



Role of Leadership Style in Enhancing Employee Productivity

Faizaan Pavlidaki

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Sundarban College of Technology Studies, Bangladesh
faizaan.pavlidaki@scts-bd.net

Peer Review Information	Abstract
<i>Submission: 30 Jan 2017</i> <i>Revision: 15 Feb 2017</i> <i>Acceptance: 25 March 2017</i> Keywords <i>Leadership Style, Employee Productivity, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Work Engagement</i>	Leadership style is a central managerial factor shaping employee effort, motivation, engagement, role clarity, and work performance. This study examines the role of leadership style in enhancing employee productivity by synthesizing established empirical evidence published up to 2016. The paper focuses primarily on transformational, transactional, participative/supportive, and passive leadership patterns and evaluates the mechanisms through which they affect individual and team outcomes. A structured literature-based methodology was used, giving priority to peer-reviewed studies and meta-analyses with verified Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs). The evidence indicates that transformational leadership has the most consistently positive association with employee productivity because it strengthens meaningfulness, trust, intrinsic motivation, engagement, and willingness to exert extra effort. Transactional leadership, especially contingent reward, is also effective when performance goals are clear and rewards are perceived as fair. Participative and supportive behaviours improve ownership and information sharing, whereas passive or laissez-faire leadership generally provides weak performance support. The synthesis further shows that leadership does not influence productivity through a single direct route; its effects are transmitted through psychological and job-related mechanisms such as engagement, job characteristics, satisfaction, and leader-follower trust. The study concludes that organizations should develop leaders who combine inspirational direction with clear expectations, feedback, fair rewards, and employee involvement.

Introduction

Organizations depend on employees not only to complete assigned tasks but also to maintain quality, solve problems, coordinate with colleagues, and respond to changing customer and operational requirements. Employee productivity therefore reflects more than output volume; it includes efficient task completion, accuracy, service quality, discretionary effort, and the ability to contribute to collective goals. Among the managerial conditions that shape these outcomes, leadership is especially important because supervisors translate organizational objectives into day-to-day

priorities, allocate attention and resources, provide feedback, and influence how employees interpret their work.

Leadership style refers to the relatively consistent pattern of behaviours through which leaders direct, motivate, support, and influence followers. Transformational leaders articulate a meaningful vision, provide individualized consideration, stimulate new ways of thinking, and encourage followers to perform beyond minimum expectations. Transactional leaders establish exchanges around clear goals, monitoring, and rewards. Participative or

supportive leaders involve employees in decisions, create interpersonal support, and encourage voice, while laissez-faire or passive leadership is characterized by delayed decisions and limited guidance. These styles can produce different productivity consequences because they affect both the motivational and structural conditions of work.

Meta-analytic evidence established early that transformational and contingent-reward leadership were positively related to important criteria such as follower satisfaction, motivation, and leader effectiveness, with transformational leadership showing substantial validity across outcomes (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Later meta-analysis across 25 years of research confirmed that transformational leadership was positively related to individual, team, and organizational performance, with particularly strong links to contextual performance (Wang et al., 2011). These findings suggest that leadership can influence productivity at multiple levels rather than operating only through the direct supervision of isolated employees.

At the employee level, leadership can enhance productivity by changing how work is experienced. Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) found that transformational leadership was associated with perceptions of enriched core job characteristics, which in turn helped explain job behaviours. Tims et al. (2011) demonstrated at the daily level that transformational leadership was connected with followers' work engagement, illustrating that leader behaviour can affect energy and dedication from one working day to another. Similarly, Kovjanic et al. (2012) showed that the fulfilment of basic psychological needs provides an important mechanism linking transformational leadership with positive employee outcomes.

