

The Influence of Social Power, Inspirational Motivation, Idealized Influence and Attribute Charisma on Manager's Leadership Effectiveness

Syukrina Alini Mat Ali¹, Dr. Erne Suzila Kassim², Aida Shekh Omar³

³Associate Prof, ^{1,2,3}Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA
syukrina@uitm.edu.my¹

Article Info

Volume 82

Page Number: 6421 - 6428

Publication Issue:

January-February 2020

Abstract

Leadership is a topic that has been studied extensively from various perspectives. Among significance and abundance leadership topics include leadership styles, how different styles would influence employees' job satisfaction and commitment, and also how the styles would derive the organizational performance. One of the recent developments is the study on how leaders could influence their subordinates' perception towards their leadership capability. As leaders and leaderships are the important aspect that synergize subordinates' motivation and shape the organizations, it is imperative to investigate what factors could determine subordinates' perception on their managers as leaders. Therefore, this study aims to answer the question of what roles do attribute charisma, idealized influence, inspirational motivation and social power play in shaping the subordinates' perception towards their managers' leadership capability. While the issue could be studied nationwide, this study focused on employees at selected organizations in Malaysia. Using the G*Power 3.1 to calculate the sample size, a sample of 74 employees was suggested and the researchers decided to double the number. Using the purposive sampling method, 140 responses were used for analysis. The items were adapted from Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Work Preference Inventory (WPI). Results of the structural model suggest social power and attributed charisma are the significant predictors to leadership effectiveness. The study contributes to the understanding of improving the magnitude of subordinate-leader relationship, especially when social power and motivation are critical in building effective leadership.

Article History

Article Received: 18 May 2019

Revised: 14 July 2019

Accepted: 22 December 2019

Publication: 01 February 2020

Keywords: Leadership, social power, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, attributed charisma and leader effectiveness

1. Introduction

Leadership is a process of influence between leaders and co-workers where a leader attempts to influence the behavior of coworkers to achieve the organizational goals (Mung, May-Chiun, Kwang Sing, & Ayob, 2011).

According to Chiu, Balkundi and Weinberg (2017), formally assigned group leaders who have more positive advice ties and fewer negative ties are more likely to be recognized as leaders by their followers. Leadership can be defined as "the ability to inspire confidence and support among the people who are needed to achieve

organizational goals” (Dubrin, 2007). Leaders can direct human resources toward the strategic objectives of the organization and ensure that organizational functions are in line with the external environment (Zaccaro & Klimoski, 2001).

One of the recent leadership research developments is the study on how leaders could influence their subordinates’ perception towards their leadership capability. As leaders and leaderships are the important aspect that synergize subordinates’ motivation and shape the organizations, it is imperative to investigate what factors could determine subordinates’ perception on their managers as leaders. Therefore, this study aims to answer the question of what roles do attribute charisma, idealized influence, inspirational motivation and social power play in shaping the subordinates’ perception towards their managers’ leadership capability.

2. Review of Literature

Leadership Effectiveness

According to Sudha, Shahnawaz and Farhat (2016) leadership effectiveness focuses largely on output measurability and accomplishment of shared goals. Developing an understanding of the elements of effective leadership is a very challenging task (Alabi & Alabi, 2015). It has been highlighted by previous researchers that leadership style is the most essential factor that influence leadership effectiveness (Hur, Van Den Berg & Wilderom, 2011). Management scholars have defined leadership as an individual’s ability to influence and motivate others (House et al., 1999). According to Anantamula (2010), leadership is one of the important elements in the organization as leadership style will affect the communication and relationship between the leader and followers that could lead to positive or negative perceptions.

Previous study for instance, through the work of Yukl (1999) argues that effective manager leadership was identified more effective through transformational and charismatic leadership. Furthermore, a transformational leader focuses more on taking action that would empower the subordinate and becoming partners in order to achieve certain objectives. In addition, as for charismatic leaders, the followers play a vital role in accepting the radical changes made by the expert leaders to accomplish certain objectives. Avolio and Yammarino (2015) define leadership as “individually considerate, intellectually stimulating, inspirationally motivation, visionary and of high ethical standards”. In addition, leadership may involve special bonding between leaders and followers that consists of emotional, respect and trust. However recent studies that concentrate on charismatic leadership revealed that it is simply conceptualized as a sub-dimension or a part of transformational leadership (Banks et al., 2016). Hunt and Conger (1999) proposed the use of transformational and charismatic leadership as synonymous terms.

