

Research Article

The Role of Leadership Style in Improving Administrative Efficiency: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Institutions

Muhammad Natsir Mallawi^{1*}, Nurasia Natsir²

^{1,2} Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Yappi, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: natsir.mallawi@stiyappi.ac.id

Abstract. Leadership constitutes a critical determinant of organizational efficiency, yet the relationship between leadership styles and administrative effectiveness remains incompletely understood, particularly across different institutional contexts. This comparative study examines how transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles influence administrative efficiency in public and private sector institutions in Indonesia. Using a mixed-methods approach, quantitative data were collected from 428 employees across 28 public institutions and 24 private organizations through validated survey instruments; qualitative data were gathered through 36 semi-structured interviews with organizational leaders and managers. Results reveal significant positive relationships between transformational leadership and administrative efficiency in both sectors ($\beta = 0.54$, $p < 0.001$ for public; $\beta = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$ for private), with transactional leadership showing moderate positive effects ($\beta = 0.32$ public; $\beta = 0.38$ private) and laissez-faire leadership demonstrating negative relationships ($\beta = -0.28$ public; $\beta = -0.24$ private). Leadership styles collectively explain 52% of efficiency variance. Mediation analysis reveals that organizational culture (28%), employee engagement (35%), and trust in leadership (22%) partially mediate transformational leadership's effects, together accounting for 62% of total indirect effects. Sector differences emerged qualitatively: transformational leadership leverages public service motivation in public institutions, while transactional leadership's performance accountability resonates more strongly in private organizations. The study contributes theoretical understanding of leadership effectiveness across institutional contexts and provides practical guidance for developing contextually appropriate leadership development programs.

Keywords: Administrative Efficiency; Comparative Study; Indonesia; Leadership Styles; Organizational Performance.

Received: October 10, 2025
Revised: December 08, 2025
Accepted: February 02, 2026
On Available: April 04, 2026
Curr. Ver.: April 04, 2026



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access
publication under the terms and
conditions of the Creative
Commons Attribution (CC BY SA)
license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

1. Introduction Research Background

Administrative efficiency represents a cornerstone of organizational success across all sectors ensuring optimal resource utilization, timely achievement of objectives, minimized waste and redundancy, and enhanced responsiveness to stakeholder needs. In an era characterized by resource constraints, heightened competition, and rising stakeholder expectations, improving administrative efficiency has become imperative for organizational sustainability (Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999; Boyne, 2002).

Leadership constitutes perhaps the most influential factor shaping organizational efficiency. Leaders establish strategic direction, allocate resources, design organizational structures, shape culture and values, and motivate and develop employees. How leaders exercise these functions profoundly impacts whether organizations operate efficiently or suffer from bureaucratic inertia, misaligned priorities, and suboptimal performance (Bass &

Avolio, 1994; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Leadership style the characteristic pattern of behavior leaders employ in influencing others has emerged as a critical variable in this relationship.

The tripartite framework of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership has received extensive empirical validation. Transformational leadership inspires followers through vision, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and idealized influence. Transactional leadership focuses on exchange relationships, clarifying expectations, providing rewards for performance, and monitoring compliance. Laissez-faire leadership represents an absence of leadership, characterized by avoidance of decisions and responsibility (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Avolio et al., 1999). While leadership's importance is universally acknowledged, the optimal style for enhancing administrative efficiency may vary across public and private institutional contexts that operate under fundamentally different logics, accountability structures, and stakeholder expectations.

Despite extensive leadership research, several gaps limit understanding of leadership's role in administrative efficiency. Most studies examine leadership effects on broad organizational outcomes rather than administrative efficiency as a distinct construct. Comparative research across public and private sectors remains sparse, limiting evidence on how institutional context shapes leadership-efficiency dynamics. Mediating and moderating mechanisms receive insufficient attention, leaving the processes through which leadership influences efficiency poorly understood (Tummers & Knies, 2013; Wright et al., 2012).

These gaps are particularly significant in developing country contexts like Indonesia, where both public bureaucracy and private enterprise face distinctive efficiency challenges. Understanding how leadership can enhance efficiency in these contexts carries significant practical importance for organizational performance and, in the public sector, for citizen service delivery.

