Original Research Article

Investigating the impact of leadership on work engagement of employees within the Khomas region, Namibia.

M. N. Hough[1*], M. K. Gaomas[1], C. V. Tibinyane[1], W. R. Pieters[1]

[1]Department Human Sciences, University of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Leadership has an effect on constructive or deviant behaviour and the work engagement levels of employees. Considering the current economic and social climate of Namibia, it is of utmost importance that leaders initiate and identify ways in which work engagement can be enhanced. Making use of an electronic survey (survey research), this study investigated the effects of different leadership styles on work engagement of employees in the Khomas region (n=157). An analysis of the data was done with SPSS (version 24), making use of Pearson's correlation and Stepwise multiple regression. Work engagement reported a negative relationship with transactional ($r = -0.43$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect) and laissez-faire leadership ($r = -0.37$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect); a positive relationship was reported with transformational leadership ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.05$; large effect). Transactional leadership ($\beta = -0,27$; $t = -2.85$; $p < 0.01$) and transformational leadership ($\beta = 0,45$; $t = 4.88$; $p < 0.00$) were found to be significant predictors of work engagement. Leaders need to avoid compulsive focus on the mistakes or failures of employees. Focusing constantly on mistakes, problems and failures may cause anxiety amongst employees and halt work engagement. Work engagement can be enhanced when leaders clearly and confidently communicate performance standards and expectations; provide praise and recognition; involve employees in decision making whilst discussing different approaches to task completion; and help to develop employees based on their individual strengths and abilities. This study may add to existing knowledge within Industrial/Organizational Psychology, leadership and interventions to improve work engagement and performance of employees.

1. Introduction

Namibia faces significant challenges regarding economic and social functioning (Chiwara & Lombard, 2017; Littlewood, 2014). The Khomas region has the largest labour force compared to other regions within Namibia (NSA, 2018). Due to the nature (focus on employees) and scope (exploratory study) of this study, the researchers focused on the Khomas region to conduct the study. Within the current economic and social climate, it is of utmost importance that leaders take the initiative and identify ways to enhance work engagement of employees. Due to Namibia's small population and dependence on the export of local goods, the country faces the challenge of competing trade-wise on the international stage (IPPR, 2014; IPPR, 2019). The optimisation of organisations is highly dependent on the commitment and engagement of employees within organisations (Geldenhuys, Laba, & Venter, 2014; Sharma & Sharma, 2014).

Leadership has a direct effect on constructive and deviant behaviour and work engagement levels of employees (Yao, Fan, Guo, & Li, 2014; Meswantri & Ilyas, 2018). If one is to consider the effects of leadership on the functioning of the organisation, it is important to clarify what is meant by leadership. In essence, we find that leadership has one main purpose: to improve the organisation (Summerfield, 2014). This may imply that a leader should enhance all the relevant aspects of the organisation, which includes the personnel. Furthermore, leadership is not a novel idea, it has been researched extensively and has been found to direct workgroups, initiate improvements in the functioning and performance of organisations, and subsequently help organisations achieve their goals (Elwell & Elikofer, 2015; Saleem & Naveed, 2017). Common sense dictates that the organisation is not merely a lifeless and mechanical construct. As a social construct, leadership influences

*Corresponding author: gnr.enco@gmail.com/ maxinegaomas@gmail.com/kavetit1977@gmail.com/wpieters@unam.na/ +264612063056

employees to participate in their own accord with the purpose to achieve organisational objectives (Omolayo, 2007). Furthermore, leadership facilitates the achievement of personnel goals (Jannesari, Khorvash, & Iravani, 2013). Research has shown that leadership types/styles do influence the work engagement of employees (Li et al., 2018). More specifically, the authors identified that transformational and transactional leadership positively affects the level of work engagement. Highly efficient organisations are characterised by employees who are engaged on a cognitive, emotional, and physical level (Strom, Sears, & Kelly, 2014). This form of engagement is characterised by vigour, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002).

The objective of this study was to determine by means of non-experimental research design the effects of leadership styles on work engagement of employees in the Khomas region.

2. Literature review
2.1 Transformational and transactional leadership
Leadership is the social influence and improvement of individual endeavours and group performance for the purpose of accomplishing joint goals (Sethuraman & Jayshree, 2014; Yukl, 2012). Transformational leadership is defined as the combined persuasive emotional connection between the leader and the organisation that enhances the performances of followers to levels that exceed expectations while being committed to a greater cause (Diaz-Saenz, 2011). Additionally, transformational leadership is defined by Warrilow (2012) as direct influence on individuals and collectives, and inspiring positive change by accounting for their personal and shared pursuits.

Alternatively, transactional leadership is a collective goal-oriented approach while offering rewards for achieving these predetermined goals (Bryman, Collinson, Grint, Jackson, & Uhl-Bien, 2011). Furthermore, transactional leadership is rooted in the premise that the exchange of effort for rewards with the aim of attaining specific goals or tasks but excludes the additional motivation of employees to exceed expectations as with transactional leadership (Bryman et al., 2011). Similarly, Lee (2020) defines transactional leadership as a bond between superiors and subordinates through a reward-exchange system to increase the progression of the organisational and the individual.

2.2 Antecedents of transformational and transactional leadership
A literature review on the antecedents to transformational leadership indicates that leadership characteristics such as self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, attributes, and beliefs; characteristics of the organisation such as fair practices within the company and collaborative organisational cultures; and co-workers such as co-workers' levels of emotional intelligence and levels of development; all influence leadership behaviours to some extent (Sun, Chen, & Zhang, 2017). Barbuto and Burbach (2006) found a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. Research has found that leaders who experience changes in self-efficacy, perspective taking, and positive affect also report improved transformational leadership behaviours and that these leadership behaviours changes were supported by co-workers and superiors (Fitzgerald, & Schutte, 2010; Mason, Griffin, & Parker, 2014). Additionally, Cerni, Curtis, and Colmar (2010) indicated that a targeted intervention programme which provided executive coaching over a 10-week period enhanced the levels of reflective thinking and leadership behaviours. Co-worker relationships, especially when positive, have been shown to enhance autonomous motivation and self-efficacy in abilities to manage. Consequently, these factors enhanced transformational leadership behaviour (Trépanier, Fernet, & Austin, 2012).

