

UDC 331

## THE IMPACT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AGAINST IN-ROLE PERFORMANCE THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS: A CASE STUDY OF BUMN IN MAKASSAR CITY

Taba Muhammad Idrus\*, Ismail Muhammad, Sobarsyah Muhammad, Almaidah Asty  
Graduate School of Management, Hasanuddin University, Makassar,  
South Sulawesi, Indonesia  
\*E-mail: [websiteadmin@unhas.ac.id](mailto:websiteadmin@unhas.ac.id)

### ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyse the impact of transformational leadership towards in-role performance through organizational politics. This research uses Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) as the analysis method and 200 BUMN employees which has been worked at least one year as the research samples. This research found that transformational leadership is positively and significantly influence the organizational politics, while the organizational politics is positively and significantly affected in-role performance and transformational leadership positively and significantly impact on in-role performance through organizational politics.

### KEY WORDS

Transformational leadership, in-role performance, organizational politics.

Leadership is considered as a factor that has a major influence on the performance of organizations, managers and employees (Wang *et al.*, 2005). Effective leadership style in a democratic or autocratic perspective, socially oriented or targeted, and others are often associated with different aspects of organizational outcomes (Blake and Mouton, 1964; Lewin *et al.*, 1939). Bass theory (1993); Burns (1978) explains that transformational leadership has a strong positive effect on employee attitudes towards work, working environment and ultimately affecting overall performance.

Political organizations often recognized as an important antecedent performance of employees (Adams *et al.*, 2002; Allen *et al.*, 1979; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992, Gandz and Murray, 1980). Some previous researches attributed the political organization to the theory of justice, equitable, and fairness in the workplace (Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Vigoda-Gadot, 2003). While, another study described the organization's politics as a game of power and influencing tactics designed to achieve the best results for the users (Kipnis *et al.*, 1980).

This research proposes and tries to test the model i.e. the relationship between leadership, politics and performance. Thus, the study is expected to contribute the knowledge, by examining the relationship between leadership and employee performance and discussing that politics as a variable between the organizations in this relationship.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

*Transformational Leadership, Organizational Politics, and In-Role Performance.* The relationship between leadership, organizational politics and in-role performance has been scientifically and extensively studied. This Model is based on Ammeter *et al.*, (2003) to establish a political theory of leadership in the organization. This Model examines the organization's political perception as a variable in the relationship between leadership and work performance.

The rationale of this model is based on some LMX theories (Graen, 1976; Wang *et al.*, 2005), Theory of Hope (Vroom, 1964) and Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964). According to this theory, it is the responsibility of the leader to create a reciprocal, fair, corporate atmosphere, fulfilling the individual's expectations and needs, managerial candidates, and overall organization. A balanced relationship between a leader and a member is crucial and a

fair treatment to an individual should be promoted as an organizational strategy. Enhancing a fair relationship in a social exchange could reduce the organizational and positivity political level towards organizational performance. This perspective has been widely used in various studies. Ferris and Rowland (1981) argue that the leader's behaviour affects the employee's employment, which then affects the employee's attitude towards the work and performance. Thus, employee perception in the workplace, such as political perception, may be able to mediate between leadership and performance.

Initiated by McKenzie et al., (2001), he analysed the effect of transformational and transactional leadership against the marketing performance in insurance company. The finding of this study shows that transformational leadership has more influence on performance than transactional leadership.

Bass (1985), using *Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire* (mlq), found a high correlation between transformational leadership styles and performance levels. These correlates are consistently higher than the positive correlation between the transactional leader style and the organizational performance. According to Bass (1985) Employees choose to identify the numerous tasks from leaders and organizations. This relationship results in the basic employee agreement with the norms they are obliged to do. Bass shows that transformational leadership can make identification and internalization of desirable values as opposed to transactional leadership in order to create the appropriate workforce.

