

**LEADERSHIP STYLES AND  
EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT**

**SHIREEN RENUKA PADMANATHAN**

**MHRM**

**Universiti Utara Malaysia**

**2010**



**KOLEJ PERNIAGAAN**  
(College of Business)  
Universiti Utara Malaysia

**PERAKUAN KERJA KERTAS PROJEK**  
(Certification of Project Paper)

Saya, mengaku bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa  
(I, the undersigned, certified that)  
**SHIREEN RENUKA PADMANATHAN (802427)**

Calon untuk Ijazah Sarjana  
(Candidate for the degree of) **MASTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

telah mengemukakan kertas projek yang bertajuk  
(has presented his/her project paper of the following title)

**LEADERSHIP STYLES AND EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT**

Seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit kertas project  
(as it appears on the title page and front cover of the project paper)

Bahawa kertas projek tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan.  
(that the project paper acceptable in the form and content and that a satisfactory knowledge of the field is covered by the project paper).

Nama Penyelia : **DR. NORSAH BT MAT**

*norsiah@uum.edu.my*

Tandatangan  
(Signature)

Tarikh : **17 FEBRUARY 2011**

(Date)

## **PERMISSION TO USE**

In presenting this project paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this project paper in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purpose may be granted by my supervisor(s) or, in their absence by the Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this project paper or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be given to me and to University Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my project paper. Request for permission to copy or make other use of materials in this project paper, in whole or in part should be addressed to:

**Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business**

**College of Business**

**Universiti Utara Malaysia**

**06010 UUM Sintok**

**Kedah Darul Aman**

## ABSTRAK

Objektif kajian ini adalah untuk mengkaji hubungan antara gaya-gaya kepimpinan transaksional dan transformasi pada tahap dedikasi pekerja di sector FES Intel Malaysia. Kajian ini akan mengkaji gaya-gaya kepimpinan yang lebih positif and aspek-aspek yang akan meningkatkan tahap dedikasi pekerja. Walaubagaimanapun, kajian ini juga akan digunakan untuk meramalkan jikanya kepimpinan transaksional atau transformasi adalah lebih berkesan dan langkah-langkah yang akan diambil until menaiki tahap dedikasi perkerja. Kajian ini kritikal kepada Intel Malaysia kerana pihak atasan mahu langkah-langkah masa depan diambil untuk memastikan tindakan yang sesuai akan diambil untuk memastikan bahawa pekerja-pekerja akan rasa lebih dedikasi terhadap pekerjaan mereka and kepada syarikat. Maka, dua soalan penyelidikan (hipotesis) telah direka untuk mencapai objektif kajian ini.

Kajian kuantitatif akan digunakan untuk satu soal selidik ini dan data akan digunakan untuk pengujian hipotesis. Sampel untuk kajian ini terdiri dari pekerja-pekerja dari bahagian FES di Intel Pulau Pinang. Salinan soal selidik akan didistribusikan kepada sampel pekerja-pekerja dalam bahagian FES selepas bertemu dengan mereka.

Analisis ini menunjukkan bahawa kedua-dua gaya kepimpinan, iaitu transaksional dan transformasi memang ada kesan positif, tetapi, gaya transaksi adalah gaya yang lebih dominan jika dibanding dengan gaya kepimpinan transformasi. Implikasi dan langkah-langkah arah masa depan untuk kajian kepimpinan akan dibincangkan.

## ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to examine the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles on employee engagement at Intel Malaysia. This study examines the predictive ability to gauge the ability of leadership styles to positively predict aspects of employee engagement. However, it would also want to predict if it's transformational or transactional leadership as the more effective style as it will have more predictive power. This study is critical to Intel Malaysia as we would like future steps to be taken to ensure that appropriate future action will be taken to ensure that employees are kept engaged at a high level. Hence, two research questions were developed to achieve the objective of this study.

Quantitative study using a structured questionnaire was used to collect the data for the hypothesis testing. The population for this study was the exempt level of the FES Organization at Intel Penang. A hardcopy questionnaire was distributed to the sample of employees in various FES Organizations after the face validity was conducted.