Factors of leadership effectiveness

Social power is particularly tied to supervisors’ strategies directed at their staff to gain compliance from them (Pierro, Raven, Amato & Bélanger, 2013). Based on the social power theory (French & Raven, 1959), leaders apply different wide range of bases of power (or sources of power) to influence their subordinates. A widely accepted definition of social power is where the induction of psychological forces by one entity B upon another A and to the resistance of this induction set up by A (Cartwright, 1959). The five powers that can be the influencing agent to the employees are coercive power (which is the ability to punish), reward power (which is the ability to reward the employees by monetary or non-monetary compensation). Next is legitimate power (which is the ability to influence by the position one’s hold), expert power (which is all about the knowledge one’s have) and the last is referent power (which is the ability to influence because of the leader’s identification (Mittal & Elias, 2016)). This basic leader’s power has a huge impact and can influence the employees at the workplace. Bierstedt (1960) stated that social power can be identified from influence, competence and also knowledge of the employees. As for Chen, Lee-Chai and Bargh (2001), social power concept can also depend on different goals among individuals in the organization. Furthermore, according to Lord, Phillips and Rush (1980) the effects of employee’s perception is based from the characteristics of the managers regarding their social power. Leadership is an essential element in ensuring organizational sustainability. By analyzing employee’s perception, leaders should show good manager’s leadership to them. Prior research found that when followers perceived their managers as a leader, they tend to be more committed to the organization, and more willing to comply with their manager's requests (de Luque, Washburn, Waldman & House, 2008). Based on the discussion, we offer:

H₁ There is a relationship between social power and employee perception towards manager’s leadership style.

It is pertinent to highlight another factor which was contributed by Bass and Avolio (1994) who attributed charisma, and two behavioral components—idealized influence and inspirational motivation. Charismatic leaders are those deploying innovative and unconventional means for attaining the vision (Rast, Hogg, & Giessner, 2016). When subordinates trust and attribute charisma to the leader, a charismatic relationship (Klein & House, 1995) emerges in which their values are reliable. According to Tuan and Thao (2018), charismatic leaders are engaged in excellent acts that subordinates can interpret as involving great personal risk, devotion, and self-sacrifice. Charismatic leadership consists of shared and idealized future vision and aspiration including the leader’s dedicated actions to achieve his/her mission (Banks et al., 2016). As such, charismatic leaders have been defined as persons who “by the force of their personal abilities are capable of having profound and extraordinary effects on followers” (House & Baetz, 1979). Idealized influence is defined as the ability of the

leader to serve as a good role model to the followers (Mhatre & Riggio, 2014). Idealized influence is also related to charismatic characteristics that generate pride, faith and respect that leaders encourage their coworkers to instill within themselves (Zuhairy, Tajuddin, Ibrahima, & Ismail, 2015). Idealized influence demonstrates high standards, sense of mission, as well as ethical and moral orientation of leaders (Franke & Felfe, 2011). Leaders act as high performing role models and motivate subordinates through a high sense of purpose. These behaviors may strengthen followers' collective identity and their belief in the necessity and propriety of their actions (Franke & Felfe, 2011). Therefore, based on the discussion, we hypothesize for:

H₂ There is a relationship between idealized influence and employee perception towards manager's leadership style.

As for inspirational motivation, Bryman (2007) defines this as the leader giving meaning and challenge to the followers by being enthusiastic to future state. According to Antonakis and House (2002) in Zuhairy et al., (2015) describe "leaders who inspire and motivate (Germain, 2017) followers to reach ambitious goals that may have previously seemed unreachable, by raising followers' expectations, and communicating confidence that followers can achieve ambitious goals, thus creating a self-fulfilling prophecy". Inspirational motivation measures vision by recording the frequency with which leaders use symbols, metaphors, and simplified emotional appeals to increase awareness and understanding of mutually desired goals (Densten, 2002). As for Mhatre and Riggio (2014), inspiration motivation conveys high performance expectation and communicates sense of confidence that followers can fulfill the expectation. Inspirational motivation can lead the followers towards leader's vision with the assistance of positive environment and trust (Germain, 2017). Idealized influence and inspirational motivation best represent the notion of a leader's charisma (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Hence, we hypothesize for:

H₃ There is a relationship between inspirational motivation and employee perception towards manager's leadership style.

H₄ There is a relationship between attributed charisma and employee perception towards manager's leadership style.