Bass (1997) asserts that there are three dimensions that define transactional leadership behaviours, contingency reward, and management-by-exception (active or passive). Contingency reward is defined by the implementation of system of rewards that extrinsically motivate followers to ensure the achievement of goals or tasks. Management by exception (active) is defined as the implementation of specific interventions and meticulous inspection of cohort behaviours to maintain obedience to the rules and regulations of the organisation, which is accomplished by corrective action when specific transgressions occur. Management by exception (passive) allows employees with the necessary freedom to function in their roles within the workspace, with corrective action only required when employees do not meet or deviate from the expected levels of performance. Camps and Torres (2011) found that organisational learning capability and how employable the follower serve as antecedents of transactional leadership behaviour.

2.3 Outcomes of transformational and transactional leadership
Clarke (2013) found that transformational leadership positively correlated with perceptions of safety climate and safety behaviour (safety compliance and safety participation). Furthermore, the transactional leadership ensured that employees complied with the rules and regulations of the organisation, this in turn was also correlated to promoting employees participating in safety. Ma and Jiang (2018) found that creativity amongst employees and transformational

leadership showed no significant correlation, while transactional leadership was positively correlated to the creativity of employees. Cho, Shin, Billing, and Bhagat (2019) found that transformational leadership positively correlated to affective organisational behaviour, more so for American employees than Korean employees. However, transactional leadership was only positively correlated to affective organisational behaviour for Korean employees.

Sundi (2013) found a positive correlation between transformational leadership, transactional leadership and employee motivation. Employees' motivation, transformational leadership and transactional leadership was positively correlated to employee performance. Ismail, Mohamad, Mohamed, Rafiuddin and Zhen (2010) found a positive correlation between transformational leadership and procedural justice. Furthermore, a positive correlation between transactional leadership and leadership trust of employees was found. A positive relationship was found between transactional leadership, distributive justice, and employees' levels of leadership trust. Riaz and Haider (2010) found positive relationships between transactional leadership, transformational leadership, job satisfaction and career satisfaction. Lan, Chang, Ma, Zhang and Chuang (2019); Nazim (2016) found a positive correlation between transformational, transactional leadership and job satisfaction. Transformational leadership and transactional leadership have been shown to correlate to job satisfaction, organisational commitment, perceived performance and intentions to quit (Nazim Ali, Ali, & Tariq, 2014).

Transformational leadership and contingent rewards significantly influence work engagement (Breevaart et al., 2014). Furthermore, both transactional leadership and transformational leadership has been shown to positively correlate with work engagement, however transactional leadership showed higher predictability related to work engagement and the psychological capital of employees (Li, Castaño, & Li, 2018). Dartey-Baah and Ampofo (2015) found that transactional leadership correlates positively with job stress, while transformational leadership correlates negatively with the job stress levels of employees. Alternatively, Pishgooie, Atashzadeh-Shoorideh, Falcó-Pegueroles and Lotfi (2019) researched on the relationship between leadership styles of nursing managers and nursing staff and found that both transformational leadership and transactional leadership reduced the levels of employees' job stress and their intentions to quit their jobs.

2.4 Work engagement

One of the reasons why there has been an increase in the interest in work engagement is because of its predictive relationship to job performance (Tims, Bakker, & Xanthopuulou, 2011). Work engagement is defined as positive organisational behaviour that constitutes vigour, absorption and dedication (Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2014). Positive organisational behaviour comprises of hard-working and engaged employees. Furthermore, engaged employees are more energetic and see their jobs as a challenge (Barnes & Collier, 2013). Vigour speaks to how energetic employees are as well as their levels of resilience and the amount of effort the employees put into their work (Bakker, 2017). When employees are dedicated, they are highly involved with their work, enthusiastic, inspired and find meaning in their work (Bakker, 2017). Lastly, absorption is the way that employees become, immersed in their work that they are not even conscious of how fast time passes by whilst working (Bakker et al., 2014).

2.5 Antecedents of work engagement

Job resources are a good predictor of work engagement (Albrecht, 2013). It helps employees do their jobs well, achieve work-related goals, motivate personal growth and lessen the job demands (Bakker et al., 2014). The job resources that have been identified as predictors of work engagement were task significance, performance feedback, relationship with supervisor, social support from co-workers, task variety, autonomy, learning opportunities, and transformational leadership (Albrecht, 2013; Bakker et al., 2014). Leadership influence many of these resources. Job resources have an intrinsic and extrinsic motivational role in an employees' work life. Job resources (extrinsic motivational role) are important in achieving work goals (Bakker, 2011). When employees feel supported it helps them achieve their work goals. Employees' growth, learning, and development forms part of the intrinsic motivational role (Bakker, 2011). This is when an employee receives performance feedback, they know in which areas they need to improve or perform well in and learn.

Personality has been shown to play an important part in work engagement (Albrecht, 2013). Certain individuals can use their job resources for optimal functioning as opposed to others and this is due to differences in their personalities (Albrecht, 2013). Individuals that are extroverts will be more social and experience more positive emotions. These employees are more engaged in their work because they can reap social support from their co-workers and supervisors, perceive problems as challenges and ask for performance feedback (Bakker et al., 2014). Furthermore, it has been shown that extroversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability are related to higher levels of work engagement (Bakker et al., 2014).

