

ROLE OF LEADERSHIP IN EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT - EMPLOYEE PERSONALITY AS A MEDIATING FACTOR

Dr. Sundari Dadhabai¹ Vyshnavi Bhattad²

1. Associate Professor, Department of MBA, Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation (KLEF), Deemed to be University, Vaddeswaram, Green fields, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India -522302. Mail ID: sundaridadhabai@gmail.com. Ph. 9059849965.
2. MBA Student,,Department of MBA,Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation (KLEF), Deemed to be University, Vaddeswaram, Green fields, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India - 522302, Mail ID: vyshubhattad@gmail.com Ph: 6304869164

DOI : 10.48047/IJFANS/11/S7/022

ABSTRACT

In the present day VUCA world if any organization want to sustain it is possible only with the support of all employees who are driven by the able leader. In this context researcher is interested to know whether the leader style determines the development of employees thus contributing for the growth The purpose of this research article is to investigate how personality qualities play a mediating role and how leadership influences employee growth. The main goal is to investigate the relationship between successful leadership styles and employee growth in organizations, as well as how personality characteristics between people can temper this relationship. The study will also examine the numerous interactions between leadership styles and personality attributes of employees that affect employee growth.To fulfil the research aims, the study will employ a quantitative method by collecting data using a survey questionnaire. Employees from INTEL Company will get the survey, and data will be gathered and analysed using statistical methods like regression analysis. The research will concentrate on the effects of leadership styles (Autocratic, Democratic and Laissez faire) on employee growth, the moderating effect of employee personality characteristics, and the mediating function of employee personality in the link between leadership and employee development.

KEY WORDS:

Personality, Leadership, Employee Growth, Autocratic Leadership style, Laissez faire

INTRODUCTION

Executives lead, advise, and influence people to achieve goals in each context. Leadership inspires employee enthusiasm and trust.Leadership influences others. Influencing a group to achieve a goal is another meaning. Leaders must encourage teams to achieve long-term goal. Leadership involves shaping behaviour. Consider how a leader and his followers interact. Leaders encourage others to attain their goals. Good leaders may be created. Leaders may succeed with drive and dedication. Leadership definitions include these. Leadership is persuading people to strive toward common goals.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Nandana, Prabhu K P (2016)¹The author of the article "Transformational leadership and workplace spirituality: A structural model of team effectiveness" This study aims to ascertain how transformational leadership's embedded team culture affects the efficiency of teams. G. Harnath (2011)²In his essay "A study of leadership among teachers," he examines how leadership styles relate to certain socioeconomic and organizational position characteristics of the instructors as well as how they interact with one another. Irene Huertas- Valdivia (2018)³He wrote on the "Effects of various leadership styles on hospitality workers" in his writings. His goals are to research how various leadership philosophies might help to maximize the potential of hospitality employees. Badri Nath (2013)⁴"Effects of different leadership styles on hospitality workers" analyses how emotional intelligence affects leadership effectiveness and leadership styles .Deshpande Puranik, Vijaya (2015)⁵ in their article "An analytical study of leadership styles in diverse organizations" Their main objective is to prepare the leadership profile of leaders of the public sector organisations, and IT organisations and thereby to find out the effective style of leadership in each type of organisation.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To examine the type of leadership style prevailing in organization
2. To know the impact of leadership style on employee development.
3. To investigate the mediating role of employee personality in the relationship between leadership and employee development.
4. To identify the most effective leadership styles for promoting employee development

HYPOTHESES**H₁₀ : there is no significant impact of leadership style on employee development**

H_{1a}: There is no significant impact of autocratic leadership style on employee development

H_{1b}: There is no significant impact of democratic leadership style on employee development

H_{1c}: There is no significant impact of laissez faire leadership style on employee development

H₂₀ :Employee personality is not affecting the relationship between leadership and employee development

H_{2a}: There is no significant impact of autocratic leadership style on employee personality

H_{2b}: There is no significant impact of democratic leadership style on employee personality

H_{2c}: There is no significant impact of laissez faire leadership style on employee personality