3. Methodology

Quantitative research design was used to confirm the structure using survey method. A set of instrument was adapted and adopted based on general leadership to measure each of the dimensions based on the leadership theory (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999). Respondents was selected using purposive sampling technique as this type of sampling is confined to specific types of people who can provide the desired information, either because they are the only ones who have it, or conform to some criteria set by the researcher (Sekaran & Bougie, 2014). Questionnaires were distributed to companies (public and

private sectors) in Selangor area. A five-point Likert scale ranging from not at all true to very true for each construct was used as a measurement tool. Total number of 170 questionnaires was received, however only 140 questionnaires were usable due to less than six months working experience and the respondents did not know their supervisors. Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was used for data cleaning and PLS-SEM version 3 used to analyze the data.

4. Result and Discussion

A descriptive analysis was conducted to describe the demographic profile of the respondents and the results are shown in Table 1. Based on the analysis, most of the respondents were female (68.6%) while 31.4% were male. Majority of the respondents' aged between 31 to 40 years old (49.3%). Most of the respondents have been working under the supervision of a manager between six months to two years (42.1%). The highest percentage of respondents worked in the Administrative and Business Operation department (27.9%).

Table 1: Demographic Profiles

Variable	Frequency	%
Gender		
<i>Male</i>	44	31.4
<i>Female</i>	96	68.6
Age		
<i>20 to 30 years old</i>	48	34.3
<i>31 to 40 years old</i>	69	49.3
<i>41 to 50 years old</i>	19	13.6
<i>51 to 60 years old</i>	1	2.8
No of years working		
<i>6 months to 2 years</i>	59	42.1
<i>2- 5 years</i>	52	37.2
<i>More than 5 years</i>	29	20.7
Job responsibilities		
<i>Information and Communication</i>	11	7.9
<i>Customers and service management</i>	20	14.3
<i>Education and training</i>	26	18.6
<i>Administrative and business operation</i>	39	27.9
<i>Human resource and talent management</i>	12	8.6
<i>Accounting and finance</i>	12	8.6
<i>Research and development</i>	4	2.9
<i>Science and engineering</i>	4	2.9
<i>Others</i>	12	8.6

Measurement Model

The conceptual model was empirically analyzed using SmartPLS version 3. The assessment of measurement model needs to be conducted in order to confirm validity and reliability in the data of the study. The indicator loading, CR and AVE for the reflective constructs are shown in Table 2. The table indicates that all the loadings

exceed the recommendation value 0.6 and above for the exploratory study. Two items that measure social power were deleted due to the low loading, which are RP6 and RP7 of “My Head of Department can make me feel valued” and “My Head of Department can make me feel like he/she approves of me”. All constructs which consisted of social power, inspirational motivation,

idealized influence, attribute charisma and leader effective meet the minimum value of the threshold requirement which are CR > 0.7 and AVEs are greater than 0.5 after the deletion process of two items (Hair, 2014).

Table 2: Internal Consistency and Convergent Validity

Construct	Items	Loading	AVE	CR
Social Power (SP)	EP1: give me good technical suggestions	0.809	0.737	0.957
	EP2: share with me his/her considerable experience and/or training	0.777		
	EP3: provide me with sound job-related advice	0.857		
	EP4: provide me with needed technical knowledge	0.831		
	RP7: make me feel personally accepted.	0.881		
	RP8: make me feel important.	0.879		
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	IM9: Talks optimistically about the future	0.914	0.821	0.948
	IM10: Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished	0.885		
	IM11: Articulates a compelling vision of the future	0.939		
	IM12: Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved	0.885		
Idealized Influence (II)	II13: Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs	0.809	0.727	0.914
	II14: Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose	0.873		
	II15: Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission	0.897		
	II16: Considers the moral and ethical consequences of his/her decisions	0.83		
Attribute Charisma (AC)	AC17: Instills pride in being associated with him/her.	0.817	0.714	0.909
	AC18: Displays a sense of power and confidence	0.784		
	AC19: Goes beyond his/her self-interest for the good of the group	0.879		
	AC20: Acts in ways that build my trust	0.895		
Leader Effectiveness (EE)	EE21: effective in representing me to higher authorities	0.885	0.809	0.944
	EE22: effective in meeting my job-related needs	0.889		
	EE23: effective in meeting organizational requirements	0.918		
	EE24: Overall, leads a group that is effective	0.905		

Next, discriminant validity was conducted to observe how a particular construct is different from the other constructs in the study (Lowry & Gaskin, 2014). This occurs due to the adoption of the different theories in this study (Hair 2014). There are three methods to measure discriminant validity, which are cross loading, Fornell and Larcker’s criterion and heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) techniques. This study used HTMT criterion as according to Henseler, Ringle and Sarstedt (2015),