2.6 Outcomes of work engagement

Work engagement has been shown to improve the overall health of employees (Bakker et al., 2014). This is because engaged employees were found to partake in activities that relax them and help them to detach psychologically from work such as sports (Bakker et al., 2014). Furthermore, according to the *Broaden-and-build theory* employees that are engaged are open to new experiences more than non-engaged employees (Bakker et al., 2014). This is because when employees can adapt to a work environment that is always changing they become more engaged in their work. Engaged employees learn more and exhibit proactive behaviour especially those that are high in conscientiousness (Bakker et al., 2014). There are four reasons why engaged employees perform better than non-engaged employees. Firstly, engaged employees are known to experience positive emotions which increases their thought-action repertoire by building physical, social, psychological and intellectual resources (Bakker et al., 2014). Secondly, engaged employees experience better health which gives them more time to focus on their work (Bakker, 2011). Individuals that experience positive emotions are less likely to develop cardiovascular disease (Boehm & Kubzansky, 2012) and get flu less often than those who experience negative emotions (Kok et al., 2013). Thirdly, engaged employees seek performance feedback and social support from their co-workers and supervisors to generate new resources (Bakker, 2011). Lastly, engaged employees transfer their engagement which in turn increases the team's overall performance (Bakker, 2011). The *Social Contagion Theory* explains this better. It proposes that when an individual has ties to another individual; they start to exhibit similar behaviour, attitudes, or personality (Burgess, Riddell, Fancourt, & Murayama, 2018).

Based on the literature discussed above, the following hypotheses have been developed:

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and work engagement.

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive relationship between transactional leadership and work engagement.

Hypothesis 3: There is a negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership and work engagement.

Hypothesis 4: Transformational leadership is a significant predictor of work engagement.

Hypothesis 5: Transactional leadership is a significant predictor of work engagement.

Hypothesis 6: Laissez-faire leadership is a significant predictor of work engagement.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research approach

This study made use of an electronic survey (quantitative research). The link, with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and all ethical requirements, were sent to different employees working in the Khomas region. Data were collected based on participants' biographical information, leadership style, and work engagement levels. It took participants approximately 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

The study made use of the convenience sampling technique which is defined as the population components that are included in the sample based on the ease of access and availability (Martínez-Mesa et al., 2016). All participants were informed of the right to privacy, confidentiality and the purpose of the study. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study without any negative consequences. After employees' consent was obtained they could proceed with the completion of the survey. The surveys were submitted electronically after completion and kept on a secure data server. A total of n=157 individuals responded to the survey.

3.2 Participants

The sample consisted of 157 respondents from the total of 241 321 employed people in the Khomas region (NSA, 2018). The only restrictions for participants of this research study were that they are employed within the Khomas region. The study does not aim to generalise the findings to the entire Khomas region but rather to gather exploratory data for future studies and gain initial insight into the topic under investigation. Of the sample, 104 were woman (66.2%) and 52 were men (33.1%). The ages of the respondents were mostly evenly distributed, with the ages 41 to 45 (n=30, 19.1%) representing the largest proportion of the respondents and the under 24 age category having the least responses (n=10, 6.4%). From the sample, the longest job tenure length was amongst employees working for 16 years or longer (n=43, 27.4%). The distribution between single (n=70, 44.6%) and married employees (n=72, 45.9%) were fairly evenly distributed. The most frequent qualification was an Honours degree (n=35, 22.3%). Most of the respondents worked at a Non-management level (n=81, 51.6%). The rest of the biographical data can be found in Table 1.

TABLE 1: Frequency distribution of the sample (n=157)

Category:	Item:	Frequency:	Percentage:
SEX:	Male	52	33.1
	Female	104	66.2
	Missing values	1	0.6
AGE:	Below 24	10	6.4
	24-28	18	11.5
	29-31	15	9.6
	32-35	23	14.6
	36-40	26	16.6
	41-45	30	19.1
	46-50	15	9.6
	51 and older	20	12.7
JOB TENURE:	Less than 1 year	17	10.8
	1-2	18	11.5
	3-4	20	12.7
	5-6	13	8.3
	7-8	18	11.5
	9-10	7	4.5
	11-15	20	12.7
	16 and more	43	27.4
	Missing responses	1	0.6
QUALIFICATIONS:	Grade 12	21	13.4
	Certificate	9	5.7
	Diploma	18	11.5
	Degree	31	19.7
	Honours Degree	35	22.3
	Master's Degree	32	20.4
	PHD	11	7.0
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS (children):	None	53	33.8
	1-2	75	47.8
	3-4	21	13.4
	5-6	5	3.2
	10 and more	2	1.3
	Missing responses	1	0.6
MARITAL STATUS:	Single	70	44.6
	Married	72	45.9
	Divorced	13	8.3
	Widowed	1	0.6
	Missing responses	1	0.6
MANAGEMENT LEVEL	Non-management	81	51.6
	Mid-level management	48	30.6
	Senior management	28	17.8
TOTAL:		157	100.0

3.3 Measuring instruments

The survey comprised of three sections. The first section assessed the respondent's demographic characteristics such as age, gender, education level, job tenure, number of dependents, marital status and level of management.

The second section consisted of the revised *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* developed by Avolio and Bass (2004). The questionnaire consists of 28 items. Transformational leadership consists of inspirational motivation (The Person I Am Rating… "*Talks optimistically about the future"),* intellectual stimulation ("*Seeks differing perspectives when solving* problems"); and individual consideration, ("*Spends time teaching and coaching").* Transactional leadership consists of contingent rewards ("*Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts'*), management by exception- active ("*Keeps track of all mistakes*"), management by exception- passive ("*fails to interfere until problems become serious*"); and Laissez-faire, ("*Fails to interfere until problems become serious*"). The response scale ranges from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always). Bagheri, Sohrabi, and Moradi, (2015) found a reliability coefficient of α=0.90. Work engagement was assessed using the *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale* (UWES-9) developed by

Schaufeli et al. (2006). The scale focused on vigour ("*At my work, I feel bursting with energy*"), dedication ("*When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work*"), and absorption ("*I am immersed in my work*"). Pieters, Van Zyl and Nel (2020) found the reliability for vigour at α=0.81, dedication α=0.81 and absorption α=0.82. Kazimbu and Pieters (2020) found a reliability for the instrument of α=0.91.

