



An Examination of Theory X Leadership Style and its Impact in the Business Environment – Literature Review

Samuel Agyekum Benson

Ph.D. Student

Valley View University

Oyibi, Accra

School of Business

Email: sammybenson76@gmail.com

Abstract

The literature study focuses on autocratic leadership as a barrier to success in the workplace and other institutions where it is used. The study accomplishes this goal by reviewing and synthesizing the present scholarly literature on this burgeoning topic. The review was conducted by using the Web of Science academic search engines to identify papers from top publications in operations and management. Leaders in developing economy organizations have been reported to have an autocratic leadership style. This review is intended to remind leaders that authoritarian leadership, no matter what color it is painted, is a style of leadership that is generally despised by the people who lead in enterprises. The majority of the time, employees do not have a favorable work attitude. Leaders have mostly ignored employees by adhering to an out-of-date set of principles because they stuck to Theory X, whereas most employees would be more aligned with Theory Y. The different definitions proposed by researchers were emphasized and explored in this review. The advantages and disadvantages of utilizing an authoritarian leadership style were also discussed. It was found that using an autocratic leadership style to solve problems hinders the development of creative ideas; as a result, executives should learn to apply restraint while employing the technique in their organizations.

Keywords: Theory X Leadership Style, Autocratic leadership style, Authoritarian leadership style, and Business Environment

Introduction

Leaders are the pivots around which all primary and crucial business operations revolve in the corporate world (Carroll & Laasch, 2020). This means that how they direct (Miao, Newman, Schwarz, & Cooper, 2018), guide (Ghislieri, Molino, & Cortese, 2018), and control (Tse, To, & Chiu, 2018). the people who work for them could decide how quickly their organizations advance. As leaders, they put themselves in front of the group (Pais, Hurst, Lowe, Rosenbaum, & Wadle, 2019), facilitating development (Geesa, Stith, & Rose, 2020) and motivating employees (Rabiul & Yean, 2021) to achieve organizational goals. A leader is someone who can encourage others to do something they don't want to do or are too lethargic to

accomplish (Latham, 2020). The leadership process entails persuading employees to achieve a common purpose (Shafiu, Manaf, & Muslim, 2019). It is the act of a leader influencing a subordinate's behaviors (Liu, Fuller, Hester, Bennett, & Dickerson, 2018), attitude (HSE, 2018), sentiments (Lanaj, Gabriel, & Chawla, 2021), and goals (Schultz, 2020) in a social system with the willing and eager collaboration of the subordinate being influenced. Certain leadership styles are displayed when affecting employees (Baig, Iqbal, Abrar, Baig, Amjad, Zia-ur-Rehman, & Awan, 2021). According to (Cummings, Tate, Lee, Wong, Paananen, Micaroni, & Chatterjee, 2018), leadership styles are the complete pattern of a leader's behaviors as seen by the leader's personnel. Pye, Mertens, Helewaut, & Krystallidou (2018) went on to say that a leader's leadership style is the distinct way in which he interacts with his team and manages (Smith, Busi, Ball, & Van Der Meer, 2019) the duties at hand.

A Theory X boss is known for their autocratic leadership style (Chukwusa, 2018), allowing little or no employee input in decision-making. They repeatedly require workers to talk and involve them in decision-making when, in fact, a plan of action has been committed to. This group of leaders calls for staff meetings to answer questions and make announcements (van der Haar, Koeslag-Kreunen, Euwe, & Segers, 2017). Staff may not be committed in this environment, resulting in low motivation (Parashakti & Afifah, 2018), low morale (Gyang, 2018), and unwillingness (Uslu, 2019) to establish goals. Leadership in most organizations has been plagued by micromanagement (McKenzie, 2017) and ineffective distribution of authority (Pyc, Meltzer, & Liu, 2017). Organizational failure may result from leaders' inability to appropriately delegate responsibility (Niswaty, Juniati, Darwis, & Salam, 2019) and their over-reliance on autocratic leadership styles or patterns (Guo, Decoster, Babalola, De Schutter, Garba, & Riisla, 2018). This could also be due to management's incapacity to plan (McMillan & Overall, 2017), organize (Martinsons, Davison, & Huang, 2017), and control efficiently (Dahlgaard-Park, Reyes, & Chen, 2018).

Autocratic leadership style hindrance

An autocratic boss never accepts staff decisions (Meyer, 2017) and is usually distant (Siddique, Siddique, & Siddique, 2020). It is frequently referred to as coercive leadership because it is imposed on an organization (Etzioni, 2019). Autocratic executives make decisions (Gurr, Jagers, & Moore, 2017); nevertheless, input from employees may be sought along the process, but it is rarely taken into account (Omonona, Olabanji, & Obamen, 2019). This is because they are benign autocrats. Autocratic leaders exercise total, authoritarian control over their subordinates (NawoseIng'ollan & Roussel, 2017). Authoritarian leadership includes little or no input from group members (Davis, 2018); leaders make the decisions (Wang, 2021); group leaders prescribe all work techniques (Husk, Blockley, Lovell, Bethel, Lang, Byng, & Garside, 2020); and group members are rarely trusted with crucial decisions or duties (Beban, Schoenberger, & Lamb, 2019). In some situations, such as when decisions must be taken rapidly without consulting a large group of people, autocratic leadership may be advantageous. When a specific type of leadership style is applied, nothing significant can be accomplished.

