IJABM

www.ftms.edu.my/journals/index.php/journals/ijabm

Research Paper

LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ITS IMPACT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Joyce Chua
MBA Graduate
Lord Ashcroft International Business School
Anglia Ruskin University, UK
ctsoraya.s@gmail.com

Abdul Basit
Lecturer
School of Accounting & Business Management
FTMS College, Malaysia
Abdulbasit@ftms.edu.my

Zubair Hassan
Senior Lecturer
School of Accounting & Business Management
FTMS College, Malaysia
Zubai7@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to determine the impact of leadership style on employee's performance. A causal research design was used to carry out this research. Middle management employees 'from services sector at different of location in Klang Valley was used. To do this, respondents from a hearing aid company was chosen. Each respondent should have worked more than 5 years in the field. A Likert scale from 1-5 was used to collect data, where the questionnaire was tested for its face, content and construct validity along with reliability of the construct. A sample size of two hundred and fifty (250) respondents was used using non-probability convenient sampling method. Regression analysis was conducted to analyses the data using SPSS 21. The result shows that autocratic and democratic leadership style has positive and significant impact on employee performance. However we found that laissez-fair leadership style have no significant influence on employee performance. This suggests that leaders with extremely distinguished styles have more influences on employee performance as it is more evident throughout their interaction with the immediate supervisor. Therefore, leaders could adopt innovative strategies using suitable leadership style in order to achieve work performance at the very best level as well as to gain the long-term success. Therefore we concluded that the autocratic leadership is useful in the short term and democratic leadership style is useful in all time horizons to improve employee performance. Future research could consider employees reporting immediate supervisors for last five years to ensure more constructive feedback about the leadership style practices by the managers. Also the study should cover a larger sample using more systematic sampling technique to generalize the result.

Key Terms: *Leadership Style, autocratic, democratic and laissez-fair leadership style, employee performance*

1.   INTRODUCTION

This study focus on examining the impact of leadership styles on employee performance. The historical perspective of leadership indicated that recently leadership is used as an effective management approach to manage large size organizations (Iqbal, Anwar & Haidar , 2015). The gradual replacement of personnel administration with human resource management results integration of leadership styles into effective employee management or performance (Iqbal et al, 2015). This demands leaders to adapt themselves to various situation when demand arise to ensure there is effective leadership (Heresy & Blanchard, 1988). Different leadership styles were used based on the amount of direction, decision making power and empowerment (Iqbal et al, 2015). When it comes to administration the leadership , situation and performance of employees are loosely connected and let to hang on their own (Iqbal et al, 2015). This has caused poor employee performance due to the lack of direction and strategic leadership in managing routine work.

Many researches, in the past examined the performance and factors affecting employee performance. One of the dominant key factor that have been discussed in the past researches were leadership such as participative, autocratic, and democratic (Iqbal et al, 2015). Similarly many researches were done to examine the performance and how it was affected by various leadership styles. Most of the studies were highly lacking the data collected on Malaysian context, especially on employees performance and leadership style in commercial service such as ear hearing service providers. The three leadership style was considered as dominant in the past literature, although no research was conducted to examine these styles in the hearing aid sector's working managers to examine at what extent the style of leadership affected its employees. (Iqbal et al , 2015).)

To achieve the aim of this study, the following objectives are formulated
To examine the impact of autocratic leadership Style on Employee Performances
To examine the impact of democratic leadership Style on Employee Performances
To examine the impact of laisses-fair leadership style on Employee Performances

The rest of the paper is organised with four section. The next section will focus on literature review, followed by research methods and data collection procedures, data analysis and discussions and conclusion & recommendations.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership is the most cogitating and investigate at organizational variable, the leader has a potential impact on employee performance (Cummings & Schwab, 1973). The concept of leadership is originally developed in folk psychology to explain the factor of leadership style impact on employee (Jaskaran & Sri-Guru, 2014). Leadership is the process by which a person exerts influence over people and inspires, motivates, and directs their activities to help achieve group or organizational goals (Jones & George, 2004). Leadership is essentially a process in which one individual or sometimes a small group of individuals influences the efforts of others towards the achievement of goals in a given set of circumstances (Cole, 2005). Leadership style is a pattern of behaviours which engaged in by leader when dealing with employee. Lewin, Leppit, and White (1939) acknowledged three leadership styles such as autocratic, democratic and Laissez-Faire. Vigoda-Gadot (2007) argued that , every leader in their organization and operations practices particular leadership style where such styles is referred as a set of the behaviour patterns, leadership frequently occurs during the constant organizational work and others knows leaders by leadership.   The manager of the organization is in very cooperation with the employee, the leadership style of these managers