This study pursues four primary objectives: to examine relationships between leadership styles and administrative efficiency; to compare how leadership styles influence efficiency across public and private sectors; to identify contextual factors that mediate or moderate the relationship between leadership and efficiency; and to develop evidence-based recommendations for leadership development aimed at enhancing administrative efficiency.

2. Literature Review

Leadership Styles: Theoretical Foundations

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership theory, developed by Bass building on Burns' foundational work, posits that effective leaders transform followers by elevating their consciousness about organizational goals and developing them to higher levels of potential. The theory comprises four dimensions: idealized influence through role modeling ethical behavior and building trust; inspirational motivation through articulating compelling vision; intellectual stimulation through challenging assumptions and encouraging creativity; and individualized consideration through attending to individual developmental needs (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Meta-analytic research consistently demonstrates transformational leadership's positive effects on follower satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment, and organizational performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Wang et al., 2011).

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership emphasizes exchange relationships between leaders and followers: clarifying performance expectations, providing rewards contingent on achieving objectives, monitoring performance, and taking corrective action. It comprises contingent reward through exchanging rewards for effort, and management-by-exception through intervening when standards are not met (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Research shows transactional leadership produces positive outcomes, though generally smaller than transformational effects, and proves particularly effective in stable environments with clear performance standards and when followers are motivated by extrinsic rewards (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Laissez-Faire Leadership

Laissez-faire leadership represents an absence or avoidance of leadership abdicating responsibility, delaying decisions, giving no feedback, and making little effort to help followers or develop the organization. This non-leadership approach consistently demonstrates negative relationships with organizational outcomes including satisfaction,

motivation, performance, and effectiveness (Avolio et al., 1999). It represents the least effective leadership style in the full-range leadership model.

Administrative Efficiency: Conceptualization and Measurement

Administrative efficiency refers to the optimal use of resources to achieve organizational goals, conceptually encompassing input-output ratios that maximize outcomes relative to resources consumed. It comprises multiple dimensions: process efficiency through streamlined procedures minimizing delays; resource utilization through optimal deployment of human, financial, and material resources; decision-making effectiveness through timely, informed decisions at appropriate authority levels; coordination and integration through seamless collaboration across units; and responsiveness through rapid adaptation to changing needs (Boyne, 2002). Measuring efficiency presents challenges particularly in public sectors where outcomes are multidimensional, requiring mixed approaches integrating objective metrics and perceptual assessments.

Leadership and Efficiency: Empirical Evidence

Research examining leadership-efficiency relationships generally supports positive associations. Transformational leadership enhances efficiency through inspiring commitment to organizational goals, empowering employees to identify and eliminate inefficiencies, fostering process innovation, and developing capabilities. Transactional leadership contributes through clarifying expectations, establishing accountability, monitoring performance, and recognizing achievements. Laissez-faire leadership consistently undermines efficiency through lack of direction, delayed decision-making, and absent accountability, creating bottlenecks that compound over time (Tummers & Knies, 2013; Wright et al., 2012).

Public Versus Private Sector Leadership

Comparative research suggests core leadership principles apply across sectors while important contextual differences shape their operation. Public sector leaders navigate more complex political environments with multiple stakeholder demands, greater transparency requirements, more rigid civil service structures, and emphasis on equity alongside efficiency. Private sector leaders face clearer bottom-line accountability, greater managerial flexibility, stronger performance incentives, and emphasis on competitive advantage (Boyne, 2002; Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999).

Some scholars argue transformational leadership proves particularly valuable in public sectors given employees' public service motivation and limited financial incentive flexibility (Wright et al., 2012; Tummers & Knies, 2013). Others contend transactional leadership's emphasis on clear accountability aligns well with private sector performance orientation. Mediating mechanisms organizational culture, employee engagement, trust may operate differently across contexts, though evidence remains limited and mixed.

3. Research Methodology

Research Design

This research employs a comparative mixed-methods design integrating quantitative survey research with qualitative interviews (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). The quantitative component examines relationships between leadership styles and administrative efficiency through structured measurement and statistical analysis. The qualitative component explores contextual factors, implementation processes, and participant perspectives illuminating how leadership influences efficiency in practice. Data were collected concurrently from May to December 2024.