This approach lets employees focus on specific activities (Grzesik, & Piwowar-Sulej, 2018) rather than making complex judgments, allowing them to become highly proficient at doing specialized tasks, which can be helpful to the firm. Autocratic leadership can be beneficial at times, but it can also be a source of passivity (Islam,

Ali, Jamil, & Ali, 2021), which is why leaders who abuse the autocratic leadership style are sometimes perceived as dictatorial (Amah, 2019). Innovative ideas may be stifled in organizations due to authoritarian leadership (Dedahanov, Bozorov, & Sung, 2019), which results from employees' incapacity to participate because they are not consulted (Prisacari, 2020). The classical leadership style is a word used to describe autocratic leadership (Idiegbeyan-Ose, 2018). It is a situation in which the leader has complete control over decision-making (Christensen & Lægreid, 2020) and authority (Ashburn-Nardo, Lindsey, Morris, & Goodwin, 2020). Staff members are not allowed to give an opinion (Kadiyono, Sulistiobudi, Haris, Wahab, Ramdani, Purwanto, ... & Sumartiningsih, 2020) or discuss (Amah, 2018) with the leader; instead, they are expected to follow commands (Zheng, Graham, Farh, & Huang, 2021) and instructions (Wang, Cheng, & Wang, 2018) without being given any explanations. This is because a systematic set of incentives and punishments (Druskienė, & Šarkiūnaitė, 2018) is used to create a motivational atmosphere. Autocratic leadership has been widely criticized in recent years. Some research indicates that businesses with many authoritarian CEOs had more turnover (Buckley, & Reuter, 2019) and absenteeism (Erskine, & Georgiou, 2018) than other organizations.

According to (Siddique & Siddique, 2019), an autocratic leadership style is defined by personnel not engaging in decision-making; all choices are taken without the staff's consent (Akpaprep, Jengre, & Mogre, 2019), and they also control "with an iron hand." (Jackson & Rosberg, 2020). Furthermore, they are adamant in their stance (Smiecinska, 2020) and frequently refuse to explain their actions (Dai, & Spires, 2018). Leaders often disregard prior agreements with employees (Todorova & Vasilev, 2017). They establish tasks (Dyczkowska, 2018) and processes (Essa, 2018) and are unconcerned about the decisions and initiative of their employees. This supported (Le, & Lei, 2019) thesis that leadership is supposed to be a shared role that no one in an organization should claim. The autocratic style is also defined by a leader's will being carried out without regard for the opinions of his or her subordinates (Lin, Chen, Herman, Wei, & Ma, 2019). Based on unilateral (Zhang, & Xie, 2017), top-down communication (Thielen, 2019), autocratic leaders make decisions on their own (Bertsch, Nguyen, Alford, Baran, Reynen, Saeed, & Ondracek, 2017), issue commands to their personnel (Fahlevi, Zuhri, Parashakti, & Ekhsan, 2019), and expect them to follow them out. Leaders utilize their position to determine the proper remuneration to motivate (Olusadum & Anulika, 2018). Autocratic leadership frequently explicitly states what (Glasius, 2018), when (Dörnyei & Muir, 2019), and how (Kalangi, Weol, Tulung, & Rogahang, 2021) a task should be completed. The relationship between the leader and the staff is likewise well defined (Peker, Inandi, & Gilic, 2018). In many cases, staff feedback is not solicited while making decisions (Otieno, & Njoroge, 2019). According to research, decision-making under autocratic leadership is less innovative (Akkaya, 2020); hence (Drouin, Müller, Sankaran, & Vaagaasar, 2018) suggested that transitioning from authoritarian to democratic leadership is more complex than vice versa. Control is one of the management elements that an autocratic leader usually employs (Jiang, Chen, Sun, & Yang, 2017).

Because autocratic leadership is an exchange process (Al Khajeh, 2018), contingent reinforcement of personnel based on performance is necessary. It encourages employees by appealing to their desires and monetary transactions (Kuhn & Maleki, 2017). To keep control, autocratic leaders could employ organizational bureaucracy

(Baltacı, & Balcı, 2017), policy (World Health Organization. 2020), power (Appelbaum, Kogan, Vasarhelyi, & Yan, 2017), and authority (Zelditch, & Walker, 2018). According to (Mensah 2019), previous leadership academics have recognized offering contingent benefits on fulfilling contractual duties as a rationale for employee success. Because it incorporates the trade notion ingrained in autocratic leader behavior, this principal activity represents authoritarian leadership. Tangible (e.g., wage raises) and intangible (e.g., recognition) commodities may be incorporated in contingent incentive transactions or relationships. Leaders of autocracies have been acknowledged. Cherry (2015) uses coercion to establish rules (Karlsson, 2020), control people (Reny, 2021), and make decisions (Mavromati, 2018), and rewards loyalty over merit (da Silva, Neto, Coelho, L., & de Castro, 2019). Theory X, developed by Douglas McGregor, asserts that people should be pushed to work (Aykut, 2019), tightly overseen (Tien, 2019), and paid (Anjara, Nellums, Bonetto, & Van Bortel, 2017) or punished based on individual production (Yusuf, Oluyemisi, Abosede, & Taiwo, 2020).

The focus of autocratic leadership is tight adherence to the organizational chart (Hartnell, Ou, Kinicki, Choi, & Karam, 2019) and explicit delineation of processes (Davies, 2021). According to (Turner R. 2021), authoritarian leaders can succeed in specific work scenarios because they allow for the extremes of thought and ruthlessness, depending on the occasion (Yang, Tossan, & Law, 2021). Because the leader has absolute control in a group or organization (Constantiou, Marton, & Tuunainen, 2017), the autocratic leadership style is strong-minded by the leader's power (Caillier, 2020). The leader is the only one who makes decisions (Smith & Song, 2020) and is responsible for the organization's behavior (Haque, Fernando, & Caputi, 2019), outcomes (Carsten, Uhl-Bien, & Huang, 2018), and accomplishments (Johennesse & Chou, 2017). He expects his coworkers only to follow his instructions (Gumusluoglu, Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, & Hu, 2020) and directives (Li, Liu, & Luo, 2018), to respect (Chen, Davison, Mao, & Wang, 2018), and carry out his choices (Dirani, Hamie, & Tlaiss, 2017) and demands (Sakurai, 2021), and to communicate professionally and in writing (Gandolfi, & Stone, 2017). This leadership style is appropriate for tasks that must be accomplished quickly (Samosudova, 2017) and with reliant associates in insecure working groups (Bartlett, 2019). This leadership style is effective and produces good outcomes at first (Mohiuddin, 2017). However, according to (Drewniak, Drewniak, & Posadzinska, 2020), if this sort of leadership conduct is used long-term without considering the number of human resources and the requirement for associate freedom, it becomes a limiting element in the organization's success.