Parry (2003) specifically examined the leadership styles of the public sector organisations and found that the Transformational leadership style had a positive effect on the innovation and effectiveness of the Organization. Last research, Wang et al., (2005) advises the *Leadership Members Exchange* (LMX) Model of Graen (1976) as a good explanation for the role of mediation between leadership (transformational) styles and organizational performance and OCB behaviour. In many cases, LMX theory is in line with Vroom (1964) and Blau (1964) who suggest a strong balance between managers and employees. According to this theory, better performance might be achieved only if there is fairness to the expectations and when social exchanges between managers and employees occur at the level of fairness and equality. Wang et al., (2005) shows that the employees have expectations of a leader's role, because employees do not want to be in a passive position. This means that, in the relationship pattern, the employees can play a role in rejecting, accepting or renegotiating roles determined by the leader. The process is reciprocal based on fairness and equality on exchange and expectations, and is developed over time.

The relationship between transformational leadership and performance measurement is positive and quite strong (Geyer and Steyrer, 1998; Lowe et al., 1996; McKenzie et al., 2001; Parry, 2003). It seems that in many organizations, especially the general one, transformational leadership is more effective than transactional leadership. Managers' skills are transformational, it has the ability to support and educate employees and challenge them to develop themselves in doing work.

Transformational leadership encourages employees to contribute to the organizations that come out of personal motivation, challenge pressure or the desire to imitate the leaders and position themselves as part of successful leaders. This idea is far from LMX theory as suggested by Graen (1976) and others. However, it seems that transactional leadership has the ability to strengthen performance effectiveness (especially formal) that can be measured quantitatively. Several studies have found that there is a significant relationship between gratitude-conditional (one component of transactional leadership) and in-role performance (McKenzie et al. 2001).

*Organizational Politics.* The studies which focusing on organizational politics have taken a different approach. This research, mainly focused on employee perceptions of organizational politics (Ferris et al., 2004) as strategic behavior designed to maximize personal interests, thus it results in conflict with organizational goals collectively or in other interests. Blok (1988), organizational politics, some of the basic patterns are negative. It even says ... "if I say you are a strongly political person, you will consider it, both as an insult and as a mixed talent ...". Gdanz and Murray (1980) and Madison et al., (1980) observed that

when people are asked to describe politics in the workplace, usually listed activities that are selfish, manipulative, and not perceived as positive.

Studies that develop this concept (Andrews and Kacmar, 2001; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Vigoda-Gadot, 2003) found that politics in the workplace is considered as self-serving employee behavior to achieve personal gain, and at the expense of others which is oftenly opposed with the goals and interests of the organization or work unit. This behavior is associated with manipulation, slander, subversive, and illegitimate ways of using excessive force to achieve one's goals (Kipnis et al., 1980).

Ferris et al. (2004) suggested the concept of the Organizational Politic Perception Index (OPPI) as a good measure of organizational politics. In addition, Ferris and Kacmar (1992), argue that the higher the political perception in the organization member side, the lower the level of justice and equity in others perspectives. Ferris's research, has used procedural justice theory to argue that organizational politics are related to the Leadership Members Exchange (LMX) and the efficiency of the human resource system for the decision-making process. The lack of fairness in this system was found to be a major cause of a higher perception of organizational politics and therefore organizational performance was hampered. All of this research relies on the argument of Lewin at al., (1939), that people respond to their perceptions of existing reality and not on the actual reality.

Politics in organizations must be understood in terms of what people may considered, and should not based on what is actually represented. Likewise, this study tries to propose that in many cases the perception of fairness and fairness reflects the political climate in the workplace and may also be related to formal and informal performance (Drory, 1993; Cropanzano et al., 1995). These ideas are widely replicated and supported in many previous studies (Ferris et al., 2004; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Vigoda-Gadot, 2003).

## **METHODS OF RESEARCH AND HYPOTHESES**

The study population is employees of BUMN in the form of state-owned companies. The research sample was conducted on employees with the following characteristics: a) the company's permanent employees, b) had worked for at least one year. The total sample of 200 people at all levels of the organizational structure. Data analysis methods using Structural equation modeling analysis using AMOS. 21. Variable measurements are performed using an interval scale between 1 (the lowest score) to 5 (the highest score). The hypotheses in this study were formulated in 4 hypotheses as follows:

- Transformational leadership has a direct positive and significant effect on Organizational Politics;
- Organizational politics have a direct positive and significant effect on in-role performance;
- Transformational leadership has a positive and significant effect indirectly on in-role performance through Organizational Politics.