Sampling and Participants

Organizational Sample

Fifty-two organizations participated: 28 public institutions (ministries n=8, provincial agencies n=10, district agencies n=10) and 24 private organizations (manufacturing n=10, services n=8, financial institutions n=6). Organizations were selected to represent diversity in size, industry, and location. Inclusion criteria required a minimum of 200 employees, at least 5 years in operation, and willingness to provide access to employees and performance data.

Survey Respondents

Within each organization, 6–12 employees were randomly sampled from administrative units, yielding a final sample of 428 respondents: 238 from public institutions (55.6%) and 190 from private organizations (44.4%), with an 86% response rate. Respondents averaged

8.7 years organizational tenure (SD = 5.2) and 34.8 years of age (SD = 7.9), with 52% female. Position levels included 23% supervisory, 54% professional/technical, and 23% support staff.

Interview Participants

Thirty-six organizational leaders and managers participated in semi-structured interviews through purposive sampling: 20 from public institutions (agency heads n=8, unit directors n=12) and 16 from private organizations (CEOs/directors n=7, department managers n=9). Participants were selected from both high-efficiency and lower-efficiency organizations to capture diverse perspectives.

Measurement Instruments

Leadership Styles

Leadership styles were measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X Short Form; Bass & Avolio, 1994), a 36-item validated instrument assessing transformational (20 items, 4 dimensions), transactional (8 items, 2 dimensions), and laissez-faire leadership (4 items) on 5-point frequency scales (0 = not at all to 4 = frequently, if not always). Sample reliabilities: transformational $\alpha = 0.94$, transactional $\alpha = 0.87$, laissez-faire $\alpha = 0.82$.

Administrative Efficiency and Mediating Variables

Administrative efficiency was assessed through a 15-item scale covering process efficiency (5 items), resource utilization (4 items), decision-making effectiveness (3 items), and coordination quality (3 items) on 5-point Likert scales ($\alpha = 0.91$). Mediating variables included organizational culture measured with the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (12 items, $\alpha = 0.88$), employee engagement via the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale short form (9 items, $\alpha = 0.92$), and trust in leadership via a 7-item scale ($\alpha = 0.89$).

Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis used SPSS version 27 and the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2018). Hierarchical regression examined leadership-efficiency relationships controlling for organizational size, age, and location. Multi-group analysis tested sector differences using Fisher's z-test for coefficient comparisons. Mediation analysis with 5,000 bootstrap samples tested indirect effects through organizational culture, engagement, and trust. Qualitative analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis in NVivo 14 (two-coder reliability $\kappa = 0.87$). Integration occurred during interpretation.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board. All participants provided informed consent. Organizational and individual identities are protected through de-identification. Special attention was given to power dynamics in employer-employee relationships; participation was strictly voluntary.

4. Results

Descriptive Statistics and Sector Comparisons

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and sector comparisons for key variables using independent-samples t-tests.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Sector Comparisons (n = 428; * p < .05; *** p < .001).

| Variable | Public M (SD) | Private M (SD) | t-value | p-value | Cohen's d |
|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Transformational Leadership | 3.12 (0.68) | 3.28 (0.72) | -2.34 | < .05 | 0.23 |
| Transactional Leadership | 2.87 (0.71) | 3.14 (0.69) | -3.92 | < .001 | 0.39 |
| Laissez-Faire Leadership | 1.48 (0.62) | 1.34 (0.58) | 2.41 | < .05 | 0.24 |
| Administrative Efficiency | 3.48 (0.64) | 3.76 (0.68) | -4.38 | < .001 | 0.43 |

Private sector organizations report significantly higher transactional leadership (M = 3.14 vs. 2.87, p < .001, d = 0.39) and administrative efficiency (M = 3.76 vs. 3.48, p < .001, d = 0.43) than public institutions. Public organizations show slightly higher laissez-faire leadership (M = 1.48 vs. 1.34, p < .05, d = 0.24). The transformational leadership difference is smaller but statistically significant (M = 3.28 vs. 3.12, p < .05, d = 0.23), with private organizations scoring marginally higher. All effect sizes (d) fall in the small-to-medium range.