has a significant impact on employee self-confidence. Consequently it was found that the employee self-confidence has a positive impact on performance (Shirzad & Zanganeh, 2011). Jago (1982) argued that the good leaders are made, but not born. If the person has the desire and determination, he/she can become an effective leader (Jago, 1982). Good leaders develop through a never-ending process of self-study, education, training, and experience (Jago, 1982). The other popular definitions of leadership stated that it is more about an individual who influences a group of people to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2017). According to Zeitchik (2012), leadership about inspiring others to trail the vision until it becomes a shared effort to achieve the vision. Cole (2005) defined leadership as a dynamic process whereby one man influences others to contribute voluntarily to the realization and achievement of the goals and objectives.

Leadership style is the most dominant factors that impact employees' attitudes and behaviours including organizational commitment. Leadership can be defined as the capacity to impact a group of employees' decision, behaviour, recognition of the goal, and work with confidence and zeal (Adair, 2002). Leader is required to develop the future vision, to motivate the organizational members, and to achieve the visions and to improve the performance (Adair, 2002). According to Adair (2002) leadership is the ability to encourage others to seek out and defined objectives enthusiastically. It is the human factor which binds a group together and to improve their performance and to direct them towards goals (Koudri,1999). Also it was suggested that leadership is to deal and cope with change, focus on the long-term and the big picture, not always keep to save him/herself to take risks, and concentrating on people and their values, not just only the bottom-line (Koudri, 1999).

The main goal of any organization is to enhance the employee's job performance that it could survive in this highly competitive environment. Performance is a multidimensional construct and an extremely vital criterion that determines organizational successes or failures (Prasetya & Kato, 2011 July). According to Niranjana and Pattanayak (2005), the performance of an employee is the result and behavior on a task which can be observed and evaluated. Niranjana and Pattanayak (2005) also argued that employee performance is the contribution made by an individual in the accomplishment of organizational goals. Employee performance can be simply the result of the patterns of action, and bring it out to satisfy an objective (Ibrahim, Al Sejini, & Al Qassimi, 2004). According to some researches employee performance consists of directly observable actions of an employee, and also related to either mental actions or products, such as the answers and decisions (Ibrahim et al 2004). This results in organizational attainment of goals. Ibrahim et al (2004) defined job performance as an important activity that provides both the goals and methods to achieve the organizational goals.

Since leadership is one of the key issues that organisation faces and attributes to its success and failures, a vast majority of literature , in the past, have focus on examining the impact of leadership and its effects on employee performance or organisational performance. The similar significant number of studies also has done over in Malaysia. The table below shows some of the key researches done on Malaysian context in examining the impact of leadership and its impact on employee performance.

Table 1: Key studies on leadership in the study context

No.	Student study	Title	Dimension/ Variable
1	Nasrah, (2012)	The relationship between leadership style and employee performance: A case of federal public sector in Sabah	Leadership style employee performance, federal public sector in Sabah.
2	Muthuveloo et al (2014)	Impact of Leadership Styles on Employee Adaptability in Call Center: A Perspective of Telecommunication Industry in Malaysia	leadership styles, employee adaptability, telecommunication industry
3	Long et al (2012)	Leadership Styles and Employees' Turnover Intention: Exploratory Study of Academic Staff in a Malaysian College	Leadership style Employees' turnover Transformation Transactional Organization
4	Voon et al (2011)	The influence of leadership styles on employees Job satisfaction in public sector organizations in Malaysia	Leadership; transformational; transactional; job satisfaction; working condition; working assignment
5	Arham (2014)	Leadership and Performance: The Case of Malaysian Smes In the Services Sector	Transformational leadership, Transactional leadership, Organizational performance, Services SMEs, Malaysia.
6	Nasir et al (2014)	The Relationship of Leadership Styles and organizational performance among IPTA Academic Leaders in Klang Valley Area, Malaysia	Leadership styles, organizational performance, IPTA, Academic leaders
7	Long et al (2014)	The Impact of Transformational Leadership Style on Job Satisfaction	Transformational leadership Followers Leadership styles Job satisfaction Relationship
8	Ali and Tang (2016 January)	Leadership Styles, Business Performance Job Satisfaction, New Leadership Framework, Malaysia	Job Satisfaction influence Business performance

From the past literature, it is obvious that the dominant three style of leadership are autocratic, democratic, and laisses-faire style of leadership. Therefore these three styles will be reviewed.