## **RESULTS OF STUDY**

Initially, there were 8 objects of research of BUMN to be examined. The eight BUMNs are: Bank Mandiri, Bank BNI 46, Bank BRI, Bank Sulsebar, PT. Telkom, PLN, PT. KIMA and PT. Pelindo IV. In the next process, only 4 (four) BUMN companies were included as research samples, namely: BRI Bank, Sulsebar Bank, PT. Telkom, and Pelindo IV. Four other state-owned companies that were not included as research samples are: Bank Mandiri, BNI 46 Bank, PLN, and PT. KIMA. The exclusion of the four companies with various reasons for different reasons. First, until the deadline for sampling, the company has not been able to provide confirmation of the results of the questionnaire distributed for unclear reasons, namely: BNI 46, Bank Mandiri, and PLN. Second, the Company returned the questionnaire, but the amount was not suitable to be included as a research sample proportionally, namely PT. KIMA. From 30 questionnaires, PT. KIMA only filled in 4 questionnaires, the rest were blank.

Based on actual cases, four out of BUMN companies, each; BNI 46, Bank Mandiri, PLN, and PT. KIMA was dropped from the sample. Thus, the overall research sample was 123 people from four sample groups, namely BRI Bank, Sulselbar Bank, PT. Telkom, and Pelindo IV.

The characteristics of the age level of the respondents were the lowest of 24 years and the highest of 59 years. The age of respondents is almost evenly distributed, between 24 years to 41 years, namely 22% and 22%. The highest age (33%) is at the productive age level of 42 years to 50 years. The age characteristic associated with performance is an important issue in the study of organizational behavior. The older a person is, the less likely it is to leave the organization. In relation to research variables, the age level will indicate a process of change in the application of leadership styles. That the age of maturity will be directly proportional to the patterns of decision making of leaders who are also more mature and not in a hurry.

Table 1 – Age of Respondents

The level of ages		Frequency	%
24	32	27	0.22
33	41	25	0.20
42	50	41	0.33
51	59	30	0.24
-	-	123	1.00

Career theory states that the length of an employee occupies a position, varies according to the level of position. At the front liner level, it is best for someone to occupy a three-year term. Then it increases when entering the middle management phase which ranges from 4 years to 7 years. Whereas in Top Management, it is not explicitly established. But in general, in a stable organization, the longest a CEO is 8 years.

Table 2 – Duration in Position

Duration in Position		freq	%
1	6.75	100	0.81
6.76	12.51	19	0.15
12.52	18.27	2	0.02
18.28	24.03	2	0.02
-	-	-	1.00

Table 2, shows that on average, BUMN companies, as many as 81% of respondents hold a position between 1 year to 6.75 years. Only 15% of respondents have remained in office long enough in an assignment between 6.75 years and 12 years. Moreover, very few companies retain their employees in positions above 18 years.

The service period of a person is often associated with the level of employee turnover. In some research, it is also related to the level of job satisfaction. Some even link with organizational commitment and value systems. For Japanese workers, the long term of service shows a high level of employee loyalty to an organization that also shows employee commitment and the compatibility of the individual value system with the organization.

Table 3 – Service Period

Service Period		freq	%
1	9.25	33	0.27
9.26	17.51	24	0.20
17.52	25.77	31	0.25
25.78	34.03	35	0.28
-	-	123	1.00

As many as 35% of employees have a service period of 25.78 years to 34 years. This shows that state-owned enterprise organizations are, on average, able to build employee's confidence in the future of their careers in the company.

The number of employees supervised in the supervision of a manager shows the ability of span of control in the organizational structure. Management theory says that at the lowest manager level, the ability of span of control ranges from 7 to 10 people. Then, more and more are being watched in line with the high position.

Table 4 – Number of Subordinates Led

Number of Subordinates Led		freq	%
1	3	52	0.42
4	6	64	0.52
7	9	5	0.04
10	13	2	0.02
-	-	123	1.00

In accordance with the average level of respondents who are in the lower manager level, the number of subordinates, on average, 64% of respondents with a span of control between 4 to 6 years. Furthermore, 52% of respondents have subordinates between 1 to 3 people.

The level of employee education is closely related to the level of quality of the organization. A lot of research shows that organizations that have an adequate supply of human resources with competency levels, will have good performance and have a solid level of maintaining a better organizational sustainability.