Leadership Styles and Administrative Efficiency

Hierarchical regression analysis examined leadership style effects on administrative efficiency, controlling for organizational size, age, and location. Table 2 presents standardized regression coefficients for the overall sample and by sector.

Table 2. Leadership Styles Predicting Administrative Efficiency (* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; ns = not significant).

| Predictor | Overall β | Public β | Private β | Diff. Z | p |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------|----|
| Transformational Leadership | .51*** | .54*** | .48*** | 0.68 | ns |
| Transactional Leadership | .35*** | .32** | .38*** | -0.52 | ns |
| Laissez-Faire Leadership | -.26** | -.28** | -.24* | -0.36 | ns |
| R ² | .52 | .56 | .49 | | |

Results confirm strong positive relationships between transformational leadership and efficiency across both sectors (overall $\beta = .51$, $p < .001$), with the highest variance explained in public institutions ($R^2 = .56$). Transactional leadership shows moderate positive effects (overall $\beta = .35$, $p < .001$), and laissez-faire leadership negatively predicts efficiency across contexts (overall $\beta = -.26$, $p < .01$). Although transformational leadership shows numerically stronger effects in public institutions ($\beta = .54$ vs. $.48$) and transactional leadership shows relatively stronger effects in private organizations ($\beta = .38$ vs. $.32$), formal Fisher's z-tests confirm these cross-sector differences are not statistically significant suggesting fundamental leadership principles operate similarly across institutional contexts.

Mediating Mechanisms

Mediation analysis with 5,000 bootstrap samples examined whether organizational culture, employee engagement, and trust in leadership mediate transformational leadership's effects on efficiency. Results reveal significant partial mediation through all three pathways. Organizational culture mediates 28% of total effect (indirect effect = $.15$, 95% CI $[.11, .20]$); employee engagement mediates 35% (indirect effect = $.19$, 95% CI $[.14, .24]$); trust in leadership mediates 22% (indirect effect = $.12$, 95% CI $[.08, .16]$). Combined, the three mediators account for 62% of transformational leadership's total effect, with 38% remaining as direct effect.

For transactional leadership, mediation patterns differ: employee engagement shows stronger mediation (42% of total effect) than organizational culture (18%) or trust (15%), suggesting transactional leadership influences efficiency more through motivational pathways than cultural or relational mechanisms. Sector comparisons reveal engagement mediation is slightly stronger in private organizations where performance incentives are more salient, while cultural mediation is relatively stronger in public institutions where organizational culture is more deeply entrenched.

Qualitative Insights: How Leadership Influences Efficiency

Vision and Direction

Transformational leaders enhance efficiency through clearly articulating organizational priorities and efficiency imperatives. One public sector director explained: "When our new director came, she spent three months developing a clear efficiency vision with measurable targets. For the first time, everyone understood why efficiency mattered and what we were trying to achieve. This clarity eliminated duplicated efforts and wasted resources." Leaders failing to provide direction create priority confusion resulting in resource misallocation and inefficient operations.

Process Improvement and Innovation

Effective leaders actively champion process improvement. A private sector manager stated: "Our CEO constantly challenges us to find better ways of working. He celebrates process improvements and protects innovators when experiments fail. This creates a culture where we continuously eliminate inefficiencies." Conversely, risk-averse leaders suppress improvement initiatives, perpetuating inefficient practices and creating improvement-resistant cultures that persist across leadership transitions.

Decision-Making Speed and Quality

Leadership decisiveness emerged as critical for efficiency across all cases. Participants described how laissez-faire leaders create bottlenecks through delayed decisions. One public sector employee lamented: "My director never decides anything. We have proposals sitting on his desk for months. Meanwhile, problems compound and opportunities pass." Decisive leaders whether transformational or transactional enable timely action that prevents problems from accumulating into systemic inefficiencies.

