

The Mediation Effect of Effective Leadership Behavior on the Relationship between Leadership Self-Efficacy and Managerial Job Performance

Shehu Inuwa Galoji
Department of Business Administration
Bauchi State University
Gadau-Nigeria
shehugaloji@gmail.com

Abstract— Background: The study on leadership and what makes it effective can never be over emphasized, it was observed that since the beginning of the 19th century, there was proliferation of research studies on the leadership phenomenon aimed at enhancing the ability to predict effective leadership in organizations

Aims:- This study attempts to examine the relationship between leadership self-efficacy and managerial job performance and whether effective leadership behavior mediates the relationship.

Methods: Quantitative data using questionnaire was collected among the branch managers of the banks.

Results: The result shows that LSE influences the managerial performance. The result shows that hypothesis H1 is hereby supported. The result of the mediation test shows that LSE is significantly related to managerial job performance. Hierarchical regression analysis was conducted using the Baron and Kenny (1986) method (four steps of mediation analysis). And the result shows partial mediation had occurred.

Conclusions: The findings of this study on the relationship between LSE and managerial job performance are in concord with previous studies. Further, future studies should consider the other dimensions of interest.

Index Terms— Leadership, Self-Efficacy, Managerial Job Performance, Effective Leadership Behavior

I. INTRODUCTION

The study on leadership and what makes it effective can never be over emphasized. Yukl (1989) observed since the beginning of the 19th century that there was proliferation of research studies on the leadership phenomenon aimed at enhancing the ability to predict effective leadership in organizations (Hendricks & Payne, 2007). Leadership has been adjudged in work situations as an important phenomenon due to its connection, to some extent, on what people usually assume and the extent they demonstrate it to the effectiveness of organizations. Further it was argued that although effectiveness has been usually operationalized, it has been assumed as a unitary characteristic, which defines some form of commonly accepted theorem showing that leadership is not unitary, but a combination of related ones, always enhancing effectiveness.

Several scholars in the past have defined and explained leadership in various ways based on their interests and concerns (Oyinlade, 2006). Hence, it is argued that a universally agreed definition of leadership does not exist in the

literature (e.g. Yukl, 1998; Paglis, 2010). Despite being a broadly understood notion, leadership is a concept that has defied a consensus in definition and measurement (House and Podsakoff, 1994). In one of the penultimate treatments of theory and research on leadership, Bass (1990) observed that there are seemingly as many definitions of leadership as there are scholars endeavoring to study this concept (Schafer, 2010). Bennis and Nanus (1985), and Oyinlade (2006), reported that scholars and researchers alike had defined leadership in different ways over so many years. Conger (1992) also indicated that leadership is largely an intuitive concept for which there can never be a single agreed-upon definition.

Although a sample of the writings in the area however shows some form of common themes (Paglis, 2010), i.e. leadership is seen as a process of social interaction where the leader's ability in influencing the behaviors of their followers can strongly influence the performance outcomes (Pirola-Merlo et al., 2002; Kerr, Garvin, Heaton & Boyle, 2006); leadership is seen as a process of social influence that focuses on the accomplishment of common objectives (Yukl, 1998; Vardiman, Houghton & Jinkerson, 2006; Paglis, 2010).

Alas, Tafel, and Tuulik (2007) viewed leadership in terms of individual traits, leader behavior, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, influence over followers, influence on task goals, and influence on organizational culture (Amagoh, 2009). Three themes that appear in the literature according to Paglis (2010) are social influence, voluntary followership and objective/strategy setting. However, it can be said that the recurring theme that appeared in many leadership definitions involves the use of non-coercive influences to coordinate the activities of group members towards the accomplishment of group goals (Oyinlade, Gellhaus, & Darboe, 2003; Oyinlade, 2006).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) and Effective Leadership Behavior

The most popular area having much interest in the research on leadership efficacy and other work related outcomes is leadership efficacy and effective leadership behavior relationship (Paglis, 2010). Murphy and Ensher (1999) assessed twice the quality of relationships and characteristics over an eight week period. They investigated the contribution of team member characteristics towards the

development of leader-member exchange. It was found that LSE relates to leaders' own ratings of leader-member exchange and not that of followers as LSE correlates with perceptions of follower performance.