Swarup (2013) argued that autocratic leadership style is a classified leadership style. It's a style of leadership where a manager is the most powerful entity and it is the primary decision maker (Gordon, 2013). This style of leadership is based on the traditional premise that leaders are good managers who direct and control their people. Autocratic leadership style should be adapted to the characteristics of the leader, the subordinate, and the nature of the situation (Mullins, 2007). Mullins (2007) described autocratic leadership is appropriate

to get the best results during crisis. The attention which given by employee to leadership is based on the assumption that subordinates are more likely to work effectively for managers who adopt a certain style of leadership (Mullins, 2007). DuBrin, Dalglish and Miller (2006) argued that autocratic leader emphasis and considered as a task oriented, and focus on tasks accomplishment. The autocratic leader monitors and exercises powers with little trust or confidence on the followers (DurBrin et al, 2006). Due to this attitude, followers in the system fear and mistrust their leader (Jooste & Fourie, 2009). As autocratic leaders are appropriated in a crisis, difficult and complex situations or situation where quick decision are required to make, autocratic leaders become more effective (Jooste & Fourie, 2009). Autocratic leadership is demonstrated as a controlling, directing, or coercive leader, who seldom takes decisions basing on input from their subordinates (Bass, 1990). Similarly, with McClelland, (1975) autocratic leadership is based on personal dominance and authoritarian behavior that serves the self-interest of the leader, is self-aggrandizing and exploitative of others. The decision is made without any form of consultation and works when there is no need for input on the decision. They make plans of each milestone and their followers are bound to work or follow the rules (Maxwell, 2015). In short, the autocratic leader has full control of those around him and believes to have the complete authority to treat them as he wants. This is useful when immediate and quick decision and performance is required. Dawson (2002) stated that the autocratic style may show great results in a short time period. Similarly Koontz et al (1978) argued that autocratic leadership is only useful with, such as "*situation of emergency*" and "*in case where homogenous work force is involved*" and where the leader is wise, just and has considerable under-standing of the followers.

H1*: Autocratic Leadership Style has a positive significant impact on employee performance*

The Democratic Leader acts to value inputs and commitment via participation, listening to both the bad and the good news (Lewin et al, 1939). Smith (1998) asserted that the democratic leaders have a good relationship with the employee results the effectiveness will and high employee performance. Anderson (1991) also described that democratic leaders as one who shares decision making with the other members and therefore, democratic leadership is connected with higher morale. He denied that democratic leadership is associated with low productivity and high morale and that authoritarian leadership is associated with high productivity and low morale. Daft (2014) also argued that democratic leader delegates authority to others to encourages to make employee own decisions and mostly relies on subordinates' knowledge to complete the task.   The group members have a greater to say in decision-making, determination of policy, implementation of systems and procedures (Mullins, 2007). Jooste and Fourie (2009) argued that democratic leadership leads to improve productivity and job satisfaction.   Democratic Leadership style is one of the most effective leadership style that leads to higher productivity, better contributions from group members, and increased group morale (Anderson, 1991). Under democratic leadership, the superiors allows the subordinates to use their abilities to initiative and make contributions (Anderson, 1991). The leaders also offer support to the subordinates in accomplishing tasks (Igbaekemen &Odivwri, 2015).   In this style, managers' enable employees to make suggestions and recommendations on major issues and give subordinates full control and responsibility for those tasks, encourage subordinates to become good leaders and involved in leadership and employee development (Iqbal et al 2015).   This style provides confidence to employees who will help them for meeting deadlines, and departmental goals, to provide efficient team inputs (Iqbal et al, 2015).

H2*: Democratic Leadership Style has a positive significant impact on employee performance*