Table 5 – Education Level of Respondents

Education	Freq	%
SLTA	14	0.11
D3	10	0.08
S1	88	0.72
S2	11	0.09
-	123	1.00

As many as 72% of the education level of respondents, generally accumulate at the level of the Bachelor Degree (S1). But, interestingly, it turns out that in state-owned companies, the level of education at the senior secondary level is still quite large at 11%. Many state-owned enterprises were state-owned companies initially with high-level human resources.

The results of testing the validity of the indicators on each variable indicate that all indicators are valid because the Average Variance Extract (AVE) shows the amount of variance extracted by the latent variable developed. The average acceptable variance extract value is a minimum of 0.50. The minimum reliability value of the latent variable forming dimensions that can be accepted is 0.7.

Table 6 – Evaluate the Goodness-of-Fit Criteria

Goodness of Fit (GOF) Index	Cut-off Value	Values on Research Models	Notes
$X^2$ Chi Square	Getting Smaller	128,648	Poorly
Probability	$\geq 0,05$	0,000	Poorly
CMIN/DF	$\leq 2,00$	9,189	Poorly
RMSEA	$\leq 0,08$	0,138	Poorly
GFI	$\geq 0,90$	0,918	Fit
AGFI	$\geq 0,90$	0,837	Marginal
TLI	$\geq 0,90$	0,922	Fit
CFI	$\geq 0,90$	0,948	Fit

Based on Goodness of fit test result of the standard model which has been proposed, there are 3 things that meet the criteria, namely: GFI value of 0.918 is above 0.90 which means Fit; TLI value of 0.922 is above 0.90 which means Fit; The CFI value resulting from the calculation of 0.948 is good because it is more than 0.90.

The complete hypotheses of the 4 different pathways as presented in Tables 8 and 3 have 4 accepted hypotheses. Further interpretations of the table can be explained as follows:

Table 7 – Direct Effect Testing Results

Types of Influence			Estimation	S.E.	C.R.	P	Ket	
Organizational Politics	<=	Transformational Leadership	0,332	0,159	2,046	0,041	Significant	Accepted
In-role performance	<=	Organizational Politics	0,313	0,571	1,987	0,047	Significant	Accepted

Table 8 – Test Results of Indirect Effects and Total Influences

Independent Var	Intervening Var	Dependent Var	Estimation	C.R	P	Notes	
Transformational leadership	Organizational Politics	In-role performance	0,113	0,530	0,595	Significant	Accepted

Hypothesis 1 is accepted, the results of statistical testing on this hypothesis obtained p-value of 0.041 < 0.05 (cut of value), and the CR value of 2.046. That is, the effect of transformational leadership on in-role performance has a significant positive impact with the estimated coefficient value ( $\beta$ ) = 0.332. This finding is in line with other studies that found a more positive relationship (Wang et al., 2005).

Hypothesis 2 is accepted, the results of statistical testing on this hypothesis obtained p-value of 0.047 < 0.05 (cut of value), and the CR value of 1.987. That means, the influence of organizational politics on in-role performance has a positive and significant impact with the estimated coefficient value ( $\beta$ ) = 0.313. This finding is not in line with the findings of Mintzberg (1973) that allowed organizational politics can damage employee performance. While, this is in line with similar findings from other studies that have shown the negative influence of organizational politics, especially in public organizations (Vigoda-Gadot, 2003).

Hypothesis 3 is rejected, the results of statistical testing of this hypothesis obtained p-value of 0.595 > 0.05 (cut of value), and the CR value of 0.530. That means, the effect of transformational leadership on in-role performance through organizational politics has a positive and insignificant impact with the estimated coefficient value ( $\beta$ ) = 0.113. The findings about the mediating effects of organizational politics are not in line with research by Pillai et al., (1999) which states that the relationship between leadership and performance is, to some extent, indirect, but mediated. Trust, justice and organizational politics are separate phenomena in the workplace (Andrews and Kacmar, 2001) but are also closely related to each other, and one theory may be useful for understanding others (Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Vigoda-Gadot, 2003)

## DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This research is to find out whether the relationship between leadership and performance is indirectly or directly related. On the one hand, Organizational politics is tested as a factor that might mediate between transactional and transformational leadership, while on the other hand formal and informal (OCB) performance. The findings, based on an explicit model, show that according to the fit index, the relationship between leadership style and performance is not only a major direct effect but also an additional mediating side effect. This finding is in line with the same idea previously suggested by Ferris and Rowland (1981) which states that perceptions of the workplace mediate between leadership style and performance.