The result of Kane et al (2002) showed that LSE related significantly to a leader's goal level, strategies and functional leadership behaviors. Using expectancy-valence models of career choice, self-efficacy theory and attribution theory, Singer (1989, 1991) conducted two studies on leadership by conceptualizing leadership aspirations as a special case of career choice. In the first study, the result showed that individuals with higher levels of leadership aspiration scored higher on their self-efficacy, effectiveness, abilities in matching their self-efficacy and ease of access. They showed high positivity towards leadership characteristics and their belief in leadership is based on internal sources. Furthermore, in another study using a set of middle managers, Singer (1991) the result showed all the forms of LSE related positively with positive attitudes of leadership characteristics in leadership efficacy-effectiveness relationship.

McCormick (1999), in a study, examined whether sex-role identity and goal orientation influenced LSE development by conducting fifteen week leadership training with students in control classes. It was found that LSE was stable over time as the students were assessed before and after the intervention. In the same vein, McCormick et al., (2002) extended Bandura's (1986) self-efficacy concept to the leadership domain, it was found that LSE positively correlated with both prior leadership experience and attempt to assume leadership positions as it distinguished leaders from non-leaders. Thus women were found to have significantly lower LSE compared to men. In line with gender matching, a study conducted in a union setting by assessing the effects of verbal persuasion and gender matching on LSE. It was found that being encouraged to serve as a shop steward was significantly associated with higher efficacy for leadership and the effect was augmented when the leader and follower are of the same gender. Further, female participants were found to be less confident about their leadership capabilities than men.

In a study aimed at studying the levers of change, Paglis and Green (2002) tested a theoretical model of LSE and its relationship to leadership attempts. They surveyed managers and direct reports in two organizations on bio-data, personality and LSE, leadership attempts and organizational commitment. The factor analysis of the study presented three factors i.e. direction-setting, gaining followers' commitment and overcoming obstacles to change. This result is consistent with studies by McCormick et al. (2002), Chan and Drasgow (2001) and Hendricks and Payne (2007) on individuals' attempts/motivation to lead. However, it was argued that the study of Paglis and Green (2002) only considered managerial efficacy of driving change related behavior or initiatives. In line with the call for more research on the relationship between LSE and effective leadership behavior, Anderson et al., (2008), improved on the work of Paglis and Green (2002) to construct taxonomy of LSE and that of effective leadership.

The researchers argued that LSE has all the necessary

potentials to aid in the predicting of effective leadership in organizations; as such, a comprehensive and empirically derived taxonomic structure is needed to aid in hypothesis development and theory formation. It is on the laudable effort of Paglis and Green (2002) that Anderson, et al., (2008) built upon the work in three areas, i.e. to construct two separate tools for LSE and effective leadership; their taxonomic structure of LSE and effective leadership and LSE-effective leadership behavior relationship.

Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) and Managerial Performance

Managerial performance is often defined as "managerial behaviors believed to be optimal for identifying, assimilating and utilizing resources (including human resources) towards sustaining the organizational unit for which a manager has responsibility" (Oh and Berry, 2009). McCloy, Campbell and Cudeck, (1994) defined the term 'performance' as those behaviors or actions which are regarded as relevant to those goals of the said organization in question. They further argued that performance cannot be said to be the outcome itself, consequences or the result of behaviors or action, but rather performance can be said to be the action itself.

Several of the researches have highlighted the effectiveness of LSE in predicting leadership, group, and organizational outcomes (Hoyt et al., 2003; Chemers et al., 2000; Watson et al., 1996). The meta analysis by Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) on self-efficacy and performance as well as organizational performance (Wood & Bandura, 1989a) have shown a positive and significant result; as such, it is not surprising that scholars are now showing interest in linking self-efficacy to leadership domain. Robertson and Sadri (1993), in their study, found that managerial efficacy relates to most of performance criteria except written communication. Thus, it shows that overall managerial efficacy significantly relates to supervisor rating of performance. Onglatco et al., (1993), found that managerial efficacy significantly relates to perceived mobility, perceived success and earned salary.