Fornell-Larcker criterion does not reliably detect the lack of discriminant validity in common research situations. As shown in Table 3, all values fulfill the criterion of HTMT₉₀ by Gold, Malhotra, and Segars (2001). This indicates that discriminant validity has been established. In addition, the results of HTMT₉₀ inference also reveals that the confidence interval does not show a value of 1 on any of the construct, which confirms discriminant validity (Henseler et al., 2015; Ramayah, Cheah, Franchis Chua,

Hiram Ting & Memon, 2018). In conclusion, the sufficiency of both convergence and discriminant validity exists accordingly based on the above evaluation for measurement model and therefore, it is appropriate to proceed with structural model analysis.

Table 3: HTMT₉₀ Criterion

	1	2	3	4	VIF
1 Attribute Charisma	0.870				3.247
2 Leader Effective	(0.751,0.954)	0.864			2.961
3 Idealized Influence	(0.763,0.939)	(0.441,0.764)			3.515
Inspirational	0.867	0.693	0.884		
4 Motivation	(0.763,0.939)	(0.527,0.802)	(0.824,0.939)		2.498
	0.834	0.886	0.633	0.728	
5 Social Power	(0.738,0.902)	(0.830,0.930)	0.445,0.760)	(0.563,0.848)	

Structural Model

After the evaluation of measurement model was completed, the assessment for structural model needs to be conducted. Before analyzing the structural model, it is important to address the collinearity issue as the existence of multicollinearity does not contribute to a good regression model (Pallant, 2011). Based on the basic principles, predictors which have the VIF value more than 5.00 can be considered as problematic and need to be reviewed by removing or merging or creating high order construct (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2016; Wong, 2013). The test reveals that all the construct values meet the requirement of VIF ranging from 2.498 to 3.515 (Table 3). Therefore, there is no issue of multicollinearity in this study and the next step is to proceed with structural model.

Next, PLS algorithm was used to test the hypotheses. Additionally, bootstrapping resampling technique with 1000 sub-samples were employed to ensure the accuracy of the PLS estimates (Hair et al., 2014). Based on the results in Table 4, only two relationships were found to

have t-value ≥ 1.645 , thus significance at 0.05 level. Specifically, independent variables that are significant are (social power \rightarrow leadership effectiveness $\beta = 0.584$, $p < 0.000$; attribute charisma \rightarrow leadership effectiveness, $\beta = 0.338$, $p < 0.000$. In addition, the value of lower limit (LL) and upper Limit (UL) of the confidence interval for SP and AC towards leadership effectiveness are within the requirement as no zero value in between the LL and UL. Thus, it can be concluded that only two hypothesized relationships in this study are supported. Looking at the relative importance of the independent variable in predicting the dependent variable (EE), the result revealed that social power (SP=0.584) is the most important predictor, followed by attribute charisma (AC=0.338).

Table 4: Hypothesis Testing

	Relationship	Path Coefficient	Std error	LL	UL	T value	Decision
H1	SP \rightarrow EE	0.584	0.079	0.464	0.703	7.376**	Supported
H2	II \rightarrow EE	-0.026	0.091	-0.183	0.108	0.283	Not supported
H3	IM \rightarrow EE	0.017	0.089	-0.132	0.149	0.188	Not supported
H4	AC \rightarrow EE	0.338	0.098	0.172	0.514	3.441**	Supported

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$

Next, the values of coefficient of determination (R^2), predictive relevance (Q^2), and effect size (f^2) were revealed and presented in the following Table 5. The R^2 values displayed the amount of variance in the endogenous construct (leader effective) that can be explained by all the exogenous (SP,II,IM and AC)

constructs linking to it (Astrachan, Patel & Wanzenried, 2014). Therefore, the result of the R^2 value of 0.744 suggests that the social power, inspirational motivation, idealized influence, and attribute charisma in this study explain 74.4% of variances in leader effectiveness as recommended by Chin, Peterson and Brown (2008), the R^2 values of 0.744 was used to classify the leader

effective construct as substantial. Then, the blindfolding procedure was conducted to obtain the predictive capability of the model by using Q^2 (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2016). Based on the results, Q^2 value for leader effectiveness was 0.570. Thus, it can be concluded that the exogenous constructs (SP, IM, II and AC) possess predictive relevance over the endogenous constructs (leader effectiveness) as the Q^2 values were all above zero as outlined by Hair et al. (2016). The f^2 values

represent the effect size of a specific exogenous construct on the endogenous construct (Hair et al., 2016). According to the results in Table 5, the effect size of social power is large (0.532), attribute charisma is medium (0.138) and idealized influence and inspirational motivation are both small (0.001) respectively based on the guidelines provided by Cohen (1988).