Leaders who adopt the laissez-faire leadership style exercise little control over the followers and let the followers have the freedom to carry out their assigned tasks without direct supervision (Wu & Shiu, 2009). Laissez-faire leadership style, leader never intervenes the administrative processes and gives limitless freedom to the followers (Karip 1998). Laissez-faire leadership delegate and hands-off to allow group members to make their own decisions. Wu and Shiu (2009) argued that this type of leaders have little control over the employee, and enable employees to carry out their assigned tasks without direct supervision. Tarsik, Kassim and Nasharudin (2014) found that laissez-faire leadership style provides little or no direction and gives employees as much freedom as possible. Base on Cole (2005) laissez-faire leader seldom involved in work. Mullin (2007) also argued that laissez-faire leader consciously makes decision to pass the focus power to subordinates, and allow them has freedom of action "*do as you think*". Jooste and Fourie (2009) design this leadership as permissive leadership which is based on the premise that followers are ambitious, creative, responsible and accept and achieve the goal together with organization Robbins and Davidhizar (2007) also argued that laissez-fair style is an "*abdicates responsibilities, avoid making decision*". Akpala (1993) found that laisses-faire leaders make decision very slowly and there can be a great deal of "*buck passing*". As a result, the task may not be undertaken and conditionally become chaotic. Also , some researchers have rejected this results such as Garg and Ramjee (2013) who found that that there is a weak but significant and negative correlation between laissez-faire leadership behavior and normative commitment. Also Chen, Beck, and Amos (2005) found these laissez faire leadership styles created negative results. Therefore it indicates that laisses-fair is not an important style that boost the motivation level of workers as compare to other leadership styles (Chaudhry & Javed, 2012).However base don the overall studies, it can be hypothesis as follows:

H3: *Laissez Faire Leadership Style has positive significant impact on employee performance*

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The study engaged 216 employees from 6 organizations in Klang Valley, Malaysia. The majority of the respondents were female 138 (63.9%) and male 78 (36.10%). The ethic of the Chinese is 112 respondents constituted 51.90%, Malay 62 respondent constituted 28.7%, and 25 Indian respondents constituted 11.6%. It is clear that the 94 (43.5%) respondents are from age group 21-30 years, 70 (32.4%) respondents are from aged group of 31-40 years old, and 41 to 50 years is about 39 respondents with 18.10%. There 119 marriage respondents (55.10%) and 90 people (41.70%) still single. In terms of education level, result show that 97 respondents (36.60%) were bachelor's degree holder or professional degree, and 52 respondents (24.10%) just graduated from some of college. In terms of work experience, 70 employees (32.40%) has work experience of 5 years, 65 respondents (30.10%) have worked 6 to 10 years, and 27 respondents (12.5%) has worked more than 11 years to 15 years. In terms of income , 74 respondents (34.3%) earned a salary of RM2500.00 to RM5000.00. About 73 (33.8%) respondents earned less than RM2500.00. 41 people (19%) earned a salary ranged from RM5000.00 to RM10,000.00 per month.

Procedures

The sample consisted of participants from 6 (six) hearing aid companies. Cochran's test was used to determine sample size. Sample size of 235 employees was calculated with a confidence level of 94%. The combined workforce of these companies is approximately more than 250 staff. Therefore we distributed 250 copies in the Leadership Style

questionnaires. We received 235 questionnaires from respondents, although 222 questionnaires were successfully completed and returned. We only used 216 after omission of all questionnaires that have multiple responses and other issues in the questionnaires.

Random sampling method is also used. Simple random sampling was used and respondents from each department of each company was selected using a lottery. Data Processing and data analysis involved data coding and analysis (Gatara, 2010 cited in Suzan, 2016). Data analysis was done using quantitative approaches. Descriptive statistics such as mean and percentages were applied in the data analysis. The results were presented using tables with explanations on all parameters used. The descriptive statistical method was applied to analyses quantitative data where data were scored by calculating the percentages, means and standard deviation.

Research Instrument

Questionnaire was designed to gather the data. It consists of three parts: A, B, and C.

Part – A: deals with demographic details such as sex, education, age, etc.
Part – B: consists of 18 statements to measure the leadership styles of autocratic, democratic, and laisses faire from employee perspectives
Part-C: Five (5) items to measure employee performance such as productivity, punctuality, teamwork, skill improvement and efficiency.

By including variables, questionnaire is prepared with five points Likert scaling system. Then analysis is made with appropriate statistical tools, in order to prove the objectives of the study and to test the hypotheses. The scale construction was testing its normality and reliability.

Normality is assessed using kurtosis and skewness of the data distribution. In multivariate analysis (Ryu, 2011), the data normality is ensured if the absolute value is within (<0.1) OR (<. 001). This statistic ranges from -1 to +1. Absolute values above 0.2 indicate great skewness (Olsson, Gassne, & Hansson, 2009). It is more than Six (6) questions (D1, D2, D6, LF4, EP4, and EP5) which is more than 1 and higher than 2.055) the rest is in an acceptable range and under the suggested value. It is important to note that these are Six (6) questions found to be normal during the pilot testing. Since the greater value of those six (6) questions indicated in Kurtosis's data set is not considered normal and further reliability testing was conducted.