One of the studies that serve as an impetus to the current research is the work of Semadar et al., (2006). They found that LSE positively relates to job performance ratings when assessed bivariate but did not add to the predictive validity beyond political skill, gender and the seniority of the managers individually; thus it recorded a weaker result. Furthermore Hannah (2006) used three-conditions under a thirty-eight week longitudinal study using a sample of ninety one first year military cadets to develop and test a model of argentic leadership efficacy (ALE). The result showed that overall ALE was stable over time as it correlated with higher levels of self-concept, clarity meta-cognitive ability, motivation to lead and the senior officers' ratings of transformational leadership and performance.

In the same vein, Chemers et al., (2000), in their study, LSE as seen in the result significantly correlated with the instructor ratings of leadership potential, the overall officer ratings in a training camp, the peer-ratings of leadership effectiveness and the scores on two squad leader assessments. The result further showed LSE did not significantly relate to

non-leadership performance outcomes.

Murphy et al., (2003) found that leadership efficacy relate to the performance of female and minority managers but not with white male managers. Additionally, Watson (2001) found that an individual's self-efficacy was significantly related to objective individual performance and the collective efficacy was significantly related to objective group performance. Wood and Bandura (1989), in another study, reported that managerial self-efficacy impacted on prior performance to the task that is successful. Additionally, findings in the self-efficacy literature (while small in number) also suggested that LSE perceptions contribute to leadership success (McCormick 2002).

Based on the foregoing results of the literature highlighted on the LSE and managerial performance, the result of Robertson and Sadri (1993), Onglatco et al. (1993) Murphy and Ensher (1999) and Semadar et al. (2006) are in concord with one another. The studies reported how LSE relates to managerial and organizational performance. Although the work of Semadar et al. (2006) did not agree with the studies when considered individually as it recorded a weaker relationship, they recommended future studies to measure managerial job performance based on multidimensional measure.

III. THEORY

This research uses the self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1986) and the adaptive self-regulation mode (Tsui, 1984). Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as "belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments". The stronger the perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goals people set for themselves, the firmer their commitment to them (Gist, 1984; Bandura & Wood 1989). Self-efficacy is an important motivational construct that influences choices, goals, effort, coping, persistence, and performance (Hoyt et al., 2003). The adaptive self-regulation model proposes that standards like roles, and fit assessments set by various managerial constituents influence manager behavioral leadership which may in turn, influence managerial performance (Sosik, Potosky and Jung, 2002). Tsui & Ashford (1994) stated that when managers in an organization detect discrepancies that relate to them or constituent's standards, then they try to reduce the discrepancies which in turn influence their subsequent behavior and standard on their performance.

IV. METHODOLOGY

This study uses a descriptive and correlational type of survey design. This type of design is considered suitable for collecting primary data. Descriptive type of studies are usually undertaken in organizations so as to learn about or describe characteristics of a group, i.e. age, level of education, job status or years of service (Sekaran & Baugie, 2009). The population of this study comprises the branch managers of commercial banks. This study uses the probability sampling technique. According to Sekaran (2003), probability sampling

gives each respondent equal chance of being chosen as a sample. For this purpose, stratified sampling was adopted.

Measurements of variables of LSE measures were adapted from the taxonomy of LSE by Anderson et al., (2008); These measures were found in various studies in the past, i.e. Anderson et al., (2008); Blake and Mouton (1982); Fleishman (1975); Bass (1990). This study uses the SPSS software version 16 for the purpose of the analysis and hypothesis testing. In this case, several statistical/techniques were performed in the analysis. Analysis in this study includes the factor analysis, reliability test and regression analysis.

V. RESULTS

Factor Analysis and Reliability Test

Factor analysis and reliability test was conducted. Leadership self-efficacy is measured by 24 items. The factor analysis resulted in the deletion of 4 items thus making 20 items to measure LSE. Reliability test was then conducted and the result shows leadership self-efficacy has a reliability of (.64). The second factor analysis was on effective leadership behavior with 17 measures. The result of the factor analysis shows that 4 items were also to be deleted. The number of Items, KMO and Bartlett's Test and Cumulative were all found to meet the assumption of factor analysis. Reliability test was conducted and the result shows effective leadership behavior shows a Cronbach Alpha value of .71. Managerial job performance has 13 items; the factor analysis resulted in the deletion of 3 items. The number of Items, KMO and Bartlett's Test and Cumulative are all in concord with the assumptions. Subsequently, reliability test was also conducted to which the result shows the Cronbach alpha value of managerial job performance is .79.