METHODOLOGY

This study will use quantitative methodology and a cross sectional design. Participants will be chosen from an INTEL company and self-administered questionnaires will be used to gather the .To recruit participants from a range of organisations, the study will use a simple sample technique. Employees from various levels of the company, including front-line workers, middle-level managers, and senior management, will take part. To assess leadership styles , employee personality traits, and employee development , the research project will use standardised measurements. Theory X and Theory Y will be used to evaluate personality

traits, the Employee Development Scale will be used to examine employee development, and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) will be used to assess leadership styles. To further understand how employee personality factors influence the link between leadership style and employee development, the specific personality qualities that mediate this link will also be found using a linear regression analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

H1₀ : there is no significant impact of leadership style on employee development

H1a: There is no significant impact of autocratic leadership style on employee development

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.042 ^a	.002	-.007	4.203

a. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic

b. Dependent Variable: Employee development

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.575	1	3.575	.202	.654 ^b
	Residual	2049.213	116	17.666		
	Total	2052.788	117			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee development

b. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic

INTERPRETATION

The R-squared value of 0.002 suggests that only 0.2% of the variance in employee development can be explained by the Autocratic leadership style. The non-significant p-value of 0.654 indicates that we accept the null hypothesis, suggesting no significant impact of Autocratic leadership style on employee development.

H1b: There is no significant impact of democratic leadership style on employee development

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.494 ^a	.244	.238	3.657

a. Predictors: (Constant), democratic

b. Dependent Variable: Employee development

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	501.444	1	501.444	37.495	<.001 ^b
	Residual	1551.344	116	13.374		
	Total	2052.788	117			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee development

b. Predictors: (Constant), democratic

INTERPRETATION

The R-squared value of 0.244 suggests that 24.4% of the variance in employee development can be explained by the democratic variable, indicating a moderate relationship. The statistical significance ($p < 0.001$) suggests rejecting the null hypothesis, indicating a significant impact of democratic leadership style on employee development.

H1c: There is no significant impact of laissez faire leadership style on employee development

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.637 ^a	.405	.400	3.244

a. Predictors: (Constant), laissez-faire

b. Dependent Variable: Employee development

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	831.981	1	831.981	79.054	<.001 ^b
	Residual	1220.807	116	10.524		
	Total	2052.788	117			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee development

b. Predictors: (Constant), laissez-faire

INTERPRETATION

The R-squared value of 0.405 suggests that 40.5% of the variance in employee development can be explained by the laissez-faire variable. The statistically significant p-value ($p < 0.001$)

indicates that we should reject the null hypothesis, implying a significant impact of laissez-faire leadership style on employee development.

H20 :Employee personality is not affecting the relationship between leadership and employee development

H2a: There is no significant impact of autocratic leadership style on employee personality

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.106 ^a	.011	.003		2.009

a. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic

b. Dependent Variable: employeepersonality

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.296	1	5.296	1.312	.254 ^b
	Residual	468.297	116	4.037		
	Total	473.593	117			

a. Dependent Variable: employee personality

b. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic

INTERPRETATION

The R-squared value of 0.011 suggests that only 1.1% of the variance in employee personality can be explained by the Autocratic variable. This indicates a weak relationship between Autocratic leadership style and employee personality. The non-significant p-value of 0.254 suggests that we accept the null hypothesis, indicating no significant impact of Autocratic leadership style on employee personality.

H2b: There is no significant impact of democratic leadership style on employee personality

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.186 ^a	.035	.026		1.985

a. Predictors: (Constant), democratic

b. Dependent Variable: employeepersonality

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16.429	1	16.429	4.169	.043 ^b
	Residual	457.164	116	3.941		

Total	473.593	117			
-------	---------	-----	--	--	--

a. Dependent Variable: employeepersonality

b. Predictors: (Constant), democratic

INTERPRETATION

The R-squared value of 0.035 indicates that 3.5% of the variance in employee personality can be explained by the democratic variable. The correlation coefficient (R) of 0.186 suggests a weak positive relationship. The statistically significant p-value of 0.043 suggests rejecting the null hypothesis, indicating a potential impact of the democratic variable on employee personality.