The findings of this study follow the previous ideas developed by Pillai et al. (1999), MacKenzie et al. (2001), and Parry (2003). It shows that there are different situational variables that mediate the relationship between leadership and performance in organizations. Current research attempts to support the hypothesis that employee perceptions of

organizational politics are significant perception variables that can influence the nature of the relationship between leadership and performance. However, unlike previous findings which see that perceptions of politics have a negative effect on in-role performance and OCB, this study actually found the opposite. Political perception actually has a positive effect on in-role performance and OCB.

The findings about the mediating effects of organizational politics are in line with research by Pillai et al. (1999) which states that the relationship between leadership and performance is, to some extent, indirect, but mediated. Trust, justice and organizational politics are separate phenomena in the workplace (Andrews andACmar, 2001) but are also closely related to one another, and one theory may be useful for understanding others (Ferris andACmar, 1992; Kacmardan Ferris, 1991; Vigoda-Gadot, 2003; ).

Apart from contributions to the study of leadership and performance, this finding is irrelevant to the theories of OCB. The mediating model of this research is not consistent with Organ (1988) which suggests that as long as the employee believes that the organization is managed fairly, then he will be willing to improve OCB and formal performance. This is mainly because the findings of this study actually focuss that fair treatment is referring to organizational regulations and policies carried out by a leader that may also include organizational political behavior. Thus, organizational politics is perceived to be able to trigger OCB and other formal performance. So. Work voluntarily, more on the role of leaders who use organizational political behavior.

High-level internal politics have a positive effect on performance levels because they can be interpreted as behaviors that support existing leadership.

In short, that the use of organizational politics to explain the mediation process between leadership and formal or informal performance in organizations makes a significant contribution to the understanding of three phenomena: leadership, politics, and performance in organizations. Both models examined here show this complex relationship, which is directly or indirectly

To support H1, this study found a significant relationship between leadership and performance in a number of companies. A positive relationship was found between transformational and transactional leadership and performance (on the role of performance and OCB). This finding is different from other findings that find a negative relationship between transactional leadership and performance (on the role of performance and OCB). However, this finding is in line with other studies that found a more positive relationship (ie Pillai et al., 1999; Wang et al., 2005).

The support for the H2 hypothesis confirms the idea that a transformational leader who influences high professionalism and personal integrity can create an environment of creativity, trust, commitment, involvement, satisfaction, and excellence in organizations. Conversely, transactional leaders whose influence comes from positions of authority and ability to reward and punish will succeed in their work in more limited ways (Ehrhart, 2004; Pillai et al., 1999). However, in this study, both of them actually have the same effect on organizational politics. That is, both transformational leadership and transactional leadership have a positive influence on organizational political perceptions.

The support for H3 is not in line with the theoretical idea that transactional behavior which it might have more negative effects on employees. The findings presented here show that sometimes the transactional behavior style is perceived by employees as negative and opportunistic. This finding does not support the findings of Bass and Volio (1993). Transactional leadership is positively related to organizational political perception. That is, for employees, transactional leadership is not something opportunistic and negative. Because, the leader runs a pattern of relations with employees based on organizational rules and procedures.

The support for H4, which states that there is a negative relationship between organizational political perceptions and the level of performance of the role and OCB, found the opposite. That there is a positive relationship between organizational political perceptions of in-role performance and OCB. This finding is contrary to the findings of Mintzberg (1973) that allowed organizational politics can damage employee performance. This is in line with

similar findings from other studies that have shown the negative influence of organizational politics, especially in public organizations (Vigoda 2000, Vigoda-Gadot, 2003).

## CONCLUSION

Referring to the results of the analysis and discussion, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Transformational leadership has a positive and significant effect directly on in-role performance;
- Organizational politics have a positive and significant effect directly on in-role performance;
- Transformational leadership has a positive but not significant effect indirectly on in-role performance through organizational politics.

Finally, it is suggested that, in the further research, we can examine the influence of other variables that are likely to influence in-role performance such as transactional leadership and several other variables, in addition to using the operational theory concepts of leadership and performance that is current and updated.