VI. REGRESSION ANALYSIS

H1 Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) and Managerial Performance

To ascertain the level of this relationship, hypothesis H1 was developed as *Leadership self-efficacy significantly influences managerial job performance*. This hypothesis was tested using the regression analysis. The regression analysis between LSE and managerial job performance shows that LSE in this result explains 9.8% of the model ($R^2 = .098$, F-Change = 44.811, $p < .01$). It has a Beta value of $\beta = .314$, $p < .01$. It is therefore found that hypothesis H1 is supported.

H2 Effective Leadership Behaviour Mediates the Relationship between LSE and Managerial Performance

The result of the hierarchical regression shows that the independent variable (LSE) is significantly related to the mediator variable (effective leadership behavior) at $\beta = .314$, $p < .000$. Further, the next step shows that the independent variable (LSE) is significantly related to the dependent variable (managerial job performance) with $\beta = .338$, $p < .000$ which indicates that the second step of the mediation test has been fulfilled and found significant. In the third step, the independent variable and the mediator variables were regressed on the dependent variable and the result shows that

the mediator variable was significant $\beta = .152$, $p < .002$. This indicates that the third step has been fulfilled. The fourth step is to ascertain whether full or partial mediation has occurred. The independent variable (LSE) beta value is still significant at $\beta = .262$, $p < .000$, but the dependent variable have recorded a decrease in beta value; thus according to Baron and Kenny (1986), a partial mediation has taken place.

VII. DISCUSSION

In sum, the hypothesis H1 which states LSE influences the managerial performance. The result shows that hypothesis H1 is hereby supported. The findings of this study on the relationship between LSE and managerial job performance are in concord with previous studies, Stajkovic and Luthans (1998), Robertson and Sadri (1993), Onglatco et al., (1993), lastly, the work of Semadar et al., (2006). In order to ascertain the mediation, hierarchical regression analysis was conducted using the Baron and Kenny (1986) method (four steps of mediation analysis). The result of the mediation test shows that LSE is significantly related to managerial job performance.

The second step shows that LSE is significantly related to effective leadership behavior (mediating variable). The independent variable and the mediator variables were regressed on the dependent variable and the result shows that the mediator variable was significant. The fourth step is to ascertain whether full or partial mediation had occurred. The result shows that the independent variable's (LSE) beta value is still significant but the beta value shows a decrease.

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), a partial mediation has taken place. This result thus implies that LSE had a direct and indirect impact on managerial job performance of the managers in organizations. The result is in concord with the model of Tsui and Ashford's (1994) adaptive self-regulation model, Sosik et al., (2002) Taggar and Seijts (2003) and Cavazotte, Moreno and Hickmann (2012).

VIII. CONCLUSION

In sum, the hypothesis H1 which states LSE influences the managerial performance. The result shows that hypothesis H1 is hereby supported. The findings of this study on the relationship between LSE and managerial job performance are in concord with previous studies, Stajkovic and Luthans (1998), Robertson and Sadri (1993), Onglatco et al., (1993), lastly, the work of Semadar et al., (2006). In order to ascertain the mediation, hierarchical regression analysis was conducted using the Baron and Kenny (1986) method (four steps of mediation analysis). The result of the mediation test shows that LSE is significantly related to managerial job performance.

The second step shows that LSE is significantly related to effective leadership behavior (mediating variable). The independent variable and the mediator variables were regressed on the dependent variable and the result shows that the mediator variable was significant. The fourth step is to ascertain whether full or partial mediation had occurred. The

result shows that the independent variable's (LSE) beta value is still significant but the beta value shows a decrease.

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), a partial mediation has taken place. This result thus implies that LSE had a direct and indirect impact on managerial job performance of the managers in organizations. The result is in concord with the model of Tsui and Ashford's (1994) adaptive self-regulation model, Sosik et al., (2002) Taggar and Seijts (2003) and Cavazotte, Moreno and Hickmann (2012).

IX. LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study is not without some limitations or shortcomings. The first limitation of this study is that although there are a lot of variables that can be considered to measure LSE and leadership behavior this study is limited to some dimensions of the Anderson et al., (2008). Secondly, the data collection of this study is limited to within three months; hence it can be considered a relatively short period. The third limitation of this study is that the study considered only the commercial banks, other sectors i.e. small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and other manufacturing industries were not considered.