H2c: There is no significant impact of laissez faire leadership style on employee personality

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.372 ^a	.138	.131		1.876

a. Predictors: (Constant), laissez-faire

b. Dependent Variable: employeepersonality

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	65.376	1	65.376	18.577	<.001 ^b
	Residual	408.217	116	3.519		
	Total	473.593	117			

a. Dependent Variable: employee personality

b. Predictors: (Constant), laissez faire

INTERPRETATION

The R-squared value of 0.138 indicates that approximately 13.8% of the variance in employee personality can be explained by the Laissez-faire variable. This suggests a moderate relationship between Laissez-faire leadership style and employee personality. The significant p-value of < .001 indicates that we reject the null hypothesis, suggesting a significant impact of Laissez-faire leadership style on employee personality.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The predictor variable of Autocratic has a very weak and insignificant relationship with the dependent variable of Employee development, explaining only 0.2% of the variance in the data.

The data suggests that there is a positive relationship between a democratic leadership style and employee development. The coefficient of 1.549 indicates that for every one-unit

increase in democratic leadership, there is a predicted increase of 1.549 in employee development.

The model explains 40.5% of the variance in employee development, which suggests that laissez-faire is a moderately strong predictor of employee development. The standardized coefficient (beta) of 0.637 confirms this, indicating that laissez-faire has a moderately strong effect on employee development.

The ANOVA table shows that the regression model is not statistically significant, as the p-value for the F-test is 0.254, which is greater than the conventional alpha level of 0.05. This means that there is insufficient evidence to support the claim that the Autocratic variable has a significant effect on employee personality.

This study examined how leadership styles affect employee development and personality. Only three leadership philosophies—autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire—were emphasized.

While authoritarian leadership styles were shown to have a detrimental effect on employee growth and personality, democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles were found to have a favourable effect on both. This study found that leadership style and employee personality and development affect performance both favourably and adversely. Leadership requires opportunity, belonging, and decision-making. To enhance productivity, organizations should focus on democratic and laissez-faire leadership. This study examined how leadership styles affect personality and staff development. Quantitative data were used. This has limited the research's scope and usefulness.

REFERENCES

1. 1.Andana, P. K. (2016), Transformational leadership and workplace spirituality: A structural model of team effectiveness. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 5(11), 18-27. Doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.17875.87846
2. 2.Harnath, G. (2011). A study of leadership among teachers. *Journal of Educational Research and Extension*, 48(1), 29-35. Retrieved from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jrme/papers/Vol48-issue1/Version-4/E48142935.pdf>
3. 3.Huertas-Valdivia, I. (2018). Effects of different leadership styles on hospitality workers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(2), 1084-1101. doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-05-2016-0275
4. Nath, B. (2013). Effects of different leadership styles on hospitality workers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 25(2), 214-236. doi: 10.1108/09596111311287790
5. Deshpande Puranik, V., & Vijaya, D. (2015). An analytical study of leadership styles in diverse organizations. *International Journal of Research in Commerce, IT and Management*, 5(5), 8-12. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281356740_An_Analytical_Study_of_Leadership_Styles_in_Diverse_Organizations

6. Garg, N., & Ganesh, N. (2018). Employees' perception and diversity in management. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science*, 4(6), 108-113.
7. Cho, H. J., & Kim, M. (2017). The importance of diversity strategies in social enterprises: An exploratory study. *Sustainability*, 9(7), 1172.
8. Manoharan, A. P. (2017). Role of diversity in hospitality industry: A comprehensive literature study. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 3(8), 598-602.
9. Bedi, P., Lakra, P., & Gupta, E. (2014). Workforce diversity management: A crucial organizational strategy for the 21st century. *BVIMR Management Edge*, 7(2), 1-11.
10. Jha, A. (2009). Need for cross-cultural management: A study on workforce diversity in India. *HRM Review*, 5(2), 11-17.