Cronbach's Alpha is a coefficient of reliability, while the inter-item correlation addresses the correlation between individual items that should exceed or be greater than 0.3 (Hassan & Diallo, 2013). The bench mark value of reliability is 0.7 (Hair, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2011). The following results were obtained about the reliability of the research instrument:

Table: 2: Reliability Test

Variables	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (N = 216)
Autocratic	6	0.673
Democratic	6	0.921
Laissez-faire	6	0.634
Employee Performance	5	0.835
Overall Scale	23	0.808

4. RESULT AND DISUCSSION

Descriptive Statistics

Table: 3: Mean and Standard Deviation

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Autocratic	216	3.12	0.63
Democratic	216	3.64	0.82
Laissez-Faires	216	3.37	0.55
Employee Performance	216	3.76	0.65

The table above shows the overall perception of three different leadership behaviour of the managers from employee perspectives. Democratic leadership is considered as the most practiced or displayed behaviour with a mean value of 3.64 (SD=0.682), followed by laissez-faire with a mean value of 3.37 (SD=0.55) followed by autocratic leadership behaviour with a mean value of 3.12 (SD=0.63) indicating the least displayed leadership behaviour is autocratic among the managers. Employee performance scored a mean value of 3.76 (SD=0.65) suggesting that employee performance was seen as high among the employees.

Correlations

Table 4: Correlation Analysis

Variables	Employee performance	Autocratic	Democratic	Laissez-Faires
Employee Performance	1			
Autocratic	0.137*	1		
Democratic	0.311**	-0.130	1	
Laissez-faires	0.144*	0.174*	0.446**	1
*.Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)				
**.Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed)				

Landau and Everitt (2004) listed that the correlation coefficients range which from "-1" to "+1" representing perfect negative and positive correlation. Ringim, et.al. (2012) stated that the general rule of thumb the value should not more than 0.75, similar correlations of 0.8 or higher are suggested problematic. Any correlation coefficient that is within -1.00 or +1.00 indicates a perfect correlation between the variables (Hair et al, 2011). Therefore, variables that are found with Pearson r value that is closer to "-1.00 or +1.00" will be identified as perfectly related.

The table above suggests that all the leadership styles have a significant and positive relationship with employee performance. Also laissez-faire style is significant and positively associated with all the other leadership styles.

Regressions

Table 5: Model Summary of Employee performance

Model Summary[b]					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.361[a]	0.131	0.118	0.6142	1.993
a. Predictors: (Constant), Laissez-faire, Autocratic, Democratic					
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance					

The general rules of thumb a good fit is considered to predict a minimum of 60% variation of the dependent variable (Zygnont & Smith, 2014). According to the above table adjusted R Square is 0.118. Therefore, this model is considered to be a poor fit and it is not a good fit. The Durbin-Watson statistic (Montgomery, Peck, & Vining, 2001) defined between

0 and 4 for no autocorrelation. The Durbin-Watson is 1.993 which shows no auto correlation between selected sample sizes as value falls in a range of 1.5 to 2.5.

Table 6: Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.298	0.333		6.905	0.000
	Autocratic	0.200	0.070	0.191	2.861	0.005
	Democratic	0.285	0.059	0.358	4.862	0.000
	Laissez-faire	-0.058	0.089	-0.048	-0.651	0.515

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

According to the table above, autocratic leadership style beta coefficient value is 0.191 with a significant value of 0.005 which is lower than 0.05 (Van Vugt & De Cremer, 1999). Hence the autocratic leadership style is found to have a positive significant impact on employee performance. Bass (1990) has noticed that Autocratic leadership mostly acts as controlling, directing, or coercive leader, who seldom takes decisions basing on input from their subordinates. Employees fell under pressure reported autocratic supervision on the part of their leaders. However, Dawson (2002) stated that the autocratic style may show great results in a short time period. H1: (Accepted)

Democratic leadership style has a beta coefficient value of 0.358 with a significant value of 0.000 which is lower than 0.01 (Van Vugt & De Cremer, 1999).   Hence the Democratic leadership style is found to have a positive and significant impact on employee performance. Lewin et al (1939) found that democratic leadership style in which members of the group take a more participative role in the decision-making process, given the opportunity to participate, ideas are exchanged freely, and discussion is encouraged.   However, Akpala (1993) argued, democratic leadership is claimed to be earliest amongst all other leadership styles. Yet, Iqbal et al (2015) stated that the democratic leadership style is usually considered a benefit for the most companies. This style focuses the management that provides guidance and help to its team and departments while accepting and receiving the inputs from individual team members. H2: (Accepted)