This leadership style, which is defined by one-way communication channels (AlOqlah, 2021), reveals that autocratic leaders are rarely interested in feedback (Bernadette, 2020) and that employees have little influence and control over decision-making (Shaed, Zainol, Yusof, & Bahrin, 2018). As a result, according to (Lanzer 2019), the structure of an autocratic leadership style can be shown in the form of a pyramid, with the leader at the top and the workforce below. When presented with the need to make a choice, an autocratic leader would come up with an answer for the entire group on their own (Hall, & Ambrosio, 2017). In general, an authoritarian leader would handle a problem and make decisions for the group based on observations (Lirios, Espinosa, & Guillén, 2018) and what they believe is needed or most important for the popular of the group members to benefit at the time (Cusack,

2018). These are the people in charge of deciding when the group should wake up and go and how far they should travel that day.

According to (Shulhan 2018), Autocratic leaderships develop policy standards and assign work to personnel without consulting them. The authoritarian style should be employed only in exceptional circumstances (Badiou, 2020). When there is minimal time for collaborative decision-making (Ulibarri, 2018) or the leader is the most knowledgeable member of the group (Lee, Legood, Hughes, Tian, Newman, & Knight, 2020), authoritarian leadership is most effective. An autocratic leader assigns duties and deadlines to employees and instills an intense concentration on a goal as a result (Saragih, Fakhri, Pradana, Gilang, & Vidjashesa, 2018). The style could be handy for a team with inexperienced and/or unskilled individuals (Nwachukwu, & Emunemu, 2020). A contented employee has a positive attitude at work (Mardanov, 2020, November). Still, a disgruntled employee due to autocratic leadership (Luqman, Fatima, Ahmed, Khalid, & Bhatti, 2020) is a needless addition to their institution's difficulties.

Although authoritarian leaders emphasize high productivity (Khan, Bhat, & Hussanie, 2017), (Klem 2018) argues that this often produces counter-forces of antagonism and output restriction. Hostile attitudes (Faragó, Kende, & Krekó, 2019), the suppression of disagreement (Chiang, Chen, Liu, Akutsu, & Wang, 2021), distorted (Dragu & Przeworski, 2019), and guarded (Rosmanita, Sarwoprasodjo, & Mardiana, 2021) communications, high labor turnover (Wang, & Guan, 2018) and absenteeism (Ansoleaga, Ahumada, & Cruz, 2019), low productivity (Ortmann, & Thompson, 2018), and poor job quality (Shu, Chiang, & Lu, 2018) are all expected outcomes. This type of leadership tends to develop reliant (Hafezalkotob & Hafezalkotob, 2017) and uncreative employees (Kalu Dolly, & Okpokwasili Nonyelum,) who are scared to take on new responsibilities. When leaders care about (Ripp, Peccoraro, & Charney, 2020) and do the right thing (Morsiani, Bagnasco, & Sasso, 2017) regarding staff priorities, they win over their employees. When this happens, the team has no limit to what they can do to ensure the leader's success.

Autocratic leadership may be the best approach in some situations (Kibbe, (2019), but according to (Lirios et al., 2018), authoritarian leadership should not be used when employees become tense, fearful (Isaacs, 2020), or resentful (Chacko, 2020); expect to have their opinions heard (Page, Boysen, & Arya, 2019); and there is low staff morale (Naeem, & Azam, 2017), high turnover (Opalo & Smith, 2021), absenteeism (Nevicka, Van Vianen, De Hoogh, & Voorn, 2018), and work stoppage (Deng, 2020). Also, when you have all of the information you need to solve the problem, you're short on time, and your team is highly motivated, it's a perfect moment to employ it. (Wu, Luo, Wang, Wang, & Sapkota, 2018) said that the style might be used when new, untrained employees don't know what jobs to accomplish or what processes to follow, and adequate supervision can only be delivered through precise instructions. Others include situations when employees do not respond to any other leadership style, high-volume production is required daily, and limited decision-making time.

Discussion and Further Research

The Theory X framework was proposed by McGregor (Keerthana & Babu, 2018) to broadly understand the intersections between managers' ideas of human nature and

their techniques to motivating people in organizational settings. The perceptions and acts linked with the Theory X orientations, according to McGregor, are fundamentally unique. For example, (Taskinen 2019) suggested that managers with a Theory X perspective often presume that employees are satisfied by just addressing their lower-order physiological and safety demands and avoiding disincentives such as corporate punishment. As a result, Theory X managers frequently assume that employees have negative attitudes toward work (Badubi, 2017), that they must be compelled to work (Kaushik & Guleria, 2020), that they must keep from voicing their thoughts (Gao & Jiang, 2019), that they are incapable of self-direction (Mansaray, 2019), and that they require close direction from authority (Hight, Gajjar, & Okumus, 2019). Theory X managers are prone to believe that participative decision-making hurts their perceived power and the organization's effectiveness (Ravenelle, 2019). These findings imply that Theory X managers are less comfortable with dialogic communication (Pang, Shin, Lew, & Walther, 2018), particularly when making decisions. Managers that believe in Theory X are more likely to use anti-social methods like a threat, deception, and unpleasant stimuli (Seering, Kraut, & Dabbish, 2017, February). Theory X managers are more likely to deploy anti-socially oriented persuasive methods such as threat, deception, and unpleasant stimulation than participatory and dialogic communication approaches when seeking others' compliance. Theory X managers believe that employees demand top-down communication and that their bosses give them straight, one-way instructions. Theory X executives do not have a higher propensity for or use of participatory decision making. Theory X executives use more excellent anti-social persuasion techniques.