Leadership also affects productivity through trust and team processes. Braun et al. (2013) reported positive relationships between transformational leadership, follower job satisfaction, and objective team performance, with trust playing an important mediating role. Breevaart et al. (2014) further showed that daily transformational leadership and contingent reward were related to daily employee engagement. Collectively, these studies indicate that effective leadership combines direction with motivation and relational quality. The present paper therefore synthesizes pre-2017 evidence to explain which leadership styles most consistently enhance employee productivity, through what mechanisms, and under what practical conditions.

Literature Review

Transformational leadership is the most extensively studied style in relation to performance. Judge and Piccolo (2004) showed through meta-analysis that transformational leadership and contingent reward both had meaningful validity across leadership outcomes. Their findings are important because they challenge the assumption that inspiration alone is sufficient; structured exchange and reward also matter. The later meta-analysis by Wang et al. (2011), based on a broad body of studies, strengthened the performance argument by showing positive relationships across individual, team, and organizational criteria.

Research also explains why transformational leadership is productive. Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) linked transformational leadership to richer job characteristics and subsequent job behaviours, indicating that leaders can influence productivity by making work more meaningful, autonomous, and significant. Tims et al. (2011) found that transformational leadership was positively connected with daily work engagement. This is particularly relevant for productivity because engagement captures vigour, dedication, and absorption—states that support persistence and focused effort.

Motivational mechanisms extend beyond engagement. Kovjanic et al. (2012) used a self-determination perspective and found that employees' basic psychological needs help transmit transformational leadership effects to positive outcomes. When employees experience competence, autonomy, and relatedness, they are more likely to internalize goals and sustain effort. Braun et al. (2013) highlighted trust as another mechanism: transformational leadership was related to job satisfaction and objective team performance, while trust in the supervisor and team helped explain parts of these relationships.

Transactional leadership is most useful when it takes an active, contingent-reward form. Clear standards, timely feedback, and rewards that are linked to performance can reduce ambiguity and reinforce desired behaviour. Judge and Piccolo (2004) found contingent reward to be an effective leadership component, while Breevaart et al. (2014) observed that daily contingent reward was positively related to employee engagement. Passive management-by-exception and laissez-faire leadership, in contrast, provide limited motivational and developmental support and are generally less effective.

Participative and supportive behaviours are often embedded within broader transformational or relational approaches. They can enhance productivity by improving information quality, employee voice, ownership, and commitment to implementation. However, participation works best when decision rights and accountability remain clear. In highly routine or time-critical settings, extensive participation may slow decisions, whereas in knowledge-intensive settings it can improve problem solving and innovation. Thus, leadership effectiveness is partly contingent on task structure and organizational context.

A further meta-analytic review by Banks et al. (2016) found substantial conceptual and empirical overlap between authentic and transformational leadership, reinforcing the importance of carefully distinguishing leadership constructs when interpreting performance effects. For the present synthesis, the emphasis remains on observable leadership behaviours and their practical links with employee productivity rather than on treating closely related positive leadership labels as entirely independent.

Table 1. Selected literature linking leadership style with employee productivity-related outcomes

Study	Leadership focus	Main productivity-related finding
Judge & Piccolo (2004)	Transformational and transactional	Transformational leadership and contingent reward showed positive validity across effectiveness, motivation and satisfaction outcomes.
Piccolo & Colquitt (2006)	Transformational	Leadership influenced job behaviours partly through enriched core job characteristics.
Wang et al. (2011)	Transformational	Positive relationships were found with individual, team and organizational performance.
Tims et al. (2011)	Transformational	Daily transformational leadership was associated with higher follower work engagement.
Kovjanic et al. (2012)	Transformational	Basic psychological need fulfilment helped explain positive employee outcomes.
Braun et al. (2013)	Transformational	Positive links with job satisfaction and objective team performance; trust was an important mechanism.
Breevaart et al. (2014)	Transformational and contingent reward	Daily leadership behaviours were positively related to daily employee engagement.

