan Jyoti College of Commerce Management & Technology, Dayalpur, Purkaji
Lakshar Road, Block Khanpur, Haridwar (09 May 2026)

In IJESH ISSN: 2250-3552

www.ijesh.com

- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827–844.
- Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), 78–90.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader–member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219–247.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(3), 321–339.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 269–299.
- Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 434–451.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385–425.
- Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior* (15th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(1), 80–92.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25(1), 35–71.
- Wang, G., Oh, I.-S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(2), 223–270.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.