The study suggests that more empirical research be conducted to establish the influence of theory X leadership style and its performance in an emerging economy. Consider the following research topics and null hypotheses:

Research Question

1. Is there a significant relationship between theory X leadership style on the performance of an organization?

Null Hypotheses

1. There is no significant relationship between theory X leadership style on the performance of an organization?

Conclusion

The reasoning behind this review is based on Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y arguments (Senarathne, 2020). According to McGregor's Theory, a leader's belief system has an impact on organizational decisions. Whether in making decisions or applying other management concepts, what leaders do or don't do, are all influenced by their belief system. According to McGregor, Theory X states: the average worker does not want to work and will avoid it if he can; as a result, he must be pushed to work through threats and penalties. When it comes to issuing solving, an autocratic leadership style hinders the utilization of new solutions. As a result, executives must learn to show moderation when employing the technique in the management of their organizations.

In some cases, an autocratic leadership style can be a helpful way to accomplish success in the workplace. It does not entirely destabilize institutions. The depiction of

the authoritarian leadership style that has just been portrayed has been harsh. In reality, the class has both disadvantages and benefits. In brief, authoritarian leadership may increase production in the short term, but it is typical to see a lack of initiative and institutional strife in the long run.

The leader's utilization of performance recognition and sanction results in an increase in productivity in an authoritarian setting. These leaders are more specific, confident, and at ease with the decision-making responsibilities for the company's strategic plans and operations. Autocratic leaders are less creative than more modern (new) leaders. In a short period, an authoritarian style can produce excellent results. Excessive use of authority, on the other hand, would distort the output in the long run. This style of leadership is highly rigid, and it may be the source of employee disengagement. Since an autocratic leadership style encourages a one-sided dialogue, employees' imagination and leadership abilities are limited, and they are all engaged in repetitive work of daily activities. This personality type makes it difficult to communicate and socialize at work. If an autocratic leader heads a group or organization, it may also lead to disputes and conflicts.



REFERENCES

- Akkaya, B. (2020). Review of leadership styles in perspective of dynamic capabilities: An empirical research on managers in manufacturing firms. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 18(36), 389-407.
- Akparep, J. Y., Jengre, E., & Mogre, A. A. (2019). The influence of leadership style on organizational performance at Tumakavi development association, tamale, the northern region of Ghana. *Open Journal of Leadership*, 8(01), 1.
- Al Khajeh, E. H. (2018). Impact of leadership styles on organizational performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 2018, 1-10.
- ALOqlah, R. M. A. (2021). The effect of leadership styles on improving communication methods among academic administrators. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 16(1), 396-410.
- Amah, O. E. (2018). Employee engagement in Nigeria: The role of leaders and boundary variables. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 44(1), 1-8.

- Amah, O. E. (2019). African leadership process in the development of globalization. In *Globalisation and Leadership in Africa* (pp. 55-74). Palgrave Pivot, Cham.
- Anjara, S. G., Nellums, L. B., Bonetto, C., & Van Bortel, T. (2017). Stress, health and quality of life of female migrant domestic workers in Singapore: a cross-sectional study. *BMC women's health*, 17(1), 1-13.
- Ansoleaga, E., Ahumada, M., & Cruz, G. S. (2019). Association of workplace bullying and workplace vulnerability in the psychological distress of Chilean workers. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(20), 4039.
- Appelbaum, D., Kogan, A., Vasarhelyi, M., & Yan, Z. (2017). Impact of business analytics and enterprise systems on managerial accounting. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 25, 29-44.
- Ashburn-Nardo, L., Lindsey, A., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2020). Who is responsible for confronting prejudice? The role of perceived and conferred authority. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 35(6), 799-811.
- Aykut, H. M. (2019). The Relationship Between Theory X/Y Management Styles and Job Satisfaction: Moderation Roles of Self-Efficacy and Gender.
- Badiou, A. (2020). On the epidemic situation. *Verso Blog*, 22(3), 2020.
- Badubi, R. M. (2017). Theories of motivation and their application in organizations: A risk analysis. *International Journal of Innovation and Economic Development*, 3(3), 44-51.
- Baig, S. A., Iqbal, S., Abrar, M., Baig, I. A., Amjad, F., Zia-ur-Rehman, M., & Awan, M. U. (2021). Impact of leadership styles on employees' performance with moderating role of positive psychological capital. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 32(9-10), 1085-1105.
- Baltacı, A., & Balcı, A. (2017). Complexity leadership: A theoretical perspective. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 5(1), 30-58.
- Bartlett, R. L. (2019). *The Lived Experiences of Strong and Tough Executive Leaders: A Phenomenological Study* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University).
- Beban, A., Schoenberger, L., & Lamb, V. (2019). Pockets of liberal media in authoritarian regimes: what the crackdown on emancipatory spaces means for rural social movements in Cambodia. *Critical Agrarian Studies*, 293.
- Bernadette, A. (2020). Management styles in the academic libraries: An Overview. *Innovative Journal of Science (ISSN: 2714-3309)*, 1(1), 39-48.

Bertsch, A., Nguyen, H. T. H., Alford, A., Baran, W., Reynen, J., Saeed, M., & Ondracek, J. (2017). Exploring the relationship between personality and preferred leadership. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability, and Ethics*, 14(1), 32-45.

Buckley, N., & Reuter, O. J. (2019). Performance Incentives under Autocracy: Evidence from Russia's Regions. *Comparative Politics*, 51(2), 239-266.

Caillier, J. G. (2020). Testing the influence of autocratic leadership, democratic leadership, and public service motivation on citizen ratings of an agency head's performance. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 43(4), 918-941.

Carroll, A. B., & Laasch, O. (2020). From managerial responsibility to CSR and back to responsible management. In *Research Handbook of Responsible Management*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Carsten, M. K., Uhl-Bien, M., & Huang, L. (2018). Leader perceptions and motivation as outcomes of followership role orientation and behavior. *Leadership*, 14(6), 731-756.

Chacko, P. (2020). Gender and authoritarian populism: empowerment, protection, and the politics of resentful aspiration in India. *Critical Asian Studies*, 52(2), 204-225.

Chen, Z. J., Davison, R. M., Mao, J. Y., & Wang, Z. H. (2018). When and how authoritarian leadership and leader renting orientation influence tacit knowledge sharing intentions. *Information & Management*, 55(7), 840-849.