The analysis found that both transformational and transactional leadership positively portrayed employee engagement, where transactional show more effect on employee engagement as compared to transformational leadership. Implications, limitations and future directions for leadership research were discussed.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project paper would not have been possible without the support, love and encouragement from many people. A special thank you to my wonderful family for all their support throughout the duration of my study. I am grateful for all the wonderful things that have provided in my life to ensure that I have adequate time, nourishment (both body and soul) to see me complete my course. A delightful thank you especially to my adorable nephew, Ryan, who taught me that homework and study never ends and this in turn has spurred my love for studying. A special loving and affectionate thank you also to the wonderful man in my life, David, for his unfailing love and support and for standing by me as I complete my studies even though we are so far apart. I hope that I will be an inspiration for his studies as he has been for mine.

A special heartfelt recognition goes to my wonderful supervisor Dr Norsiah Bt Mat. She has been a tower of strength with her wisdom and guidance and many hours spent with us. I am so wonderfully lucky to have her as my project supervisor.

Last but not least, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to the Intel Malaysia Management Team who provided me with this opportunity for study and also to my manager, Eric Harding, who has been understanding and encouraging. Many thanks to all the coordinators who have worked long and hard to help our entire class obtain our Masters and to my co-students whom I have shared many happy moments with. Let me not forget all those wonderful folks that so willingly responded to my questionnaire. THANK YOU.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| PERMISSION TO USE.....  | II  |
| ABSTRAK .....   | III |
| ABSTRACT .....  | IV  |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....  | V   |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....   | VI  |
| CHAPTER 1 .....   | 1   |
| INTRODUCTION .....  | 1   |
| 1.1 Introduction to the Study .....                                 | 1   |
| 1.2 Background of the Problem.....                                  | 7   |
| 1.3 Statement of the Problem .....                                  | 9   |
| 1.4 Research Objectives .....                                       | 10  |
| 1.5 Research Questions .....  | 11  |
| 1.6 Significance of the Study.....                                  | 11  |
| 1.7 Definition of Key Terms .....                                   | 13  |
| 1.8 Organization of Remaining Chapters.....                         | 14  |
| CHAPTER 2 .....   | 15  |
| LITERATURE REVIEW.....  | 15  |
| 2.1 Review of Related Literature .....                              | 15  |
| 2.1.1 Employee Engagement, Productivity and Leadership styles ..... | 15  |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 2.1.2 Transformational Leadership : What are the Four “I” s ? .....                        | 17 |
| 2.1.3 To what extent can Leaders influence their people ? .....                            | 18 |
| 2.1.4 The relationship between Leaders and their organization .....                        | 19 |
| 2.1.5 Summary of Literature Review and Why the Focus on Transformational Leadership? ..... | 21 |
| 2.2 Research Framework/Theoretical Framework .....   | 22 |
| 2.3 Definition of Variables .....  | 26 |
| 2.3.1 Conceptual Definitions .....   | 26 |
| 2.4 Hypotheses Development.....  | 27 |
| CHAPTER 3 .....  | 28 |
| METHODOLOGY .....  | 28 |
| 3.1 Introduction.....  | 28 |
| 3.2 Research Design.....   | 28 |
| 3.2.1 Type of Study .....  | 28 |
| 3.2.2 Sources of Data.....   | 29 |
| 3.2.3 Unit of Analysis .....   | 30 |
| 3.2.4 Population Frame.....  | 30 |
| 3.2.5 Sample & Sampling Technique.....   | 30 |
| 3.3 Measurement .....  | 31 |
| 3.4 Data Collection and Administration .....   | 35 |
| 3.5 Data Analysis Techniques .....   | 35 |