3.4 Analysis
Version 24 of the IBM SPSS Programme was used for the analysis of the collected quantitative data from the electronic questionnaire (SPSS, 2016). The results were presented as descriptive statistics, with the mean, standard deviation, and reliability. Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α = .70) was used to measure the reliability of the instruments. To determine the relationship between the different variables the Pearson's product-moment correlation was used. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to determine which variable best predicted the dependent variable.
Ethical consideration

The cover page of the electronic survey explicitly stated the objectives of the study and required that the participant consent to taking the subsequent questionnaire before being able to continue. Furthermore, participants were informed of their right to refrain or withdraw from taking and/or completing the survey.

3.5 Limitations
The study was conducted within the Khomas region which limits the generalizability of the findings to the rest of Namibia. The study made use of a cross-sectional research design that has limitations in terms of predictability and establishing cause-effect relationships.

4.Results
4.1 Descriptive statistics and correlations
The means (M), standard deviation (SD), Cronbach's alpha coefficient, and correlations are recorded in Table 2.

TABLE 2: Cronbach Alpha, Mean and Standard deviation (SD)

Item name:	A	Mean	SD
WE_VIG	.91	15.02	5.30
WE_DED	.84	16.92	4.68
WE_ABS	.72	17.13	3.87
TOTAL_WE	.92	49.07	12.58
TRA_CR	.78	12.93	4.22
TRA_MEP	.78	9.76	4.14
TOTAL_TRA	.76	15.22	5.04
LF	.84	9.36	4.56
TRF_IS	.79	12.89	4.08
TRF_IM	.88	13.96	4.42
TRF_IC	.72	12.13	4.08
TOTAL_TRF	.92	38.98	11.62

WE_VIG = Work engagement (Vigour); WE_DED = Work engagement (Dedication); WE_ABS = Work engagement (Absorption); WE_TOTAL = Total work engagement; TRA_CR = Transactional leadership (Contingent rewards); TRA_MEP = Transactional leadership (Management by exception- passive); TOTAL_TRA = Total transactional leadership; LF = Laissez-faire; TRF_IS = Transformational leadership (Intellectual stimulation); TRF_IM = Transformational leadership (Inspirational motivation); TRF_IC = Transformational leadership (Individual consideration); TOTAL_TRF = Total Transformational leadership.

The *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale* (UWES-9) was found to be reliable with Cronbach's alpha of 0.91 for vigour, 0.84 for dedication, 0.72 for absorption and for Total work engagement (α=.92). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was found to be reliable in this study. For transactional leadership (contingent rewards) the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.78 was found, α=.78 for transactional leadership (management by exception-passive) and Total transactional leadership (α=.70). A Cronbach's alpha coefficient of α=.84 for Laissez-faire. For the dimensions of transformational leadership reliability results were found at α=.88 for

inspirational motivation, α=.79 for intellectual stimulation, α=.72 for individual consideration and for Total transformational leadership (α=.92). Transactional leadership (management by exception-active) were found to be unreliable in this study and excluded from any further analysis.

Vigour reported a mean of 15.02 and a standard deviation of 5.30; dedication reported a mean of 16.92 and a standard deviation of 4.68; absorption reported a mean of 17.13 and a standard deviation of 3.87; and a mean score was reported for Total work engagement of 49.07 and SD of 12.58. A mean of 12.93 were recorded for transactional leadership (contingent

rewards), SD of 4.22; mean of 9.76 for transactional leadership (management by exception-passive) and SD of 4.14; a mean of 15.22 for Total transactional leadership and SD of 5.04. A mean of 9.36 was reported for Laissez-faire and SD of 4.56. A mean of 12.89 was reported for transformational leadership (intellectual stimulation) and SD of 4.08; mean of 13.96 for transformational leadership (inspirational motivation) and SD of 4.42; and mean of 12.13 for transformational leadership (individual consideration) and SD of 4.08; and mean of 38.98 for Total transformational leadership and SD of 11.62.

Table 3: Pearson Correlation Coefficient

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1. WE_VIG	-								
2. WE_DED	.83++	-							
3. WE_ABS	.63++	.72++	-						
4. TOTAL_WE	.92++	.95++	.84++	-					
5. TRA_CR	.47*+	.47*+	.40*+	.49*+	-				
6. TRA_MEP	-.42*+	-.41*+	-.32*+	-.43*+	-.58++	-			
7. TRF_IS	.51++	.49*+	.41*+	.52++	.82++	-.58++	-		
8. TRF_IM	.45*+	.45*+	.38*+	.47*+	.85++	-.59++	.80++	-	
9. TRF_IC	.46*+	.42*+	.29*	.44*+	.79++	-.53++	.78++	.76++	-

* Statistically significant: $p \leq 0,05$

+ Practically significant correlation (medium effect): $0,30 \leq r \leq 0,49$

++ Practically significant correlation (large effect): $r \geq 0,50$

WE_VIG = Work engagement (Vigour); WE_DED = Work engagement (Dedication); WE_ABS = Work engagement (Absorption); WE_TOTAL = Total work engagement; TRA_CR = Transactional leadership (Contingent rewards); TRA_MEP = Transactional leadership (Management by exception- passive); TRF_IS = Transformational leadership (Intellectual stimulation); TRF_IM = Transformational leadership (Inspirational motivation); TRF_IC = Transformational leadership (Individual consideration).

Pearson's correlation coefficient in Table 3 indicates that Vigour reported a positive relationship with Dedication ($r = 0.83$, $p < 0.05$; large effect), Absorption ($r = 0.63$, $p < 0.05$; large effect) and Total work engagement ($r = 0.92$, $p < 0.05$; large effect). Vigour reported a positive relationship with Contingent rewards ($r = 0.47$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect), and a negative relationship with Management by exception - passive ($r = -0.42$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect). Vigour reported a positive relationship with Intellectual stimulation ($r = 0.51$, $p < 0.05$; large effect), a positive relationship with Inspirational motivation ($r = 0.45$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect), and a positive relationship with Individual consideration ($r = 0.46$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect).