Chiang, J. T. J., Chen, X. P., Liu, H., Akutsu, S., & Wang, Z. (2021). We have emotions but can't show them! Authoritarian leadership, emotion suppression climate, and team performance. *Human Relations*, 74(7), 1082-1111.

Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2020). Balancing governance capacity and legitimacy: how the Norwegian government handled the COVID-19 crisis as a high performer. *Public Administration Review*, 80(5), 774-779.

Chukwusa, J. (2018). Autocratic leadership style: Obstacle to success in academic libraries. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1.

Constantiou, I., Marton, A., & Tuunainen, V. K. (2017). Four models of sharing economy platforms. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 16(4).

Cummings, G. G., Tate, K., Lee, S., Wong, C. A., Paananen, T., Micaroni, S. P., & Chatterjee, G. E. (2018). Leadership styles and outcome patterns for the nursing workforce and work environment: A systematic review. *International journal of nursing studies*, 85, 19-60.

Cusack, S. (2018). Critical educational gerontology and the imperative to empower. In *Teaching and learning in later life* (pp. 61-75). Routledge.

- Dahlgaard-Park, S. M., Reyes, L., & Chen, C. K. (2018). The evolution and convergence of total quality management and management theories. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 29(9-10), 1108-1128.
- Dai, J., & Spires, A. J. (2018). Advocacy in an authoritarian state: How grassroots environmental NGOs influence local governments in China. *The China Journal*, 79(1), 62-83.
- da Silva, A. W. P., Neto, A. R. V., Coelho, A. L. D. A. L., & de Castro, A. B. C. (2019). Correlations between power and affective organizational commitment. *Revista de Gestão e Secretariado*, 10(1), 91-118.
- Davis, C. R. (2018). Administrator leadership styles and their impact on school nursing. *NASN School Nurse*, 33(1), 36-39.
- Davies, M. (2021). How regional organizations respond to human rights: ASEAN's ritualism in comparative perspective. *Journal of Human Rights*, 20(2), 245-262.
- Dedahanov, A. T., Bozorov, F., & Sung, S. (2019). Paternalistic leadership and innovative behavior: Psychological empowerment as a mediator. *Sustainability*, 11(6), 1770.
- Deng, Y. (2020). The Development of Elected Workplace Trade Unions in Authoritarian China. *China Review*, 20(1), 83-108.
- Dirani, K. M., Hamie, C. S., & Tlaiss, H. (2017). Leadership in Saudi Arabia: a multifaceted phenomenon. In *Leadership development in emerging market economies* (pp. 245-260). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Muir, C. (2019). Creating a motivating classroom environment. *Second handbook of English language teaching*, 719-736.
- Dragu, T., & Przeworski, A. (2019). Preventive repression: Two types of moral hazard. *American Political Science Review*, 113(1), 77-87.
- Drewniak, R., Drewniak, Z., & Posadzinska, I. (2020). Leadership styles and employee expectations.
- Drouin, N., Müller, R., Sankaran, S., & Vaagaasar, A. L. (2018). Balancing vertical and horizontal leadership in projects: empirical studies from Australia, Canada, Norway, and Sweden. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*.
- Druskienė, A., & Šarkiūnaitė, I. (2018). Motivational incentives of civil servants in Lithuanian municipalities. *Public policy and Administration*, 17(3), 344-370.
- Dyczkowska, J. (2018). Democratic or autocratic leadership style?.

Ersikine, J. A. K., & Georgiou, G. (2018). Leadership Styles: Employee Stress, Well-being, Productivity, Turnover, and Absenteeism. *Underst. Stress Work*, 28-40.

Essa, M. B. (2018). *Examining the relationship between strategic leadership, leadership styles, and knowledge sharing in the electric power sector in Jordan* (Doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University).

Etzioni, A. (2019). Power as a societal force. In *Power in modern societies* (pp. 18-28). Routledge.

Fahlevi, M., Zuhri, S., Parashakti, R., & Ekhsan, M. (2019). Leadership Styles Of Food Truck Businesses. *Journal of Research in Business, Economics, and Management*, 13(2), 2437-2442.

Faragó, L., Kende, A., & Krekó, P. (2019). Justification of intergroup violence—the role of right-wing authoritarianism and propensity for radical action. *Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict*, 12(2), 113-128.

Gandolfi, F., & Stone, S. (2017). The emergence of leadership styles: A clarified categorization. *Revista De Management Comparat International*, 18(1), 18.

Gao, A., & Jiang, J. (2019). Perceived empowering leadership, harmonious passion, and employee voice: the moderating role of job autonomy. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 1484.

Geesa, R. L., Stith, K. M., & Rose, M. A. (2020). Preparing School and District Leaders for Success in Developing and Facilitating Integrative STEM in Higher Education. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 1942775120962148.

Ghislieri, C., Molino, M., & Cortese, C. G. (2018). Work and organizational psychology look at the fourth industrial revolution: how to support workers and organizations?. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 2365.

Glasius, M. (2018). What authoritarianism is... and is not: a practice perspective. *International Affairs*, 94(3), 515-533.

Grzesik, K., & Piwowar-Sulej, K. (2018). Project Managers' Competencies and Leadership Styles from the Perspective of Organizations Functioning in Poland. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management, and Innovation*, 14(3), 35-60.

Gumusluoglu, L., Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z., & Hu, C. (2020). Angels and devils?: How do benevolent and authoritarian leaders differ in shaping ethical climate via justice perceptions across cultures?. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 29(2), 388-402.

Guo, L., Decoster, S., Babalola, M. T., De Schutter, L., Garba, O. A., & Riisla, K. (2018). Authoritarian leadership and employee creativity: The moderating role of psychological capital and the mediating part of fear and defensive silence. *Journal of Business Research*, 92, 219-230.

Gurr, T. R., Jagers, K., & Moore, W. H. (2017). The transformation of the western state: The growth of democracy, autocracy, and state power since 1800. In *On measuring democracy* (pp. 69-104). Routledge.

Gyang, T. S. (2018). Leadership and teachers' morale in senior secondary schools in Plateau State, Nigeria. *KIU Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 59-67.