To overcome some of the limitations of this research, this study recommends that future studies should consider other dimensions of the Anderson et al., (2008). Further, future studies should consider the other dimensions of interest. The period of data collection in this study tends to be limited to within the period of three months. Hence, this study recommends that future researchers should consider longitudinal study in order to have enough time for data collection.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This conference is under the sponsorship of Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) under Bauchi State University Gadau (BASUG)

REFERENCES

- [1] Bandura and R. Wood. "Effect of perceived controllability and performance standards on self-regulation of complex decision making" in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 56, 1989, pp. 805-814.
- [2] Bandura, "Self-efficacy: The exercise of control" New York: Freeman, 1997.
- [3] Bandura and R. Wood "Effect of perceived controllability and performance standards on self-regulation of complex decision making" in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 56, 1989, pp. 805-814.
- [4] McCloy, Rodney, P. Campbell, John and R. A. Cudeck "Confirmatory Test of a Model of Performance Determinants" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 79(4), 1994, pp. 493-505.
- [5] A.D. Stajkovic, and F. Luthans (). "Self- efficacy and work-related performance: a meta- analysis". In *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 124, 1998 pp. 240.
- [6] S. Tsui and S. J. Ashford "Adaptive Self-regulation: A Process View of Managerial Effectiveness", in *Journal of Management*, Vol. 20, no. 1, 1994, pp. 93-121