Table 5: Determination of Coefficient (R^2), Predictive relevance (Q^2) and Effect Size(f^2)

Construct	R^2	Q^2	f^2	Size of effect
Social power	0.744	0.570	0.532	large
Idealized influence			0.001	small
Inspirational motivation			0.001	small
Attribute charisma			0.138	medium

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Based on the results presented in the tables 4 and 5, there is an increasing concern regarding contributing factors of leadership among the coworkers in Selangor area. The result reveals that social power and attribute charisma contribute to the leader effectiveness. This is in line with Chiu, Balkunid and Weinberg (2016); Pierro et al., 2013) which highlighted the importance of the social power among the leaders. The results also indicate that influence of attribute charismatic leader on the followers tend to be driven by the social power. Furthermore, significant relationship between charismatic attribute and effective leader was also found in the previous study conducted by Awamleh and Gardner (1999); Mhatre and Riggio (2014). In addition, another study conducted by Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999) also supported the findings whereby attributed charisma lead to the competent leader. Next, it should be noted that the results for idealized influence and inspirational motivation are not completely consistent with previous findings. Hur et al. (2011) revealed the significant relationship between idealized influence and inspirational motivation with leader effectiveness. The results concluded that leaders may fail to convince the followers to attain higher goals and capable in achieving the goal targeted.

This research contributes further insight into effective leadership in the context of private and public sectors. The findings also verified the significant effect of attribute charisma and social power on leader effectiveness. Realizing the importance of social power and attribute charisma, leaders may take an advantage to maximize the usage to achieve their mission, vision and goals. In addition, even though the results for the inspirational motivational and idealized influence among the leaders are not significant, this result should not be neglected as it may give a new perspective in the different research setting. Future researchers may consider looking at other dimensions of charismatic leadership to enhance the effective leadership in an organization. In addition,

qualitative approach such as interview and observation on leadership, development and inspiration can be Considered to be explored by future researchers to give more impact to the study.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge Faculty of Business Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) for funding and supporting this study via Geran Faculty Pengurusan dan Perniagaan (Project code: 205801170001).

References

- [1] Alabi, G., & Alabi, J. (2015). Understanding the factors that influence leadership effectiveness of deans in Ghana. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 12(1), 111–132.
- [2] Anantatmula, V. (2010). Project manager leadership role in improving project performance. *Engineering Management Journal*, 22(1), 13–22. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10429247.2010.11431849>
- [3] Astrachan, C. B., Patel, V. K., & Wanzenried, G. (2014). A comparative study of CB-SEM and PLS-SEM for theory development in family firm research. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 5(1), 116–128. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2013.12.002>
- [4] Avolio, B. J., & Yammarino, F. J. (2015). Introduction to and overview of transformational and charismatic leadership. *Monographs in Leadership and Management*, 5, 399–432. [http://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3571\(2013\)0000005029](http://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3571(2013)0000005029)
- [5] Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery and organizational performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3).