Hafezalkotob, A., & Hafezalkotob, A. (2017). A novel approach for a combination of individual and group decisions based on the fuzzy best-worst method. *Applied Soft Computing*, 59, 316-325.

Hall, S. G., & Ambrosio, T. (2017). Authoritarian learning: A conceptual overview. *East European Politics*, 33(2), 143-161.

Haque, A., Fernando, M., & Caputi, P. (2019). The relationship between responsible leadership and organizational commitment and the mediating effect of employee turnover intentions: An empirical study with Australian employees. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(3), 759-774.

Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., Kinicki, A. J., Choi, D., & Karam, E. P. (2019). A meta-analytic test of organizational culture's association with elements of an organization's system and its relative predictive validity on organizational outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(6), 832.

Hight, S. K., Gajjar, T., & Okumus, F. (2019). Managers from "Hell" in the hospitality industry: How do hospitality employees profile bad managers?. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 77, 97-107.

HSE, M. H. M. (2018). Leadership Is Everyone's Game: How to Become a Leader at Any Stage in Your Career. *Canadian Journal of Medical Laboratory Science*, 80(4), 24-24.

Husk, K., Blockley, K., Lovell, R., Bethel, A., Lang, I., Byng, R., & Garside, R. (2020). What approaches to prescribing social work, for whom, and in what circumstances? A realist review. *Health & social care in the community*, 28(2), 309-324.

Idiegbeyan-Ose, J. (2018). An Investigation on the Nexus Between Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction of Library Staff in Private University Libraries South-West, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*.

Isaacs, D. (2020). Apocalypse perhaps. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, 56(8), 1169.

Islam, T., Ali, M., Jamil, S., & Ali, H. F. (2021). How workplace bullying affects nurses' well-being? The roles of burnout and passive avoidant leadership. *International Journal of Human Rights in Healthcare*.

Jackson, R. H., & Rosberg, C. G. (2020). 4. Autocrats and Lordship. In *Personal Rule in Black Africa* (pp. 143-181). University of California Press.

Jiang, H., Chen, Y., Sun, P., & Yang, J. (2017). The relationship between authoritarian leadership and employees' deviant workplace behaviors: The mediating effects of psychological contract violation and organizational cynicism. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 732.

Johennesse, L. A. C., & Chou, T. K. (2017). Employee Perceptions of Talent Management Effectiveness on Retention. *Global Business & Management Research*, 9(3).

Kadiyono, A. L., Sulistiobudi, R. A., Haris, I., Wahab, M. K. A., Ramdani, I., Purwanto, A., ... & Sumartiningsih, S. (2020). Develop leadership style model for Indonesian teachers' performance in Education 4.0 era. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(9), 363-373.

Kalangi, S., Weol, W., Tulung, J., & Rogahang, H. (2021). Principal Leadership Performance: Indonesian Case. *The International Journal of Social Sciences World (TIJOSSW)*, 3(2), 74-89.

Karlsson, C. (2020). *UNEQUAL PILLARS Examining Inequality and Protest Among Autocracies* (Master's thesis).

Kaushik, M., & Guleria, N. (2020). The impact of pandemic COVID-19 in the workplace. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 12(15), 1-10.

Keerthana, Y., & Babu, M. K. (2018). A study on theory x & theory y: implications of teachers in higher education. *International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering*, 8(10), 222-233.

Khan, Z. A., Bhat, S. J., & Hussanie, I. (2017). Understanding leadership theories- A review for researchers. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 7(5), 249-264.

Kibbe, M. R. (2019). Leadership theories and styles. In *Leadership in Surgery* (pp. 27-36). Springer, Cham.

Klem, B. (2018). The problem of peace and the meaning of 'post-war.' *Conflict, Security & Development*, 18(3), 233-255.

Kalu Dolly, C., & Okpokwasili Nonyelum, P. IMPACT OF AUTOCRATIC LEADERSHIP STYLE ON JOB PERFORMANCE OF SUBORDINATES IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES IN PORT HARCOURT, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.

Kuhn, K. M., & Maleki, A. (2017). Micro-entrepreneurs, dependent contractors, and instaserfs: Understanding online labor platform workforces. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 31(3), 183-200.

- Latham, G. (2020). Goal setting: A five-step approach to behavior change. In *Organizational Collaboration* (pp. 10-20). Routledge.
- Lanaj, K., Gabriel, A. S., & Chawla, N. (2021). The self-sacrificial nature of leader identity: Understanding the costs and benefits at work and home. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(3), 345.
- Lanzer, F. (2019). Democracy in Latin America. *Journal of Intercultural Management and Ethics*, 2(3), 73-78.
- Le, P. B., & Lei, H. (2019). Determinants of innovation capability: the roles of transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, and perceived organizational support. *Journal of knowledge management*.
- Lee, A., Legood, A., Hughes, D., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., & Knight, C. (2020). Leadership, creativity, and innovation: a meta-analytic review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(1), 1-35.
- Li, G., Liu, H., & Luo, Y. (2018). Directive versus participative leadership: Dispositional antecedents and team consequences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(3), 645-664.
- Lin, X., Chen, Z. X., Herman, H. M., Wei, W., & Ma, C. (2019). Why and when do employees like to speak up more under humble leaders? The roles of a personal sense of power and power distance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 158(4), 937-950.
- Lirios, C. G., Espinosa, F., & Guillén, J. C. (2018). Model of intangible assets and capitals in organizations. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*, 5(6), 1-12.
- Liu, Y., Fuller, B., Hester, K., Bennett, R. J., & Dickerson, M. S. (2018). Linking authentic leadership to subordinate behaviors. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.
- Luqman, R., Fatima, S., Ahmed, S., Khalid, I., & Bhatti, A. (2020). The Impact of Autocratic Leadership Style on Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Mediating Role of Employee Commitment and Moderating role of Emotional Exhaustion. *Pollster Journal of Academic Research*, 6(01), 22-47.
- Mansaray, H. E. (2019). The Role of Human Resource Management in Employee Motivation and Performance-An Overview. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI) Journal*, 183-194.
- Mardanov, I. (2020, November). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, organizational context, employee contentment, job satisfaction, performance, and intention to stay. In *Evidence-based HRM: a Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*. Emerald Publishing Limited.