Dedication reported a positive relationship with Absorption ($r = 0.72$, $p < 0.05$; large effect) and Total work engagement ($r = 0.95$, $p <$ large effect). Dedication reported a positive relationship with Contingent rewards ($r = 0.47$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect), a negative relationship with Management by exception

– passive ($r = -0.41$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect); a positive relationship with Intellectual stimulation ($r = 0.49$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect), a positive relationship with Inspirational motivation ($r = 0.45$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect) and a positive relationship with Individual consideration ($r = 0.42$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect).

Absorption reported a positive relationship with Total work engagement ($r = 0.84$, $p < 0.05$; large effect); a positive relationship with Contingent rewards ($r = 0.40$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect), a negative relationship with Management by exception – passive ($r = -0.32$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect), a positive relationship with Intellectual stimulation ($r = 0.41$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect), a positive relationship with Inspirational motivation ($r = 0.38$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect) and a positive relationship with Individual consideration ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.05$; small effect).

Total work engagement reported a positive relationship with Contingent rewards ($r = 0.49$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect), a negative relationship with Management by exception – passive ($r = -0.43$, $p <$

0.05; medium effect), a positive relationship with Intellectual stimulation ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.05$; large effect), a positive relationship with Inspirational motivation ($r = 0.47$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect) and a positive relationship with Individual consideration ($r = 0.44$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect).

Contingent rewards reported a negative relationship with management by exception – passive ($r = -0.58$, $p < 0.05$; large effect), a positive relationship with Intellectual stimulation ($r = 0.82$, $p < 0.05$; large effect), a positive relationship with Inspirational motivation ($r = 0.85$, $p < 0.05$; large effect) and a positive relationship with individual consideration ($r = 0.79$, $p < 0.05$; large effect).

Management by exception – passive reported a negative relationship with Intellectual stimulation ($r = -0.58$, $p < 0.05$; large effect), a negative relationship with Inspirational motivation ($r = -0.59$, $p < 0.05$; large effect) and a negative relationship with Individual consideration ($r = -0.53$, $p < 0.05$; large effect).

Intellectual stimulation reported a positive relationship with Inspirational motivation ($r = 0.80$, $p < 0.05$; large effect) and a positive relationship with Individual consideration ($r = 0.78$, $p < 0.05$; large effect).

Inspirational motivation reported a positive relationship with Individual consideration ($r = 0.76$, $p < 0.05$; large effect).

Table 4: Pearson Correlation Coefficient (composite variables)

TOTAL_TRA	-			
TOTAL_TRF	-.55++	-		
LF	.69++	-.67++	-	
TOTAL_WE	-.43*+	.52++	-.37*+	-

* Statistically significant: p ≤ 0,05
+ Practically significant correlation (medium effect): 0,30 ≤ r ≤ 0,49
++ Practically significant correlation (large effect): r > 0,50

TOTAL_TRA = Total transactional leadership; TOTAL_TRF = Total transformational leadership; LF = Laissez-faire leadership; TOTAL_WE = Total work engagement.

Total transformational leadership reported a negative relationship with Laissez-faire ($r = -0.67$, $p < 0.05$; large effect), and a positive relationship with Total work engagement ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.05$; large effect).

Total transactional leadership reported a negative relationship with Total transformational leadership ($r = -0.55$, $p < 0.05$; large effect), a positive relationship with Laissez-faire ($r = 0.69$, $p < 0.05$; large effect), and a negative relationship with Total work engagement ($r = -0.43$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect).

Laissez-faire reported a negative relationship with Total work engagement ($r = -0.37$, $p < 0.05$; medium effect).

4.2 Multiple regression analyses
Stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed to evaluate how well transactional leadership, transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership predict work engagement, assessing hypotheses 4, 5, and 6. To test these hypotheses Total transformational leadership was used as the independent variables in the first model, Total transactional leadership was added in the second model and Laissez-faire leadership in the third model with Total work engagement being the dependent variable. The results are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Multiple Regression with Total work engagement being the dependent variable and Total transformational leadership, Total transactional leadership and Laissez-faire leadership being the independent variables.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients Beta	Coefficients Standard Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig	F	R^2	ΔR^2
1						56.81	.268	.263
					(p < 0.00)			
(Constant)	27.23	3.02		9.01	.00*			
Total TRF	.56	.07	.52	7.54	.00*			
2						33.09	.301	.291
					(p < 0.00)			
(Constant)	40.35	5.74		7.03	.00*			
Total TRF	.43	.09	.40	4.97	.00*			
Total TRA	-.54	.20	-.22	-2.67	.01*			
3						22.47	.306	.292
					(p < 0.00)			
(Constant)	37.37	6.37		5.87	.00*			
Total TRF	.49	.10	.45	4.88	.00*			
Total TRA	-.67	.24	-.27	-2.85	.01*			
LF	.32	.29	.12	1.08	.28			

t, test; *p*, probability value; *F*, overall significance; *R*2, percentage variance explained; Δ*R*2, change in percentage variance explained; B, regression coefficient; SE, standard error.
a, Dependent variable: Total work engagement.

A Stepwise multiple regression analysis was done to evaluate how well Total transformational leadership, Total transactional leadership and Laissez-faire leadership predict Total work engagement. Table 5 indicates that Total transformational leadership produced a significant model in step 1 ($F_{(1,156)}$ = 56.81; $p < 0,00$) and account for 26.3% of the variance. In Step 2, Total transactional leadership was added to the model, producing a significant model ($F_{(2,156)}$ = 33.09; $p < 0,00$), accounting for 29.1% of the variance. In step 3,

Laissez-faire leadership was added to the model, producing a significant model ($F_{(3,156)}$ = 22.47; $p < 0,00$), accounting for 29.2% of the variance. The results show that Total transformational leadership (β = 0,45; t = 4.88; $p < 0.00$) is the strongest significant predictor of Total work engagement, followed by Total transactional leadership (β = -0,27; t = -2.85; $p < 0.01$). Laissez-faire leadership (β = 0,12; t = 1.08; $p < 0,28$) is an insignificant predictor of Total work engagement.