Resource Allocation and Optimization

Leaders influence efficiency through resource allocation decisions strategically deploying resources to high-priority activities, reallocating from low-value to high-value

functions, investing in capability development, and monitoring resource utilization. Less effective leaders allow allocation by inertia, continuing historical patterns regardless of current strategic priorities, resulting in systematic resource misalignment that compounds over time.

Sector-Specific Dynamics

Public Sector Contexts

Public sector leaders navigate distinctive challenges: complex political dynamics and changing political leadership; rigid bureaucratic structures and civil service rules; multiple conflicting stakeholder expectations; emphasis on equity and due process alongside efficiency; and intensive public scrutiny. Successful leaders leverage transformational approaches to inspire commitment to public service missions. One agency head explained: "I cannot offer large bonuses like private companies. But I can connect our work to serving citizens and improving lives. When employees understand how eliminating processing delays helps real families, they become motivated to find efficiencies."

Private Sector Contexts

Private sector leaders operate under intense competitive pressure demanding rapid adaptation, with clearer bottom-line accountability, greater decision-making authority, more extensive performance incentives, and higher employee turnover requiring continuous attention. Transactional leadership's clarity about performance expectations resonates strongly in this context. One private manager noted: "Everyone knows exactly what is expected and how performance is evaluated. Clear accountability drives efficiency." However, excessive reliance on transactional approaches can undermine long-term engagement and retention. Several participants emphasized needing transformational elements to maintain genuine commitment beyond transactional exchanges.

5. Discussion

Principal Findings and Theoretical Implications

This comparative study demonstrates that leadership style significantly influences administrative efficiency across both public and private institutional contexts. The strong positive relationship between transformational leadership and efficiency across both sectors ($\beta = .51$ overall) supports and extends transformational leadership theory: transformational leaders enhance efficiency not merely through direct management of operations but through inspiring commitment, encouraging innovation, developing capabilities, and shaping continuous improvement cultures. The finding that leadership styles collectively explain 52% of efficiency variance underscores their practical significance for organizational performance.

Transactional leadership's positive contributions challenge simplistic dichotomies pitting transformational against transactional approaches. Optimal leadership likely integrates both: transformational elements for inspiration and culture change, transactional elements for clarity, accountability, and systematic monitoring. Laissez-faire leadership's consistent negative effects across both sectors confirm that leadership abdication undermines organizational functioning regardless of institutional context, validating leadership theory's fundamental premise that leadership matters.

The mediation findings advance understanding of leadership's mechanisms. The substantial portion of transformational leadership's effect operating through organizational culture (28%), engagement (35%), and trust (22%) totaling 62% of total effect through mediators confirms that transformational leadership influences efficiency primarily through shaping organizational conditions rather than through direct management. This has important implications: organizations expecting immediate efficiency returns from leadership development will be disappointed; the pathway operates through cultural and motivational transformation requiring time.

Sector Comparisons: Similarities and Differences

The research reveals more similarities than differences in leadership-efficiency relationships across sectors. Statistical tests confirm no significant differences in leadership coefficients between sectors, supporting universalistic leadership theories proposing core principles applicable across institutional contexts. This finding has important practical implications: leadership development programs can share foundational content across sectors while adding contextually specific modules.

Nevertheless, qualitative findings illuminate important contextual nuances. Public sector leaders can leverage public service motivation where financial incentives are constrained; private sector leaders can use performance accountability more directly while managing higher turnover risks. Effective leadership in each context requires understanding and adapting to these institutional realities rather than applying generic prescriptions.

Practical Recommendations

For Both Sectors

- a. Prioritize transformational leadership development addressing vision articulation, innovation encouragement, individualized follower development, and integrity modeling;
- b. Maintain appropriate transactional elements establishing clear performance expectations, fair accountability systems, and constructive corrective feedback;
- c. Diagnose and address laissez-faire leadership through coaching, accountability structures, and when necessary, leadership reassignment;
- d. Invest in organizational culture development and employee engagement as critical mediating mechanisms, not merely outcomes.

Sector-Specific Recommendations

- a. Public sector: Emphasize mission-driven transformation connecting administrative work to citizen impact; build reform coalitions managing institutional inertia; use peer learning and recognition given limited financial incentive flexibility;
- b. Private sector: Balance performance accountability with developmental support to sustain long-term engagement; address turnover through transformational elements beyond transactional exchanges; leverage competitive pressure to motivate continuous improvement.