- Martinsons, M. G., Davison, R. M., & Huang, Q. (2017). Strategic knowledge management failures in small professional service firms in China. *International Journal of Information Management*, 37(4), 327-338.
- Mavromati, I. (2018). Russia–EU relations and the typical neighborhood, coercion vs. authority. *European Politics and Society*, 19(5), 623-624.
- McKenzie, L. M. (2017). *The stereotypes and biases that plague millennial leaders: best practices and strategies for job promotion* (Doctoral dissertation, Pepperdine University).
- McMillan, C. J., & Overall, J. S. (2017). Crossing the chasm and over the abyss: Perspectives on organizational failure. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 31(4), 271-287.
- Mensah, J. K. (2019). Talent management and employee outcomes: a psychological contract fulfillment perspective. *Public Organization Review*, 19(3), 325-344.
- Meyer, E. (2017). Being the boss in Brussels, Boston, and Beijing. *Harvard Business Review*, 95(4), 70-77.
- Miao, Q., Newman, A., Schwarz, G., & Cooper, B. (2018). How leadership and public service motivation enhance innovative behavior. *Public Administration Review*, 78(1), 71-81.
- Mohiuddin, Z. A. (2017). Influence of Leadership Style on Employees performance: Evidence from Literatures. *Journal of Marketing & Management*, 8(1).
- Morsiani, G., Bagnasco, A., & Sasso, L. (2017). How staff nurses perceive the impact of nurse managers' leadership style on job satisfaction: a mixed-method study. *Journal of nursing management*, 25(2), 119-128.
- Naeem, H., & Azam, M. F. (2017). Leadership styles in the maintenance industry of UAE: a focus group analysis. *European Scientific Journal*, 13(7), 53-67.
- NawoseIng'ollan, D., & Roussel, J. (2017). Influence of leadership styles on employees' performance: A study of Turkana County, Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 8(7), 82-98.
- Nevicka, B., Van Vianen, A. E., De Hoogh, A. H., & Voorn, B. (2018). Narcissistic leaders: An asset or a liability? Leader visibility, follower responses, and group-level absenteeism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(7), 703.
- Niswaty, R., Juniati, F., Darwis, M., & Salam, R. (2019). The Effectiveness of Leadership Functions Implementation in The Makassar Departement of Manpower. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bisnis dan Manajemen*, 5(1), 1-10.

Nwachukwu, O. L., & Emunemu, B. O. (2020). PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STYLE AND TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN IBADAN NORTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF OYO STATE, NIGERIA. *African Journal of Educational Management*, 21(1), 71-83.

Olusadum, N. J., & Anulika, N. J. (2018). Impact of Motivation on Employee Performance: A Study of AlvanIkoku Federal College of Education. *Sigma*, 1(1).

Omonona, S., Olabanji, O. N. I., & Obamen, J. (2019). Effects of leadership style on employee performance of fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) in South Africa. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 11(1 (J)), 1-10.

Opalo, K. O., & Smith, L. (2021). Ideology and succession politics in Ethiopia: autocratic leadership turnover and political instability. *Democratization*, 1-20.

Ortmann, S., & Thompson, M. R. (2018). Introduction: The "Singapore model" and China's Neo-Authoritarian Dream. *The China Quarterly*, 236, 930-945.

Otieno, B. N., & Njoroge, J. G. (2019). EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: CASE OF TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF KENYA.

Page, L., Boysen, S., & Arya, T. (2019). Creating a culture that thrives. *Organization Development Review*, 51(1), 28-35.

Pais, E., Hurst, S., Lowe, D., Rosenbaum, J., & Wadle, J. (2019). Community school teacher leaders enhance learning—community Schools: People and Places *Transforming Education and Communities*, 39.

Pang, A., Shin, W., Lew, Z., & Walther, J. B. (2018). Building relationships through dialogic communication: organizations, stakeholders, and computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 24(1), 68-82.

Parashakti, R. D., & Afifah, F. (2018). Influences of Autocratic Leadership Style, Work Motivation, and Work Discipline on Employee Performance (Case Study at PT. Elite Prima Hutama Building Management Mall Kota Kasablanka 2017. *Work*, 49.

Peker, S., Inandi, Y., & Gilic, F. (2018). The Relationship between Leadership Styles (Autocratic and Democratic) of School Administrators and the Mobbing Teachers Suffer. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 7(1), 150-164.

Prisacari, V. (2020). Assessing decision-making capacity. *Current Psychiatry*, 19(8), e1-e3.

Pyc, L. S., Meltzer, D. P., & Liu, C. (2017). Ineffective leadership and employees' adverse outcomes: The mediating effect of anxiety and depression. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 24(2), 196.

Pype, P., Mertens, F., Helewaut, F., & Krystallidou, D. (2018). Healthcare teams as complex adaptive systems: understanding team behavior through team members' perception of interpersonal interaction. *BMC health services research*, 18(1), 1-13.

Rabiul, M. K., & Yean, T. F. (2021). Leadership styles, motivating language, and work engagement: An empirical investigation of the hotel industry—*International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 92, 102712.

Ravenelle, A. J. (2019). "We're not uber:" control, autonomy, and entrepreneurship in the gig economy—*Journal of Managerial Psychology*.

Reny, M. E. (2021). Autocracies and the control of societal organizations. *Government and Opposition*, 56(1), 39-58.

Ripp, J., Peccoraro, L., & Charney, D. (2020). Attending to the emotional well-being of the health care workforce in a New York City health system during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Academic medicine*.

Rosmanita, I., Sarwoprasodjo, S., & Mardiana, R. (2021). Communication of Leadership and Group Conformity in Community Forest Management. *HABITAT*, 32(1), 37-46.