Laissez Faire leadership style as shown in the table above beta coefficient value is -0.048 with a significant value of 0.515 which is higher than 0.05 (Van Vugt & De Cremer, 1999). Hence Laissez Faire leadership style is found to have a Negative insignificant impact on employee performance. According to Ismail, Hussain, and Rashid, (2011) employees who were allowed to make their own decision would have higher levels of commitment to the organization. However, Van Vugt et al (2004) argued that Laissez-Faire leader has no control mechanism for group members by giving freedom to employees is perceived as a situation in their favour. H3: (Rejected)

5.   CONCLUSION

we have identified that the first and two variables which autocratic and democratic leadership style have a positive and significant impact towards employee's performance resulting in these extreme leadership styles can impact on an employee's performance on either good or bad ways. However, the Laissez Faire leadership style has a significant negative impact on employee performance.

A strong leadership positive impact an autocratic style, it can take charge of the group, assign tasks to different subordinate, and establish solid deadlines for projects to be finished. The subordinates may accept an autocratic style. It allows employees of the group

to pay attention on performing specific tasks without concern about making complex decisions.   This also allows the subordinates to become highly skilled at performing certain duties, which can be beneficial to the group.   The autocratic leadership only allow to cater for the short-term period, as many instances where this leadership style can be problematic.

Democratic leadership has been described as the most effective leadership style, but it does have some potential downsides.   In situations where roles are unclear or time is of the essence, some-time the democratic leadership would lead to communication failures and uncompleted projects. In some cases, group members may not have the necessary knowledge or expertise to make quality contributions to the decision-making process.   Democratic leadership works best in situations, where group members are skilled and eager to share their knowledge. It is also important to have plenty of time to allow people to contribute, develop a plan and then vote on the best course of action.

Over all, Laissez-faire leadership can be effective in situations, depend on the group members are highly skilled, motivated and capable of working on their own.   The conventional term for this style is of 'laissez-faire' leadership style and implies a completely hands-off approach, many leaders still remain open and available to group members for consultation and feedback.   The negatively happen to Laissez-faire leadership, which is without the ideal in situations, when the group members lack the knowledge or experience they need to complete tasks and make decisions. Some people are not good at setting their own deadlines, managing their own projects and solving problems on their own. In such situations, the projects can go off-track and deadlines can be missed when team members do not get enough guidance or feedback from leaders.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made:

✓ For Employees:

- To be provide more professional image in the service line. The internal employee need learn how to self-upgrades and at the same time, seriously take the responsible for the each of duty.

- To be working more independently.   As an executive level to middle management, leadership needs to seriously review at their work scope, in order to follow the regulation system of management.

- To be more communication, in order to become closer relationship. All the branch leaders, managers, or executive need to work closer with the team as to know clearer about the condition for the daily, weekly and monthly process, at the same time, can be straightly to know about the work fall, directly to solve the issue of each of the team members.

- To be seriously applied the punishment at the employee who didn't care and work seriously, and follow the instruction of the company. If they are a person who unable to stop long this, didn't respect or didn't care about the assign work.

✓ For Leaders or Managers

- The manager could pay more attention and give clear direction to the subordinate who could steer employees toward a vision firmly that exists in all the departments.

- o Capable of being a Straight, Flexible and creative manager/s, their employees can able to develop their ability in order to improve the performance of employees with max.

- o The managers could pay more attention to employee to that the relationship between manager and subordinates, who could give each other satisfy of coordination and improve their performance

- o The manager to be trained to use both styles of leadership and along with the increasing need for new skills and competencies of leadership as a result of changes in coordination, productive and motivated.

- ✓ For companies

  - o The organization should be providing standard different of compensation benefit and improved working environment if the absolute potential of employee is desired

  - o The organization should be integrated the employee more on the decision process, the importantly on the issues of concerns.

  - o Each team should be set up weekly meeting and motivation; Each of department should set up monthly meeting verify for the new issues and issue solved, Head of department should hold the quarterly meetings to get leadership feedback. The Company should hold a yearly meeting to give reward to the team or department who did the best performance, and focus more on weak team and get them on the right track.

  - o The organization looks for more cooperation, it must be fostered between subordinate and employees.

  - o The organization may consider in applying a multiple of leadership style (transformational), for the group of employees, because it is one of good impact and it will transcend most of leadership styles.

  - o The Organization should be formulated and express the polices, it will encourage the manager and employees to be part of the owner of the organization.