Limitations and Future Research

The cross-sectional design precludes causal inference, though theoretical logic and qualitative insights support the hypothesized causal direction. Longitudinal research tracking leadership changes and efficiency outcomes over time would strengthen causal claims. Common method variance may inflate survey-based relationships; future research incorporating objective efficiency metrics processing times, cost data, output volumes would enhance construct validity. Organizational volunteering may bias findings toward more effective organizations. Cultural context may influence results; replication across diverse national settings would enhance generalizability. Finally, MLQ-based leadership measurement captures employee perceptions rather than behavioral observation; future research incorporating multiple methods would provide richer understanding of how leadership actually operates.

6. Conclusion

This comparative study demonstrates that leadership style constitutes a critical determinant of administrative efficiency across both public and private institutional contexts in Indonesia. Transformational leadership proves most powerful, enhancing efficiency through inspiring commitment, encouraging innovation, developing capabilities, and shaping continuous improvement cultures explaining up to 56% of efficiency variance in public institutions. Transactional leadership contributes meaningfully through establishing clarity, accountability, and systematic monitoring. Laissez-faire leadership consistently undermines efficiency regardless of sector, confirming that leadership abdication imposes significant organizational costs universally.

While fundamental leadership principles operate similarly across sectors, contextual nuances shape how leadership is best expressed and leveraged. Public sector leaders can harness public service motivation that financial incentives cannot replicate; private sector leaders can deploy performance accountability more directly while managing retention challenges. Effective leadership in each context requires understanding and adapting to these institutional realities while maintaining commitment to the transformational core that drives organizational excellence.

For administrative science and practice in Indonesia and similar developing contexts, these findings underscore leadership's centrality in improving organizational efficiency. Leadership development investments yield returns through enhanced efficiency, improved organizational performance, and ultimately better service delivery to citizens and stakeholders.

As both public and private organizations face mounting pressures to deliver more with less, developing effective leadership represents a strategic priority with demonstrable, measurable returns.

Author Contributions: M.N.M.: Conceptualization, Methodology, Data Collection, Formal Analysis, Writing original draft preparation, Writing review and editing. N.N.: Conceptualization, Validation, Supervision, Writing review and editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was supported by institutional research funding. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions of participating organizations or funders.

Data Availability Statement: Survey data are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author, subject to organizational confidentiality agreements and participant anonymization.

Acknowledgments: The authors gratefully acknowledge the 52 participating organizations and 428 survey respondents whose cooperation made this research possible. We thank the organizational leaders who generously shared their time and insights during interviews.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441–462. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Mind Garden.
- Boyne, G. A. (2002). Public and private management: What's the difference? *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(1), 97–122. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00284>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Gong, Y., Huang, J. C., & Farh, J. L. (2009). Employee learning orientation, transformational leadership, and employee creativity: The mediating role of employee creative self-efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 765–778. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.43670890>
- Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Hui, C., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader–member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1998.2812>
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>
- Kelloway, E. K., Sivanathan, N., Francis, L., & Barling, J. (2005). Poor leadership. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 89–112). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412975995.n4>

- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership development. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 241–258). Berrett-Koehler.
- Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). The role of organizations in fostering public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1), 40–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00695.x>
- Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367–373. <https://doi.org/10.2307/976618>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7)
- Rainey, H. G., & Steinbauer, P. (1999). Galloping elephants: Developing elements of a theory of effective government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9(1), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024401>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Tummers, L. G., & Knies, E. (2013). Leadership and meaningful work in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 73(6), 859–868. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12138>
- van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic-transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 1–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2013.759347>
- Wang, G., Oh, I. S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(2), 223–270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601111401017>
- Wright, B. E., Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2012). Pulling the levers: Transformational leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence. *Public Administration Review*, 72(2), 206–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02496.x>
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Zhu, W., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2009). Moderating role of follower characteristics in the relationship between transformational leadership and follower work engagement. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 13(2), 76–92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014703>