Sakurai, K. (2021). Changes in the Frequency of Coworker Incivility: Roles of Work Hours, Workplace Sex Ratio, Supervisor Leadership Style, and Incivility. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 63(3), 177-189.

Samosudova, N. V. (2017). Modern leadership and management methods for development organizations. In *MATEC Web of Conferences* (Vol. 106, p. 08062). EDP Sciences.

Saragih, R., Fakhri, M., Pradana, M., Gilang, A., & Vidjashesa, G. A. (2018). Ethical leadership's effect on employee discipline: Case of an Indonesian telecommunication company. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management* (pp. 1630-1638).

Schultz, J. (2020). *Becoming the Leader, You Value An Act Coaching Intervention for Compassionate Leadership* (Doctoral dissertation, Widener University).

Seering, J., Kraut, R., & Dabbish, L. (2017, February). Shaping pro and anti-social behavior on twitch through moderation and example-setting. *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM conference on computer-supported cooperative work and social computing* (111-125).

Senarathne, C. W. (2020). The Optimal Capital Structure under the Conditions of Employment: An Application of Theory X and Theory Y. *Zagreb International Review of Economics & Business*, 23(1), 51-69.

Shaed, M. M. B., Zainol, I. N. B. H., Yusof, M. B. M., & Bahrin, F. K. (2018). Types of Employee Participation in Decision Making (PDM) amongst the Middle

Management in the Malaysian Public Sector. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 8(8), 603-613.

Shafiu, A. M., Manaf, H. A., & Muslim, S. (2019). The Impact Of Effective Leadership On Employee's Performance In Local Government Of Kaduna State, 2013-2019. *The International Journal of Engineering and Science (IJES)*, 8(11), 60-65.

Shu, C. Y., Chiang, Y. H., & Lu, C. H. (2018). Authoritarian leadership supervisor support and workers' compulsory citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Manpower*.

Shulhan, M. (2018). Leadership style in the madrasah in Tulungagung: how principals enhance teacher's performance. *International Journal of Educational Management*.

Siddique, C. M., & Siddique, H. F. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of managerial decision-making styles in the Arabian Gulf. *Management Research Review*.

Siddique, C. M., Siddique, H. F., & Siddique, S. U. (2020). A mediation-moderated analysis links authoritarian leadership to employee organizational embeddedness, LMX, and performance in a high-power distance culture. *Journal of Strategy and Management*.

Smiecińska, N. (2020). Crisis of Neoliberalism and the Rise of Authoritarianism in Poland: How a "Good Change" turns Poland into a Neo-Authoritarian State. In *The Global Rise of Authoritarianism in the 21st Century* (pp. 251-274). Routledge.

Smith, J. C., & Song, Y. (2020). A survey of network interdiction models and algorithms. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 283(3), 797-811.

Smith, M., Busi, M., Ball, P., & Van Der Meer, R. (2019). Factors influencing an organization's ability to manage innovation: a structured literature review and conceptual model. *Managing Innovation: What Do We Know About Innovation Success Factors?* 69-90.

Taskinen, T. (2019). Employee job satisfaction in 21st Century organizations.

Thielen, N. (2019). Top-Down Communication-The Influence of Managers on Employee Engagement.

Tien, N. H. (2019). International economics, business, and management strategy. *Dehli: Academic Publications*.

Todorova, T., & Vasilev, A. (2017). Some transaction cost effects of authoritarian management. *International Journal of the Economics of Business*, 24(3), 295-314.

Tse, H. H., To, M. L., & Chiu, W. C. (2018). When and why does transformational leadership influence employee creativity? The roles of personal control and creative personality. *Human Resource Management*, 57(1), 145-157.

Turner, R. (2021). Using Principal-steward Contracting and Scenario Planning to Manage Megaprojects. *Project Management Journal*.

Ulibarri, N. (2018). Collaborative model development increases trust in and use of scientific information in environmental decision-making. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 82, 136-142.

Uslu, O. (2019). A general overview of leadership theories from a critical perspective. *Маркетинг і менеджмент інновацій*, (1), 161-172.

van der Haar, S., Koeslag-Kreunen, M., Euwe, E., & Segers, M. (2017). Team leader structuring for team effectiveness and team learning in command-and-control teams. *Small Group Research*, 48(2), 215-248.

Wang, H., & Guan, B. (2018). The positive effect of authoritarian leadership on employee performance: The moderating role of power distance. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 357.

Wang, L., Cheng, M. Y., & Wang, S. (2018). Carrot or stick? The role of in-group/out-group on the multilevel relationship between authoritarian and differential leadership and employee turnover intention. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 152(4), 1069-1084.

Wang, Y. (2021). When artificial intelligence meets educational leaders' data-informed decision-making: A cautionary tale. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 69, 100872.

World Health Organization. (2020). Biosafety program management.

Wu, C., Luo, X., Wang, T., Wang, Y., & Sapkota, B. (2018). Safety challenges and improvement strategies of ethnic minority construction workers: a case study in Hong Kong. *International journal of occupational safety and ergonomics*.

Yang, I., Tossan, V., & Law, F. (2021). French leadership: exploring organizational leadership in French contexts. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 1-17.

Yusuf, S. O., Oluyemisi, A. G. B. O. O. L. A., Abosede, O. A., & Taiwo, O. E. (2020). EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND ADAPTIVE PERFORMANCE IN THE MANUFACTURING SECTOR: EVIDENCE FROM DRURY INDUSTRIES LIMITED, OGUN STATE, NIGERIA. *HALLMARK UNIVERSITY*, 207.

Zelditch, M., & Walker, H. A. (2018). Legitimacy and the stability of authority. *Status, Power and Legitimacy*, 315-338.

Zhang, Y., & Xie, Y. H. (2017). Authoritarian leadership and extra-role behaviors: a role-perception perspective. *Management and Organization Review*, 13(1), 147-166.

Zheng, Y., Graham, L., Farh, J. L., & Huang, X. (2021). The impact of authoritarian leadership on ethical voice: A moderated mediation model of felt uncertainty and leader benevolence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 170(1), 133-146.

© GSJ