|  |    |
|--|----|
| 3.5.1 Validity and Reliability .....   | 37 |
| 3.5.2 Descriptive Analysis .....   | 38 |
| 3.5.3 Regression Analysis.....   | 38 |
| <br>   |    |
| CHAPTER 4 .....  | 41 |
| FINDINGS .....   | 41 |
| 4.1 Introduction.....  | 41 |
| 4.2 Overview of the Data Collected .....   | 41 |
| 4.2.1 Profile of Respondents & Response Rate .....   | 41 |
| 4.2.2 Profile of Respondents .....   | 42 |
| 4.3 Goodness of Measure .....  | 44 |
| 4.3.1 Reliability Analysis .....   | 44 |
| 4.4 Descriptive Analysis.....  | 45 |
| 4.5 Pearson Correlation Coefficient.....   | 47 |
| 4.6 Multiple Regressions.....  | 49 |
| 4.7 Hypothesis Testing.....  | 51 |
| 4.7.1 Hypotheses 1 : There is a positive relationship between<br>Transformational Leadership and employee engagement.....  | 51 |
| 4.7.2 Hypotheses 2 : There is a positive relationship between<br>Transactional Leadership and employee engagement, but to a lesser<br>degree than transformational leadership..... | 52 |
| 4.8 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....  | 52 |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>4.9 CONCLUSION .....</b>  | <b>53</b> |
| <b>DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMEDATIONS.....</b>  | <b>54</b> |
| <b>5.1 Discussion .....</b>  | <b>54</b> |
| <b>5.1.1 Objective 1 : To determine if transformation leadership has an effect on employee engagement ? .....</b>  | <b>55</b> |
| <b>5.1.2 Objective 2: To determine if transactional leadership affects employee engagement but to a lesser degree than transformational leadership?.....</b> | <b>56</b> |
| <b>5.2 Implications.....</b>   | <b>57</b> |
| <b>5.3 Limitations of the Study.....</b>   | <b>58</b> |
| <b>5.3.1 Generalizability of the Findings .....</b>  | <b>58</b> |
| <b>5.3.2 Different Testing Environment.....</b>  | <b>59</b> |
| <b>5.4 Conclusions .....</b>   | <b>59</b> |
| <b>5.5 Recommendations for future research.....</b>  | <b>60</b> |
| <b>REFERENCES .....</b>  | <b>62</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX A SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....</b>   | <b>67</b> |
| <b>Appendix A : Survey Instrument (Questionnaire).....</b>   | <b>68</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX B.....</b>   | <b>74</b> |
| <b>SPSS RESULTS .....</b>  | <b>74</b> |
| <b>Appendix B-1 Respondents Profile.....</b>   | <b>75</b> |
| <b>Appendix B-2 Descriptive Statistics .....</b>   | <b>78</b> |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Appendix B-3 Reliability Analysis for Transactional Leadership .....</b>   | <b>79</b> |
| <b>Appendix B4- Reliability Analysis for Transformational Leadership.....</b> | <b>80</b> |
| <b>Appendix B-5 Correlations .....</b>  | <b>82</b> |
| <b>Appendix B-6 Multiple Regression Analysis.....</b>                         | <b>83</b> |

## LIST OF TABLES

|             |  |    |
|-------------|--|----|
| Table 1.2   | Success rates with regards to employee engagement.....               | 9  |
| Table 3.3   | Distribution of Variables.....                                       | 34 |
| Table 4.2.1 | Response Rate.....   | 41 |
| Table 4.2.2 | Profile of Respondents.....  | 42 |
| Table 4.3   | Reliability Analysis.....  | 44 |
| Table 4.4   | Descriptive Analysis of the Dependent and Independent Variables..... | 45 |
| Table 4.5   | Inter Correlation of the Main Variables.....                         | 48 |
| Table 4.6   | Results of Regression Analysis.....                                  | 49 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|              |  |    |
|--------------|--|----|
| Figure 2.2.1 | Bass' Full Range Leadership Model..... | 22 |
| Figure 2.2.2 | Research Framework.....                | 25 |

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Introduction to the Study

Employee engagement has recently emerged as a popular topic in organizations, with research demonstrating its relationship with positive work outcomes, including high performance, low turnover, and positive business results (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006; Harris, 2007; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Salanova, Agut, & Peiro, 2005; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Although there are many benefits to high employee engagement, few studies have examined how leadership can encourage and foster employee engagement in the workplace and what steps need to be taken to sustain high levels of employee engagement (Macy & Schneider, 2008; May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004).

Hence, this study intends to look at levels of employee engagement and see which leadership styles can influence higher levels of employee engagement at Intel Malaysia.

### **What is Employee Engagement?**

In general, research on employee engagement focuses on how employees feel about their jobs and how they can contribute to their jobs (Saks, 2008). Although the variable "engagement" has been studied for decades, the construct of employee engagement is still unclear and debated among

The contents of  
the thesis is for  
internal user  
only

## REFERENCES

- Bass, B.M., Waldman, D.A., Avolio, B.J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational leaders, the falling dominoes effect. *Group and Organization Studies*, 12, 73-87
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Bass, B.M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and international boundaries ? *American Psychologist*, 52, 130-139.
- Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational leadership : industrial, military, and educational impact*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1990). *Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B.M, & Avolio, B.J. (1992). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14 (5), 21-37.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership : a response to critiques. In M. Chemers and R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspective and Directions*. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1997). Full range leadership development: manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire: Mind Garden, Palo Alto, CA.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (2004). *Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire (3<sup>rd</sup>, Form5X)*, Consulting Psychologists Press: Palo Alto, CA.
- Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218.
- Bass, B.M., Waldman, D.A., Avolio, B.J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational Leaders, The Falling Dominoes Effect. *Group and Organization Studies*, 12, 73-87.
- Beatty, C., & Lee, G. (1992). Leadership among middle managers - an exploration in the context of technological change. *Human Relations*, 45(9), 957-89.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper & Row.



- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1964). *The Managerial Grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*. London: Sage.
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R.D., & Allen, J.S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 468-78.
- Curphy, G.J. (1992). *An empirical investigation of the effects of the transformational and transactional leadership on organizational climate, attrition and performance*. Greensboro: The Centre for Creative Leadership.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., de Jonge, J., Janssen, P.P.M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control. *Scandinavian Journal of Work Environment and Health*, 27 (4), 279-286.
- Den Hartog, D.N., & Koopman, P.L. (2002). Leadership in organizations. *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology*, 2, 166 – 187.
- Den Hartog, D.N., Van Muijen, J.J., & Koopman, P.L. (1997). Transactional versus transformation leadership : an analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(1), 19-34.
- Ehrlich, S.B., Meindl, J.R., & Viellieu, B. (1990). The charismatic appeal of a transformational leader: an empirical case study of a small, high-technology contractor. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1 (4), 229 – 247.
- Green, S.B., Salkind, N., & Akey, T. (1997). *Using SPSS for Windows: Analyzing and understanding data*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., & Black, B.C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis, 5th ed.* Eaglewood Chiffs: The Prentice-Hall International.
- Hallberg, U. E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Same same but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment? *European Psychologist*, 11, 119-127.
- Harris, L. L. (2007). *The relationship of leaderships' communication to employee engagement and intent to stay*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Harrison, A.W., & Rainer, R.K. (1992). The influence of individual differences on skill.

- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 268-279.
- Hater, J.J., & Bass, B.M. (1988). Superiors' evaluation and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*(4), 695-702.
- Harter, J. K., & Schmidt, F. L. (2008). Conceptual versus empirical distinctions among constructs: implications for discriminant validity. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*, 36-39.
- Hersey, P., & Balanchard, K.H. (1972), *Management of Organizational Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- House, R.J. (1971), A Path Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*, 321-8.
- Hollander, E.P. (1964). *Leaders, Groups and Influence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Howell, J.M., & Higgins, C.A. (1990). Champions of technological innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*, 317-41.
- Izzo, J., & Withers, P (2002). *Values Shift: The New Work Ethic and What It Means for Business*. Chicago: Fairwinds Press.
- Keller, R.T. (1992). Transformational leadership and the performance of R&D project groups. *Journal of Management, 18* (3), 489- 501.
- Kotter, J. (1990). What Do Leaders Really Do?. *Harvard Business Review, May-June*, 103-11
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (1987). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (1989). *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Macy, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*, 3-30.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter. M.P. (2001). Job Burnout, *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 397-422.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability and the engagement of the

- human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11-37.
- Newman, D. A., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Been there, bottled that: are state and behavioral work engagement new and useful construct "wines"? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 31-35.
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C., & Williams, E. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformation and transactional leadership : a two-study sample. *Journal of Management*, 25, 897 – 933.
- Reddin, W.J. (1970). *Managerial Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rost, J.C. (1993). *Leadership for the Twenty-first Century*. Westport: Praeger.
- Saks, A. M. (2008). The meaning and bleeding of employee engagement: how muddy is the water? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 40-43.
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiro, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: the mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1217-1227.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. John Wiley & Sons Publications
- Shamir, B. (1991). The Charismatic Relationship: Alternative Explanations and Directions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2 (2), 81-104.
- Shamir, B., House, R.J., & Arthur, M.B. (1992). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: a self-concept based theory. *Organizational Science*.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293-315.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.

- Tichy, N., & Devanna, M. (1986). *Transformational Leadership*. New York: John Wiley.
- Vroom, V.H., & Yetton, P.W. (1973). *Leadership and Decision Making*. Pittsburg.
- Yammarino, F.J., & Bass, B.M. (1990). Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations*, 43 (10), 975-995.
- Yukl, G. (1989, 1994). *Leadership in Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Zikmund, G. W. (2003). *Business Research Methods*. Thomson Publications.