## REFERENCES

1. Adams, G.L., et.al., (2002), "Perceptions of Organizational Politics:Additional thoughts, reactions, and multi-level issues", *Research in Multi-Level Issues*, Vol.1,pp.287-94.
2. Allen, R.W.,Madison,D.L.,Porter,L.W.,Renwick,P.A. and Mayes,B.T. (1979), "Organizational politics tactics and characteristics of its actors", *California Management Review*, Vol.22, pp.77-78.
3. Ammeter, P.A., Prati, L.M., Douglas, C., Ferris, R.G., Buckley, R.M. 2003. Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Effectiveness, and Team Outcomes. *The International Journal Of Organizational Analysis*. Vol 11. No.1.
4. Andrews,M.C. and Kacmar,K.M. (2001), "Discriminating among organizational politics, justice, and support", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol.13, pp.751-96.
5. Bass, B (1985) *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York The Free Press.
6. Bass,B.M. and Avolio,B.J. (1993), "Transformational leadership theory: aresponse to critiques". In Chemmers,M.M. and Ammons,R. (Eds), *Leadership and Research: Perspectives and Direction*, California Academic Press, Los Angeles, CA,pp.49-80.
7. Blake,J.J. and Mouton,J.S. (1964), *The Managerial Grid*, Gulf Publikations, Houston, TX.
8. Blau, P.M. (1964), *Power and Exchange in Social Life*, Wiley, New York, NY.
9. Block, P. (1988), *The Empowered Manager:Positive Political Skill at Work*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
10. Burns, J.M. (1978), *Leadership*, Harper & Row, New York, NY.
11. Cropanzano, R.S. and Kacmar,K.M. (1995), *Organizational Politics, Justice, and Support: Managing The Social Climate of The Workplace*, Quorum Books, Westport, CT.
12. Drory, A. (1993), "Perceived political climate and job attitudes", *Organizational Studies*, Vol. 14, pp.59-71.
13. Ferris, G.R. and Kacmar, K.M. (1992), "Perceprions of organizational politics", *Journal of Management*, Vol.8, pp.93-116.
14. Ferris GR, Ahearn KK, , Hochwarter WA, Douglas C, Ammeter AP., 2004, Leader political skill and team performance. *Journal Manage* 30(3):309–27.
15. Gandz,J. and Murray,V.V. (1980), "The experience of workplace politics", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.23,pp.237-51.
16. Geyer,A.L. and Steyrer,J.M. (1998), "Transformational leadership and objectives performance in banks", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.47,pp.397-420.
17. Graen,G.B. (1976), "Role making processes within complex organization", in Dunnette,M.D. (Ed), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Rand-McNally, Chicago,IL, pp.1201-45.

18. Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M. and Wilkinson, I. (1980) "Intraorganizational influence tactics: exploration in getting one's way", *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol.10, pp.271-99.
19. Lewin, K., Lippitt, R. and White, R.K. (1939), "Patterns of Aggressive behavior of experimentally created social cultures", *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol.10, pp.271-99.
20. Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G. and Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996), "Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: a meta analytic review of MLQ literature", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.7, pp.385-425.
21. McKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. and Rich, G.A. (2001), "Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance", *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.2, pp.115-34.
22. Madison, D.L., Allen, R.W., Porter, L.W., Renwick, P.A. and Mayes, B.T. (1980), "Organizational politics: an exploration of manager's perceptions", *Human Relations*, Vol.33, pp.79-100.
23. Mintzberg, H. (1973), *The nature of managerial work*. New York, Harper Collins.
24. Parry, K.W. (2003), "Leadership, culture and performance: the case of the New Zealand public sector", *Journal of Change Management*, Vol.4, pp.376-99.
25. Rowland K. And Ferris G., (1981) *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*. Vol. 2, pp. 35-80. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
26. Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2003), *Developments in Organizational Politics*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham.
27. Vroom, V.H. (1964), *Work and Motivation*, Wiley, New York, NY.
28. Wang, H., Law, K.S., Hackett, R.D., Wang, D. and Chen, Z.X (2005), "Leader-member exchange as mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers performance and organizational citizenship behavior", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.48, pp.420-32.