Methodology

This paper adopts a structured literature-based empirical synthesis rather than presenting fabricated primary survey data. The unit of analysis is the published empirical study or meta-analysis. The review boundary was restricted to research published in 2016 or earlier, consistent with the requested reference period. Priority was given to peer-reviewed articles that directly examined leadership style and employee-, team-, or organization-level outcomes related to productivity, such as task performance, contextual performance, engagement, job behaviours, satisfaction, and objective team performance.

Studies were selected using four criteria: (1) publication year not later than 2016; (2) clear relevance to leadership behaviour or style; (3) measurable employee or performance-related outcomes; and (4) an identifiable DOI. The synthesis emphasizes convergent findings rather

than simple vote counting. Meta-analyses were weighted conceptually more heavily because they aggregate evidence across multiple samples, while diary, multilevel, and mediation studies were used to clarify mechanisms.

For analysis, leadership styles were organized into four practical categories: transformational, transactional/contingent-reward, participative-supportive, and passive/laissez-faire. Productivity was interpreted through four dimensions: task performance, quality/efficiency, work engagement and discretionary effort, and team-level performance. Evidence was coded qualitatively as strong positive, moderate positive, context-dependent, or weak/negative. The method therefore provides an evidence-informed comparative assessment without claiming that the reviewed studies used identical productivity measures.



Figure 1. Conceptual framework: leadership styles influence employee productivity through motivation, engagement, trust and role clarity.

Table 2. Analytical constructs used in the literature-based synthesis

Construct	Operational interpretation in this study	Expected effect on productivity
Transformational leadership	Vision, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, individualized support	Strong positive
Transactional leadership	Goal clarity, monitoring, contingent reward and corrective action	Positive when active and fair
Participative/supportive leadership	Employee involvement, voice, interpersonal support and consultation	Positive but context-dependent
Passive/laissez-faire leadership	Delayed decisions, low guidance, limited feedback	Weak or negative
Employee productivity	Task output, efficiency, quality, engagement, extra-role effort and team performance	Outcome construct

Results

The evidence synthesis shows the clearest and most consistent positive productivity pattern for transformational leadership. Meta-analytic findings indicate that transformational leadership is associated with performance across multiple criteria and levels (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Wang et al., 2011). The practical implication is that employees tend to perform better when leaders provide an inspiring direction while simultaneously encouraging development, initiative, and a sense of contribution.

The second major result is that employee productivity is mediated by motivational and relational mechanisms. Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) demonstrated that transformational leaders can shape job characteristics that support desirable job behaviours. Tims et al. (2011) and Breevaart et al. (2014) connected active leadership behaviours with daily engagement, while Kovjanic et al. (2012) highlighted psychological need fulfilment. Braun et al. (2013) added evidence that trust and satisfaction are important links between transformational leadership and performance. These mechanisms explain why leadership style

can alter productivity even when formal job descriptions remain unchanged.

Transactional leadership produces a more conditional pattern. Contingent reward is useful because it clarifies expectations and reinforces achieved performance. Its effectiveness is likely to be strongest in settings where outputs can be measured reliably, employees understand the reward-performance link, and rewards are perceived as fair. However, transactional leadership alone may not generate the same level of initiative, creativity, or discretionary effort as transformational leadership. The best evidence therefore supports a complementary approach: transformational behaviours for meaning and development, combined with transactional clarity for accountability and feedback.

Participative and supportive leadership is evaluated as moderately positive and context-dependent. It can improve ownership, communication, and acceptance of decisions, which supports productivity in knowledge-intensive or interdependent work. Yet participation without role clarity can create delay or diffuse accountability. Passive leadership is the least supportive pattern because employees receive insufficient feedback, delayed decisions,

and weak problem resolution. The comparative result is therefore not that one style should be used mechanically in every situation, but that

active, developmental, and clear leadership is consistently more productivity-enhancing than passive supervision.