5. Discussion

Management by exception- passive (transactional leadership) reported a negative relationship with work engagement. Leaders need to guide employees towards achieving organisational goals and when leaders fail to do that, employees may become less engaged or unable to achieve organisational goals. Gadirajurrett, Srinivasan, Stevens, and Jeena (2018) indicated that lack of guidance (e.g *Waits for things to go wrong before taking action*) may be the main cause of team ineffectiveness. This indicates that leaders need to provide guidance to reduce costs associated with corrective actions and poor performance of employees.

Intellectual stimulation (transformational leadership) reported a positive relationship with work engagement. This indicates that when leaders allow employees to think critically about new ways to complete tasks (e.g. *Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems*), they are more likely to be engaged in their work and find novel ways to execute their task more effectively. Almutairi (2015) found a positive relationship between brainstorming and creative problem solving skills.

Inspirational motivation (transformational leadership) reported a positive relationship with work engagement. It was noted that employers (leaders) need to motivate employees (e.g. *Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved*) to ensure that they perform their tasks effectively (Polackova, 2016). Poor performance can be related to a lack of motivation.

Individual consideration (transformational leadership, e.g. *Helps me to develop my strengths*) reported a positive relationship with work engagement. Jenkins (2012) found that employees are more motivated towards their work when they receive developmental opportunities. When employees are provided with opportunities to grow and develop they become persuaded to plough back these skills to their work.

This study found that contingent rewards (transactional leadership) are positively related to work engagement of employees. Communication regarding performance expectations and requirements forms part of contingent rewards (e.g. *Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets*). Femi (2014) found that communication related positively with work performance and productivity. By providing feedback, employees can improve on future performance or know what they are doing well (Osborne & Hammoud, 2017). Praise (e.g. *Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations*) and assistance (e.g. *Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts*) also forms part of contingent rewards. Jenkins (2012) found that praise and recognition motivated staff towards completing their duties. Supervisory support reported a positive

relationship with engagement climate and work engagement (Albrecht, Breidahl, & Marty, 2018).

Hypothesis 1 of this study stated that there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and work engagement. The findings of this study support this hypothesis and found that transformational leadership reported a positive relationship with work engagement. The results of this study are supported by Jangsiriwattana (2019) who found a positive relationship between transformational leadership and work engagement. Leaders who motivate, inspire and develop employees are likely to have employees that are engaged. Investing in employees through these different methods, employees are encouraged to work hard for the leader and achieve organisational goals. Transformational leadership (positively) predicted work engagement in this study. The result of this study supports hypothesis 4 of this study that assessed if transformational leadership is a significant predictor of work engagement.

Hypothesis 2 of this study aims to asses if there is a positive relationship between transactional leadership and work engagement. The findings of this study reject this hypothesis, contrary to some of the other studies. Most of the items that formed part of transactional leadership in this study stems from management by exception active (e.g. *Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures*) and passive (e.g. *Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action*). This indicates that when leaders are constantly focusing on the mistakes or failures and refrains from providing guidance it reduces employees work engagement levels. Employees may become too worried about failing again in future instead of being supported to take on new activities and use their own initiative. Aboramadan and Dahleez (2020); Jangsiriwattana (2019) found a positive relationship between transactional leadership and work engagement amongst employees. When a leader fails to intervene before matters become chronic it assures employees that they have their leaders support and guidance when tasks become difficult or when they need help. Transactional leadership (negatively) predicted work engagement. Hypothesis 5 of this study assessed if transactional leadership is a significant predictor of work engagement and was rejected.

Hypothesis 3 of this study aims to assess if there is a negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership and work engagement. The findings of this study support this hypothesis and found a negative relationship between Laissez-faire leadership and work engagement. The results of this study are supported by a study conducted by Moody (2012). When leaders fail to get involved with work activities, is available for guidance or avoids making decisions, it negatively

affects employees work engagement levels. Leaders are part of the job resources available for employees to be engaged in their work. Laissez-faire leadership was an insignificant predictor of work engagement. The results of this study rejected hypothesis 6 of the study that aimed to assess if laissez-faire leadership is a significant predictor of work engagement.

6. Recommendations and practical implications

When leaders "wait for things to go wrong before taking action", apart from costing organisations more money for corrective action, it may communicate a message related to a lack of direction. When employees don't know what the future holds for them or what their role is to achieve these goals, performance may be negatively affected. Leaders need to be vocal about the future, organisational goals and the role that employees need to execute. When leaders allow employees to execute their work duties and provide the needed support when needed, it communicates a message of support and allows employees to tackle new challenges with more confidence and ease.

This study recommends that leaders allow followers to think critically about how to execute work related duties. Through this way, followers feel empowered, have an opportunity to think creatively about ways to complete task and experience higher levels of ownership about the process. Instructing employees about work task, employees may feel excluded and does not necessarily "buy into" the task or its completion. Leaders are also cautioned to be aware about employees that may need additional guidance or support and which employees are able to function more independently.

Leaders are encouraged to communicate optimistically and confidently about the future as well as the outcome of future goals. Employees need to be motivated about the future goals and inspired about the possibility of success. Inspiration may be a catalyst that helps employees to persevere when duties get difficult and remain hopeful when faced with challenges at work. Being hopeful about the future motivates employees to become confident in their own abilities and the possibility of future success.

This study recommends that leaders spend time developing followers and provide opportunities within and outside the organisation to develop their skills and abilities. Employees may regard the development or developmental opportunities from their leader (organisation) as a token of appreciation and consideration. When followers notice that the leader (organisation) invests in them, they become more appreciative and reciprocate these gestures with additional effort and hard work.