  - o The organization should be dismissed some of negative employees who might influence others employees and they can show in a weak performance.

Limitations

The main limitation observed is related to the sample size of the study. All the respondents were from a single service field, which could influence their work performance and reward perceptions due to its practices and other factors. The results cannot be universal or generalize the finding across all the industries or even the own industry due to the limited companies involved.

Future Research Direction

It is important to examine the impact of leadership style on employee performance by considering a larger ample size including employees and managers from all the companies in the industry.

Also future researchers can analyses the impact of moderating effect of employee tenure or age or gender on the relationship between leadership style and employee performance. Alternatively future researches can examine the mediating effect of personality or emotional intelligence of leaders on the relationship between leadership style and employee performance.

REFERENCES

Adair, J. E. (2002). Inspiring leadership-learning from great leaders. Thorogood Publishing.

Akpala, A. (1993). Management: An introduction and the Nigerian perspective. Department of Management, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Nigeria.

Ali, N. N. K., & Tang, S. Y. (2016, January). Does Multiple Leadership Styles Mediated by Job Satisfaction Influence Better Business Performance? Perception of MNC Employees in Malaysia. In SHS Web of Conferences (Vol. 23). EDP Sciences.

Anderson, S.E. (1991). Principal's management style and patterns of teacher implementation across multiple innovations. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 2 (4), 286-304.

Arham, A. F. (2014). Leadership and performance: The case of Malaysian SMEs in the services sector. International Journal of Asian Social Science, 4(3), 343-355.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational dynamics, 18(3), 19-31.

Chaudhry, A. Q., & Javed, H. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez faire leadership style on motivation. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3(7).

Chen, H. C., Beck, S. L., & Amos, L. K. (2005). Leadership styles and nursing faculty job satisfaction in Taiwan. Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 37(4), 374-380.

Cole, G.A. (2005). Organizational Behavior. Nottingham: TJ International

Cummings, L. L., & Schwab, D. P. (1973). Performance in organizations: Determinants & appraisal. Good Year Books.

Daft, R. L. (2014). The leadership experience. Cengage Learning.

Dawson, L. L. (2002). Crises of charismatic legitimacy and violent behavior in new religious movements. Cults, Religion, and Violence, 80-101.

DuBrin, A. J., Dalglish, C., & Miller, P. (2006). Leadership: 2nd Asia-Pacific Edition.

Garg, A. K., & Ramjee, D. (2013). The relationship between leadership styles and employee commitment at a parastatal company in South Africa. The International Business & Economics Research Journal (Online), 12(11), 1411.

Gordon, G. (2013). School leadership linked to engagement and student achievement. Washington, DC: Gallup.

Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. Journal of Marketing theory and Practice, 19(2), 139-152.

Hassan, Z., & Diallo, M. M. (2013). Cross-cultural adjustments and expatriate's job performance: a study on Malaysia. International Journal of Accounting and Business Management,(IJABM), 1(1), 8-23.

Ibrahim, M. E., Al Sejini, S., & Al Qassimi, O. A. A. (2004). Job satisfaction and performance of government employees in UAE. Journal of Management Research, 4(1), 1-12.

Igbaekemen, G. O., & Odivwri, J. E. (2015). Impact of leadership style on organization performance: A critical literature review. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 5(142), 1-7.

Iqbal, N., Anwar, S., & Haider, N. (2015). Effect of leadership style on employee performance. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 5(5), 1-6 (Online).

Ismail, W. K. W., Hussain, G., & Rashid, M. A. (2011). Integrative framework of leadership effectiveness. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2(2).

Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. Management science, 28(3),315-336.

Jaskaran, S.D. and Sri-Guru, G.S. (2014). Challenges of Organizational Behavior: Leadership and its Impact on Performance of Employees: A case Study of a Public Sector Bank in Mohali. Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research, 3 (11), 33-50.

Jones, G.R. and George, JM. (2004). Essentials Managing Organizational Behavior, Upper Saddle River. Prentice Hall

Jooste, C., & Fourie, B. (2009). The role of strategic leadership in effective strategy implementation: Perceptions of South African strategic leaders. Southern African Business Review, 13(3), 51-68

Karip,E(1998). Transformational Leadership. Educational Administration in Theory and Practice, 4(16), 443-465.

Kootz H (1978) Principles of management. McGraw Hill, Tokyo.

Kourdi J (1999) One stop leadership. ICSA Publishing Limited, London

Landau, S., & Everitt, B. S. (2004). Analysis of repeated measures II: Linear mixed model. A Handbook of Statistical Analysis Using SPSS. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall, 194-215.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". The Journal of social psychology, 10(2), 269-299.