Table 3. Comparative synthesis of leadership styles and employee productivity

Leadership style	Evidence pattern	Main mechanism	Productivity implication
Transformational	Strong positive	Meaning, trust, engagement, psychological need fulfilment	Higher task/contextual performance and extra effort
Transactional / contingent reward	Moderate positive	Goal clarity, feedback, reward-performance link	Higher reliability and effort when criteria are clear
Participative / supportive	Moderate; context-dependent	Voice, ownership, information sharing	Useful for problem solving and commitment
Passive / laissez-faire	Weak / adverse	Low guidance and delayed feedback	Lower coordination and weaker performance support

Conclusion and Discussion

The reviewed evidence supports the conclusion that leadership style is a meaningful organizational lever for employee productivity. Transformational leadership has the strongest overall support because it combines direction with inspiration, individualized support, intellectual stimulation, and a broader sense of purpose. Its productivity effects are not limited to direct commands; they are transmitted through the quality of employees' work experience. When leaders strengthen trust, engagement, meaningfulness, competence, and autonomy, employees are more likely to sustain effort and contribute beyond formal minimum requirements. Transactional leadership should not be dismissed. Contingent reward provides the clarity, monitoring, and reinforcement that many operational environments require. Judge and Piccolo (2004) found that contingent reward had meaningful validity, and Breevaart et al. (2014) showed that it can support daily engagement. Consequently, the most practical leadership model is often a balanced one in which managers establish clear performance standards and fair rewards while also using transformational behaviours to build commitment and initiative. The results also emphasize that productivity is multidimensional. A leader may improve short-term output through close monitoring, yet fail to develop trust, learning, or discretionary effort. Conversely, a highly inspirational leader may create enthusiasm but underperform if employees lack clear goals or feedback. Effective leadership therefore requires both relational quality and performance structure. Managers should communicate priorities, explain why the work matters, provide frequent feedback, recognize achievements, invite appropriate employee

input, and intervene promptly when obstacles arise. For human resource practice, organizations should evaluate leadership development using employee and performance outcomes rather than relying only on personality or seniority. Training should include vision communication, coaching, feedback, goal setting, reward fairness, conflict resolution, and participative decision-making. Periodic employee feedback can identify passive leadership patterns before they become embedded. Selection and promotion systems should also consider a manager's ability to generate trust and engagement, because the literature shows that these are important pathways to performance (Braun et al., 2013; Kovjanic et al., 2012). This study is limited by its literature-based design and by differences in how the source studies operationalize performance. The synthesis does not estimate a new pooled effect size and should not be interpreted as primary survey evidence from a single organization or country. Nevertheless, restricting the evidence base to established peer-reviewed studies published up to 2016 provides a coherent foundation for understanding the leadership-productivity relationship. Future empirical research can test the framework in specific sectors using matched supervisor-employee data, objective productivity indicators, and longitudinal designs. In conclusion, employee productivity is most likely to improve when leadership is active, clear, developmental, and trustworthy. Transformational leadership provides the strongest basis for motivation and discretionary effort, contingent-reward leadership strengthens accountability, and participative-supportive behaviours improve ownership where the task context allows. Passive leadership offers the least support. Organizations

seeking sustainable productivity should therefore develop flexible leaders who can combine inspiration, structure, feedback, fair exchange, and employee involvement.

References

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>

Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 327–340. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2006.20786079>

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2011). Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 121–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.12.011>

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>

Kovjanic, S., Schuh, S. C., Jonas, K., Van Quaquebeke, N., & van Dick, R. (2012). How do transformational leaders foster positive employee outcomes? A self-determination-based analysis of employees' needs as mediating links. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(8), 1031–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1771>

Braun, S., Peus, C., Weisweiler, S., & Frey, D. (2013). Transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and team performance: A multilevel mediation model of trust. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 270–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.11.006>

Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., Demerouti, E., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2014). Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 138–157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12041>

Banks, G. C., McCauley, K. D., Gardner, W. L., & Guler, C. E. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(4), 634–652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.02.006>