Leaders need to praise and recognise employees for the work that they do well. By acknowledging the effort and extra determination employees invest in their job employees feel appreciated and become more engaged in their work. When employees are recognised for the work they do, they become more motivated towards the tasks and it enhances the quality of the relationship between leader and follower. A healthy relationship between leader and follower also reduces work stress and intention to leave.

Leaders need to motivate and inspire followers. This may persuade employees towards positive change and help them to achieve organisational goals. It is recommended that organisations specifically select or appoint leaders with charisma. Identifying potential leaders within the organisation would also benefit from leadership training where the ability to motivate and inspire followers can be cultivated. Specific focus can be placed on enhancing levels of self-efficacy and emotional intelligence.

It is suggested that leaders be involved with the processes and activities within the organisation. It is also suggested that when he/she gets involved that it's not only when things go wrong (chronic failure). Leaders need to get involved before things get out of control but also allow employees the necessary autonomy. It is suggested that leaders exercise control the same way they recognise and reward employees. Being overly focused on corrective measures, mistakes and disciplining employees instils fear, employees may become detach or withdrawn from the organisation.

Leaders need to respond timeously to enquiries and make decision when needed. Being an absent leader that does not respond to enquiries or one that does not make decisions frustrates employees and negatively affects productivity. Followers look up to leaders and expect them to provide guidance and rely on their judgement when needed.

7. Conclusion

This study adds to the limited literature within the field of Industrial/Organisational psychology and leadership in Namibia. A positive relationship was found between transformational leadership and work engagement. Transformational leadership was also a significant (positive) predictor of work engagement. Leaders that are able to inspire and motivate employees as part of this sample may enhance work engagement of followers.

A negative relationship was found between transactional leadership and work engagement. When leaders only focus on problems and mistakes, or avoids getting involved until problems become catastrophic, it reduces employees work engagement levels. Transactional leadership was also found to predict (negatively) work engagement.

Leaders that are absent, avoids making decisions or does not respond to enquiring reduces work

engagement. This study found that Laissez-faire leadership has a negative relationship with work engagement.

References

Aboramadan, M., & Dahleez, K. A. (2020). Leadership styles and employees work outcomes in non-profit organizations: the role of work engagement. *Journal of Management Development*, *39*(7), 869-893.

Albrecht, S. L. (2013). Work engagement and the positive power of meaningful work. In Bakker, Arnold B. (ed), *Advances in positive organizational psychology*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, England, pp.237-260.

Albrecht, S., Breidahl, E., & Marty, A. (2018). Organizational resources, organizational engagement climate and employee engagement. *Career Development International*, *23*(1), 67-85.

Almutairi, A. N. M. (2015). The effect of using brainstorming strategy in developing creative problem solving skills among male students in Kuwait: A field study on Saud Al-Kharji school in Kuwait city. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(3), 136-145.

Bagheri, R., Sohrabi, Z., & Moradi, E. (2015). Psychometric properties of Persian version of the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ). *Medical journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran*, *29*(256), 1-9.

Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*(4), 265-269.

Bakker, A. B. (2017). Strategic and proactive approaches to work engagement. *Organizational Dynamics*, *46*(2), 67-75.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD–R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 389-411.

Barbuto, J. E., & Burbach, M. E. (2006). The emotional intelligence of transformational leaders: A field study of elected officials. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *146*(1), 51-64.

Barnes, D. C., & Collier, J. E. (2013). Investigating work engagement in the service environment. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *27*, 485-499.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, *52*(2), 130-139.

Boehm, J. K., & Kubzansky, L. D. (2012). The heart's content: the association between positive psychological well-being and cardiovascular health. *Psychological Bulletin*, *138*(4), 655-691.

Breevaart, K., Bakker, A., Hetland, J., Demerouti, E., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2014). Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *87*(1), 138-157.

Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds.). (2011). The SAGE handbook of leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Bryman, A. (Ed.). (2011). *The SAGE handbook of leadership*. Sage Publications.

Burgess, L. G., Riddell, P. M., Fancourt, A., & Murayama, K. (2018). The influence of social contagion within education: A motivational perspective. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, *12*(4), 164-174.

Camps, J., & Torres, F. (2011). Contingent reward leader behaviour: Where does it come from? *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, *28*(3), 212-230.

Cerni, T., Curtis, G. J., & Colmar, S. H. (2010). Executive coaching can enhance transformational leadership. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, *5*(1), 81-85.

Chiwara, P., & Lombard, A. (2017). The challenge to promote social and economic equality in Namibia through social work. *Social Work*, *53*(4), 563-578.

Cho, Y., Shin, M., Billing, T. K., & Bhagat, R. S. (2019). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and affective organizational commitment: a closer look at their relationships in two distinct national contexts. *Asian Business and Management*, *18*(3), 187-210.

Clarke, S. (2013). Safety leadership: A meta-analytic review of transformational and transactional leadership styles as antecedents of safety behaviours. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *86*(1), 22-49.

Dartey-Baah, K., & Ampofo, E. Y. (2015). Examining the influence of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles on Perceived Job Stress among Ghanaian Banking Employees. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *10*(8), 161-170.

Diaz-Saenz, H. R. (2011). *Transformational leadership*. In Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds). The SAGE handbook of leadership, Sage, Thousand Oaks, 299-310.

Elwell, S. M., & Elikofer, A. N. (2015). Defining leadership in a changing time. *Journal of Trauma Nursing*, *22*(6), 312-314.

Femi, A. F. (2014). The impact of communication on workers performance in selected organisations in Lagos State, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*; *19*(11), 75-82.

Fitzgerald, S., & Schutte, N. S. (2010). Increasing transformational leadership through enhancing self-efficacy. *Journal of Management Development*, *29*(5), 495-505.

Gadirajurrett, H., Srinivasan, R., Stevens, J., & Jeena. N. (2018). Impact of leadership on teams performance. Retrieved from https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/etm_studentprojects/1912?utm_source=pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu%2Fetm_studentprojects%2F1912&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages on 13 January 2021.