- [7] Schafer, Joseph "Effective leaders and leadership in policing: traits, assessment, development, and expansion Policing: an International" in *Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 33(4), 2010, pp. 644-663.
- [8] Semadar, G. Robins, and G. Ferris "Comparing the validity of multiple social effectiveness constructs in the prediction of managerial job performance" in *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27, 2006, pp. 443-461.
- [9] Pirola-Merlo and L. Mann "The relationship between individual creativity and team creativity: Aggregating across people and time" in *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 25, 2004, 235-257.
- [10] Oyinlade, Olu "A Method of Assessing leadership effectiveness: Introducing the Essential Behavioral Leadership Qualities Approach" in *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, Vol. 19(1), 2006, pp. 25-40.
- [11] M. Bass "Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research" New York: Free Press, 1990.
- [12] M. Bass and Stogdill's *Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, 3rd Ed. London: The Free Press, 1990.
- [13] B. M. Bass, "Leadership and performance beyond expectations" New York, Free Press 1985.
- [14] Hoyt "The role of leadership efficacy and stereotype activation in women's identification with leadership" *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, Vol. 11, 2005, pp. 2-14.
- [15] Hoyt & J. Blascovich "Transformational and transactional leadership in virtual and physical environments" in *Small Group Research*, Vol. 34, 2003, pp. 678-715.
- [16] Hoyt, S. Murphy, S. Halverson & C. Watson "Group leadership: Efficacy and effectiveness" in *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Vol. 7, 2003, pp. 259-274.
- [17] Watson, M. Chemers and N. Preiser "Collective efficacy: A multilevel analysis" in *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 27, 2001, pp. 1057-1068.
- [18] G. Bowers and S. E. Seashore "Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership in *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1977, 238-263.
- [19] W. Anderson, H. T. Krajewski, R. D. Goffin, and D. N. Jackson "A leadership self-efficacy taxonomy and its relation to effective leadership" in *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 19, 2008, pp. 595-608.
- [20] D. Vardiman, Phillip, D. Houghton, Jeffery and L. Jinkerson, Darryl "Environmental leadership development: Toward a contextual model of leader selection and effectiveness" in *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 27 (2), pp. 93-110.
- [21] A. Fleishman, M. M. Mumford, S. J. Zaccaro, K. Y. Levin, , A. L. Korokin and M. B. Hein "Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behavior: A synthesis and function interpretation" in *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 2, 1991, pp. 245-287.
- [22] F. Amagoh, () "Leadership development and leadership effectiveness" in *Management Decision*, Vol. 47(6), 2009, pp. 989-999.
- [23] Cavazotte, V. Moreno and M. Hickmann "Effects of leader intelligence, personality and emotional intelligence on transformational leadership and managerial performance" in *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 23, 2012, pp. 443-455.
- [24] Yukl "How leaders influence organizational effectiveness" *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 19, 2008, pp. 708-722.
- [25] Yukl, A. Gordon, & T. Taber "A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research" in *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol. 9, 2002, pp. 15-32.
- [26] T. Robertson, and G. Sadri. "Managerial self-efficacy and managerial performance" in *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 4, 1993, pp. 37-45.
- [27] Conger "Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: an insider's perspective on these developing streams of research" in *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 10, 1999, pp. 145-170.
- [28] Hendricks & S. Payne "Beyond the big five: Leader goal orientation as a predictor of leadership effectiveness" in *Human Performance*, Vol. 20, 2007, pp. 317-343.
- [29] J. Sosik, J. Potosky and I. Jung, Dong "Adaptive Self-Regulation: Meeting Others' Expectations of Leadership and Performance" in the *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 142(2), 2002, pp. 211-232.
- [30] K. Y. Chan, and F. Drasgow "Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead" in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86(3), 2001, pp. 481-498.
- [31] Paglis, Laura "Leadership self-efficacy: research findings and practical applications" in *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 29(9), 2010, pp. 771-782.
- [32] L., Paglis and S. G. Green "Leadership self-efficacy and managers' motivation for leading change" in *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23, 2002, pp. 215-235.
- [33] J. McCormick "Self-efficacy and leadership effectiveness: Applying social cognitive theory to leadership" in *Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 8, 2001, pp. 22-33.
- [34] M. J. McCormick, J. Tanguma, and A. S. Lopex-Forment "Extending self- efficacy theory to leadership: A review and empirical test" in *Journal of Leadership Education*, Vol. 1, 2002, pp. 34-49.
- [35] M. M. Chemers "An integrative theory of leadership" Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1997.
- [36] M. M. Chemers, C. B. Watson and S. T. May: Dispositional affect and leadership effectiveness: A comparison of self-esteem, optimism, and efficacy" in *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 26, 2000, pp. 267-277.
- [37] M. Singer "The relationship between employee sex, length of service, and leadership aspirations: A study from valence, self-efficacy, and attribution perspectives" in *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, Vol. 40, 1991, pp. 417-436.
- [38] M. Onglatco, E. Yuen, C. Leong & G. Lee "Managerial self-efficacy and managerial success in Singapore" in *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 10, 1993, pp. 14-21.
- [39] Oh, In-Sue and Berry, Christopher M. "The Five-Factor Model of Personality and Managerial Performance: Validity Gains Through the Use of 360 Degree Performance" in *Ratingsm Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 94(6), 2009, pp. 1498-1513.
- [40] R., Alas, K, Tafel, and K. Tuulik, "Leadership style during transition in society: case of Estonia. In *Problems and Perspectives in Management*" Vol. 5(1), 2007, pp. 50-60.
- [41] R. J. House "Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 7, 1996, pp. 323-352.
- [42] R. M Baron and D. A. Kenny "The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations" in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 51, 1986, 1173-1182.

- [43] R. R. Blake and J. S. Mouton “Management by grid principles or situationalism” in Group and Organization Studies, Vol 7, 1982, pp. 207–210.
- [44] R. Wood and A. Bandura “Social cognitive theory of organizational management” in Academy of Management Review, Vol. 14, 1989, pp. 361-384.
- [45] S. Murphy and E. Ensher “The effects of leaders and subordinate characteristics in the development of leader–member exchange quality” in Journal of Applied Social Psychology, Vol. 29, 1999, pp. 1371–1394.
- [46] S. Taggar and G. H. Seijts “Leader and staff role-efficacy as antecedents of collective-efficacy and team performance” Human Performance, Vol. 16, 2003, pp. 131-156.
- [47] T. Hannah, Sean, J. Avolio, Bruce, F. Luthans & P.D. Harms “Leadership efficacy: Review and future directions” The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 19, 2008, pp. 669-692.
- [48] T.D. Kane, S. J. Zaccaro, T. R. Tremble and A. D. Masuda “An examination of the leader's regulation of groups” in Small Group Research, Vol. 33, 2002, pp. 65-78.
- [49] U. Sekaran and R. Bougie, “Research methods for business: A skill building approaches (5th ed.). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2010.
- [50] W. G. Bennis, and B. Nanus “Leaders: The strategies for taking charge” New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

IJBAMR