Long, C. S., Thean, L. Y., Ismail, W. K. W., & Jusoh, A. (2012). Leadership styles and employees' turnover intention: Exploratory study of academic staff in a Malaysian College. World Applied Sciences Journal, 19(4), 575-581.

Long, C. S., Yusof, W. M. M., Kowang, T. O., & Heng, L. H. (2014). The impact of transformational leadership style on job satisfaction. World Applied Sciences Journal, 29(1), 117-124.

Maxwell, J. C. (2002). Leadership 101: What every leader needs to know. Thomas Nelson.

McClelland, D. C. (1975). Power: The inner experience. Irvington.

Montgomery, D. C., Peck, E. A., & Vining, G. G (2001) Introduction to Linear Regression Analysis.

Mullins, L. J. (2007). Management and organisational behaviour. Pearson education.

Muthuveloo, R., Kathamuthu, K., & Ping, T. A. (2014). Impact of Leadership Styles on Employee Adaptability in Call Center: A Perspective of Telecommunication Industry in Malaysia. Asian Social Science, 10(7), 96-106.

Nasir, H. M., Nordin, R., Seman, S. A. A., & Rahmat, A. (2014). The Relationship of Leadership Styles and organizational performance among IPTA Academic Leaders in Klang Valley Area, Malaysia. Business & Entrepreneurship Journal, 3(2), 1-3.

Nasrah, A. (2012). The relationship between leadership style and employee performance: A case of federal public sector in Sabah (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Malaysia Sabah).

Niranjana, P., & Pattanayak, B. (2005). Influence of learned optimism and organisational ethos on organisational citizenship behaviour: A study on Indian corporations. International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management, 5(1), 85-98.

Northouse, P. G. (2017). Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice. Sage Publications.

Olsson, M., Gassne, J., & Hansson, K. (2009). Do different scales measure the same construct? Three sense of coherence scales. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 63(2), 166-167.

Prasetya, A., & Kato, M. (2011, July). The effect of financial and non-financial compensation to the employee performance. In The 2nd International Research Symposium in Service Management. Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Ringim, K. J., Razalli, M. R., & Hasnan, N. (2012). A framework of business process re-engineering factors and organizational performance of Nigerian banks. Asian Social Science, 8(4), 203-216

Robbins, B., & Davidhizar, R. (2007). Transformational leadership in health care today. The Health Care Manager, 26(3), 234-239.

Shirzad, K. B., & Zanganeh, F. (2011). The relationship between senior managers leadership style of school districts of Tehran and spirit of the administrators in girls state school. Journal of Management Research and Training, 1(1), 105-124.

Smith, C. (1998). Political Parties in the Information Age: from mass party to leadership organization. Public administration in an information age.

Susan, N. (2016). Influence of Transformational Leadership on Employee Performance. A Case Study of Safaricom Limited. Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management, 3(2), 33-55

Swarup, B. (2013). Leadership. Retrieved from http://www.hrfolks.com. (access at 17th January 2018)

Tarsik, N. F., Kassim, N. A., & Nasharudin, N. (2014). Transformational, Transactional or Laissez-Faire: What Styles do University Librarians Practice?. Journal of Organizational Management Studies, 2014 (2014),1-10.

Van Vugt, M., & De Cremer, D. (1999). Leadership in social dilemmas: The effects of group identification on collective actions to provide public goods. Journal of personality and social psychology, 76(4), 587.

Van Vugt, M., Jepson, S. F., Hart, C. M., & De Cremer, D. (2004). Autocratic leadership in social dilemmas: A threat to group stability. Journal of experimental social psychology, 40(1), 1-13.

Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models. Personnel Review, 36(5), 661-683.

Voon, M. L., Lo, M. C., Ngui, K. S., & Ayob, N. B. (2011). The influence of leadership styles on employees' job satisfaction in public sector organizations in Malaysia. International Journal of Business, Management and Social Sciences, 2(1), 24-32.

Wu, F., & Shiu, C. (2009). The Relationship between leadership styles and foreign English teachers job satisfaction in adult English cram schools: Evidences in Taiwan. The Journal of American Academy of Business, 14(2), 75-82.

Zeitchik, S. (2012). 10 Ways to Define Leadership. Business News Daily.

Zygmont, C., & Smith, M. R. (2014). Robust factor analysis in the presence of normality violations, missing data, and outliers&58; Empirical questions and possible solutions. Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 10(1), 40-55.