- [6] Banks, G. C., Engemann, K. N., Williams, C. E., Gooty, J., McCauley, K. D., & Medaugh, M. R. (2016). A meta-analytic review and future research agenda of charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 28(4), 508–529. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.12.003>
- [7] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks CA Sage. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(96\)90189-5](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(96)90189-5)
- [8] Bryman, A. (2007). *Effective leadership in higher education*. Nurse Prescribing (Vol. 5). London: Learning Foundation for Higher Institution. <http://doi.org/10.12968/npre.2007.5.5.23745>
- [9] Chin, W. W., Peterson, R. A., & Brown, S. P. (2008). Structural equation modeling in marketing: Some practical reminders. *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 16(4), 287–298. <http://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679160402>
- [10] Chiu, C. C., Balkunid, P., & Weinberg, F. (2016). When managers become leaders: The role of manager network centralities, social power, and followers' perception of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
- [11] Chiu, C. Y. (Chad), Balkundi, P., & Weinberg, F. J. (2017). When managers become leaders: The role of manager network centralities, social power, and followers' perception of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 28(2), 334–348. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.05.004>
- [12] Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 397–421. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00025-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00025-9)
- [13] Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (Vol. 2nd). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <http://doi.org/10.1234/12345678>
- [14] de Luque, M. S., Washburn, N. T., Waldman, D. A., & House, R. J. (2008). Unrequited profit: How stakeholder and economic values relate to subordinates' perceptions of leadership and firm performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(4), 626–654. <http://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.53.4.626>
- [15] Densten, ian L. (2002). Clarifying inspirational motivation and its relationship to extra effort. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(1), 40–44. <http://doi.org/10.1108/01437730210414553>
- [16] Franke, F., & Felfe, J. (2011). How does transformational leadership impact employees' psychological strain?: Examining differentiated effects and the moderating role of affective organizational commitment. *Leadership*, 7(3), 295–316. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1742715011407387>
- [17] French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The basis of social power. In Cartwright, D. *Studies in social power*. (pp. 150–167).
- [18] Germain, J. (2017). Reflections on leadership: Theory, experience, and practice: *Quest*, 69(2), 169–176. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2017.1302347>
- [19] Gold, A. H., Malhotra, A., & Segars, A. H. (2001). Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(1), 185. Retrieved from <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1289679.1289687%5Cnhttp://search.proquest.com/docview/218924148/abstract?accountid=12253>
- [20] Hair, J. F. J., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publication. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2013.01.002>
- [21] Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43, 115–135. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- [22] House, R. J., & Baetz, M. L. (1979). *Leadership: Some empirical generalizations and new research directions*. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 341. Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=6815384&site=ehost-live>
- [23] Hunt, J. G. (Jerry), & Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership: Taking stock of the present and future (part II). *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 331. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00012-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00012-0)
- [24] Hur, Y. H., Van Den Berg, P. T., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2011). Transformational leadership as a mediator between emotional intelligence and team outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22(4), 591–603. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.002>
- [25] Klein, & House. (1995). On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 183–198.
- [26] Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- [27] Lowry, P. B., & Gaskin, J. (2014). Partial least squares (PLS) structural equation modeling (SEM) for building and testing behavioral causal theory: When to choose it and how to use it. *IEEE Transactions on Professional*

- Communication, 57(2), 123–146.
<http://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2014.2312452>
- [28] Mhatre, K. H., & Riggio, R. E. (2014). Charismatic and transformational leadership: Past, present, and future charismatic and transformational leadership. The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations. Oxford Handbook Online, (February).
<http://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199755615.013.012>
- [29] Mittal, R., & Elias, S. M. (2016). Social power and leadership in cross-cultural context. Journal of Management Development, 35(1), 58–74.
<http://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2014-0020>
- [30] Mung, L. V., May-Chiun, L., Kwang Sing, N., & Ayob, N. (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.
- [31] Pallant, J. (2011). For the SPSS Survival Manual: A step by Step Guide to Data Analysis using IBM SPSS (6th ed). New York: Mc Graw Hill Education.
- [32] Pierro, A., Raven, B. H., Amato, C., & Bélanger, J. J. (2013). Bases of social power, leadership styles, and organizational commitment. International Journal of Psychology, 48(6), 1122–1134.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.733398>
- [33] Ramayah, T., Cheah, J., Franchis Chua, Hiram Ting, & Memon, M. A. (2016). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using Smart PLS 3.0: An updated and Practical Guide to Statistical Analysis. Kuala Lumpur: Pearson Malaysia Sdn Bhd.
- [34] Rast, D. E., Hogg, M. A., & Giessner, S. R. (2016). Who trusts charismatic leaders who champion change? The role of group identification, membership centrality, and self-uncertainty. Group Dynamics, 20(4), 259–275.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000053>
- [35] Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2014). Research methods for business. In Research methods for business (p. 436).
- [36] Sudha, K. S., Shah Nawaz, M. G., & Farhat, A. (2016). Leadership styles, leader's effectiveness and well-being: Exploring collective efficacy as a mediator. Vision, 20(2), 111–120.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0972262916637260>
- [37] Tuan, L. T., & Thao, V. T. (2018). Charismatic leadership and public service recovery performance. Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 36(1), 108–123.
<http://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-06-2017-0122>
- [38] Wong, K. K. (2013). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) techniques using SmartPLS. Marketing Bulletin, 24, 1–32. <http://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128>
- [39] Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weakness in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 285–305.
- [40] Zuhairy, M., Tajuddin, M., Ibrahimi, H., & Ismail, N. (2015). Leadership Styles and Organizational Performance: A Predictive analysis. In Conference: Malaysia-Japan Joint International Conference 2015. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED525809&site=ehost-live%5Cnhttp://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res_dat=xri:pqdiss&rft_dat=xri:pqdiss:3442746