Geldenhuys, M., Laba, K., & Venter, C. M. (2014). Meaningful work, work engagement and organisational commitment. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *40*(1), 1-10.

IPPR, (2014). Easing the Way for Investment in Namibia. By Graham Hopwood.

IPPR, (2019). Improving the Business Environment in Namibia. By Graham Hopwood and Frederico Links.

Ismail, A., Mohamad, M. H., Mohamed, H. A. B., Rafiuddin, N. M., & Zhen, K. W. P. (2010). Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles as a Predictor of Individual Outcomes. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, *17*(6), 89-104.

Jangsiriwattana, T. (2019). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership: Employee perception of organizational performance and work engagement. *Journal of the International Academy for Case Studies*, *25*(3), 1-10.

Jannesari, H., Khorvash, M., & Iravani, M. (2013). A social work study on the effect of different factors on leadership style: A case study of educational system. *Management Science Letters*, *3*(3), 1007-1012.

Jenkins, A. G. (2012). *The value of verbal praise and recognition amongst New Zealand library staff*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

Kazimbu, C., & Pieters, W. R. (2020). Customer service on the menu: work engagement of waiters in Windhoek. *Namibia Journal of Managerial Science*, *3*(1), 69-84.

Lan, T. S., Chang, I., Ma, T. C., Zhang, L. P., & Chuang, K. C. (2019). Influences of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and patriarchal leadership on job satisfaction of cram school faculty members. *Sustainability*, *11*(12), 3465-3478.

Lee, H. W. (2020). Motivational effect of performance management: does leadership matter? *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, *16*(59), 59-76.

Li, Y., Castaño, G., & Li, Y. (2018). Linking leadership styles to work engagement. *Chinese Management Studies*, *12*(2), 433-452.

Littlewood, D. (2014). 'Cursed' communities? Corporate social responsibility (CSR), company towns and the mining industry in Namibia. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *120*(1), 39-63.

Ma, X., & Jiang, W. (2018). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and employee creativity in entrepreneurial firms. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *54*(3), 302-324.

Mason, C., Griffin, M., & Parker, S. (2014). Transformational leadership development. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *35*(3), 179-194.

Meswantri, M., & Ilyas, A. (2018). Determinant of employee engagement and its implications on employee performance. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, *8*(3), 36-44.

Nazim, F. (2016). Principals' Transformational and Transactional Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction of College Teachers. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(34), 18-22.

Nazim Ali, S. J., Ali, A., & Tariq, M. (2014). Transformational and transactional leadership as predictors of job satisfaction, commitment, perceived performance and turnover intention (empirical evidence from Malakand division, Pakistan). *Life Science Journal*, *11*(5), 48-53.

Namibian Statistics Agency (2018). The Namibian labour force survey 2018 report. Retrieved from https://d3rp5jatom3eyn.cloudfront.net/cms/assets/documents/Namibia_Labour_Force_Survey_Reports_2018_pdf.pdf on 28 December 2021.

Osborne, S., & Hammoud, M. S. (2017). Effective employee engagement in the workplace. *International Journal of Applied Management and Technology*, *16* (1), 50-67.

Omolayo, B. (2007). Effect of leadership style on job-related tension and psychological sense of community in work organizations: A case study of four organizations in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*, *4*(2), 30-37.

Pieters, W. R., Van Zyl, E., & Nel, P. (2020). Job attitudes as a predictor of work engagement of lecturing staff at the University of Namibia. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, *17*, 1-11.

Pishgooie, A. H., Atashzadeh-Shoorideh, F., Falcó-Pegueroles, A., & Lotfi, Z. (2019). Correlation between nursing managers' leadership styles and nurses' job stress and anticipated turnover. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *27*(3), 527-534.

Polackova, K. (2016, November). *Motivation, performance and efficiency*. Presented at International Scientific Conference for Ph.D. students of EU countries, London.

Riaz, A., & Haider, M. H. (2010). Role of transformational and transactional leadership on job satisfaction and career satisfaction. *Business and Economic Horizons*, *1*(1), 29-38.

Saleem, A., & Naveed, S. (2017). Leadership and employees reaction towards change: role of leaders' personal attributes and transformational leadership. *Pakistan Administrative Review*, *1*(1), 61-82.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*(1), 71-92.

Sethuraman, K., & Jayshree, S. (2014). "Effective leadership styles. *International Business Research 7*(9), 165-172.

Sharma, M. S., & Sharma, M. V. (2014). Employee engagement to enhance productivity in current scenario. *International Journal of Commerce, Business and Management*, *3*(4), 595-604.

SPSS. (2016). *SPSS 24.0 for Windows*. Chicago, IL: SPSS Incorporated.

Strom, D. L., Sears, K. L., & Kelly, K. M. (2014). Work engagement: The roles of organizational justice and leadership style in predicting engagement among employees. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *21*(1), 71-82.

Summerfield, M. R. (2014). Leadership: A simple definition. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, *71*(3), 251-253.

Sun, J., Chen, X., & Zhang, S. (2017). A review of research evidence on the antecedents of transformational leadership. *Education Sciences*, *7*(1), 15.

Sundi, K. (2013). Effect of transformational leadership and transactional leadership on employee performance of Konawe Education Department at Southeast Sulawesi Province. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, *2*(12), 50-58.

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2011). Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement? *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(1), 121-131.

Trépanier, S. G., Fernet, C., & Austin, S. (2012). Social and motivational antecedents of perceptions of transformational leadership: A self-determination theory perspective. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, *44*(4), 272-277.

Warrilow, S. (2012). Transformational leadership theory-The 4 key components in leading change & managing change. *Harvard Business Review*, *2*(3), 101-104.

Yao, Y. H., Fan, Y. Y., Guo, Y. X., & Li, Y. (2014). Leadership, work stress and employee behavior. *Chinese Management Studies*, *8*(1), 108-126.

Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *26*(4), 66-85.